REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
OF THE JURUPA VALLEY CITY COUNCIL
Thursday, January 17, 2019
Council Reception: 6:00 p.m.
Regular Session: 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chamber
8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509

A. As a courtesy to those in attendance, we ask that cell phones be turned off or set to their silent mode and that you keep talking to a minimum so that all persons can hear the comments of the public and City Council.

B. A member of the public who wishes to speak under Public Comments must fill out a “Speaker Card” and submit it to the City Clerk BEFORE the Mayor calls for Public Comments on an agenda item. Each agenda item up will be open for public comments before taking action. Public comments on subjects that are not on the agenda can be made during the “Public Appearance/Comments” portion of the agenda.

C. Members of the public who wish to comment on the CONSENT CALENDAR may do so during the Public Comment portion of the Agenda prior to the adoption of the Consent Calendar.

D. As a courtesy to others and to assure that each person wishing to be heard has an opportunity to speak, please limit your comments to 3 minutes.

6:00 P.M. - 7:00 P.M. - CITY COUNCIL RECEPTION

Members of the public are invited to a Special Council Reception to meet their Council Members prior to tonight’s meeting.

1. 7:00 P.M. - CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL FOR REGULAR SESSION

- Brian Berkson, Mayor
- Anthony Kelly, Jr., Mayor Pro Tem
- Chris Barajas, Council Member
- Lorena Barajas, Council Member
- Micheal Goodland, Council Member

2. INVOCATION

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
5. PRESENTATIONS

6. PUBLIC APPEARANCE/COMMENTS

Persons wishing to address the City Council on subjects other than those listed on the Agenda are requested to do so at this time. A member of the public who wishes to speak under Public Appearance/Comments OR the Consent Calendar must fill out a “Speaker Card” and submit it to the City Clerk BEFORE the Mayor calls for Public Comments on an agenda item. When addressing the City Council, please come to the podium and state your name and address for the record. While listing your name and address is not required, it helps us to provide follow-up information to you if needed. In order to conduct a timely meeting, we ask that you keep your comments to 3 minutes. Government Code Section 54954.2 prohibits the City Council from taking action on a specific item until it appears on an agenda.

7. INTRODUCTIONS, ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, COUNCIL COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

8. CITY MANAGER'S UPDATE

9. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. DECEMBER 11, 2018 SPECIAL MEETING

B. DECEMBER 20, 2018 REGULAR MEETING

10. CONSENT CALENDAR (COMMENTS ON CONSENT AGENDA TAKEN HERE)

(All matters on the Consent Calendar are to be approved in one motion unless a Councilmember requests a separate action on a specific item on the Consent Calendar. If an item is removed from the Consent Calendar, it will be discussed individually and acted upon separately.)

A. COUNCIL APPROVAL OF A MOTION TO WAIVE THE READING OF THE TEXT OF ALL ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS INCLUDED IN THE AGENDA

Requested Action: That the City Council waive the reading of the text of all ordinances and resolutions included in the agenda.

B. CONSIDERATION OF CHECK REGISTER IN THE AMOUNT OF $3,189,341.12

Requested Action: That the City Council ratify the check registers dated December 13, 2018 and January 3, 2019 as well as the payroll registers dated December 19, 2018 and January 2, 2019.
C. APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO AGREEMENT FOR PURCHASE, INSTALLATION, CONFIGURATION, MAINTENANCE, SUPPORT AND TRAINING OF LASERFICHE SOFTWARE SYSTEM AND DOCUMENT SCANNING SERVICES

Requested Action: That the City Council approve Amendment No. 1 to the agreement between the City of Jurupa Valley and ECS imaging, Inc. for the purchase, installation, configuration, maintenance, support and training of the Laserfiche software system and documentation scanning services.

D. AUTHORIZING THE DESTRUCTION OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE CITY RECORDS

Requested Action: That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-01, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, AUTHORIZING THE DESTRUCTION OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE CITY RECORDS

E. APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES BETWEEN THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY AND ONWARD ENGINEERING FOR ENGINEERING DESIGN SERVICES FOR THE 2018-2019 ADA IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (18-B.1)

1. Requested Action: That the City Council approve an agreement between Onward Engineering and the City of Jurupa Valley for the 2018-2019 ADA Improvement Project in an amount not to exceed $26,900 and authorize the City Manager to execute the Agreement in substantially the form attached and in such final form as approved by the City Attorney; and

2. Authorize the City Manager to execute scope of services amendments not to exceed 10% of the total agreement pursuant to requirements set forth in the agreement.

F. RATIFY THE TRANSPORTATION UNIFORM MITIGATION FEE REIMBURSEMENT AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS AND THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY FOR THE MARKET STREET BRIDGE OVER THE SANTA ANA RIVER

Requested Action: That the City Council ratify the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) Reimbursement Agreement by and between the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) and the City of Jurupa Valley for the Market Street Bridge over the Santa Ana River as approved by the City Attorney.
11. CONSIDERATION OF ANY ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR

12. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. PUBLIC HEARING FOR RECONSIDERATION OF MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 17099: CHANGE OF ZONE (CZ) NO. 17003 TO CHANGE THE ZONING CLASSIFICATION OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY FROM R-1 (ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS) TO R-4 (PLANNED RESIDENTIAL) AND TO CONSIDER AN APPEAL OF TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 37211, SUBDIVISION OF SAID PROPERTY INTO 48 lots for future single family residential development, three lettered street lots, 2 lettered lots for drainage facilities, and the construction of associated on-site and off-site infrastructure. Property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) (APPLICANT: SEQUANATA PARTNERS, LP)

1. Requested Action: That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-02, entitled:

   A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR A PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION (“SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS”) (48 UNITS) LOCATED ON 10.4 ACRES AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018)

2. That the City Council conduct a first reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2019-01, entitled:

   AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY OFFICIAL ZONING MAP CHANGING THE ZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) FROM ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (R-4) ZONE

3. That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-03, entitled:

B. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA16005) FROM LDR (LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL – COUNTRY NEIGHBORHOOD) TO MDR (MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL) AND NOTICE OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION’S DECISION TO APPROVE MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 16146 (TTM37052) A PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT FOR NOTICING THE ADVISORY AGENCY’S (PLANNING COMMISSION) DECISION OF APPROVING A SUBDIVISION OF A PROPERTY LOCATED WEST OF HUDSON STREET BETWEEN 60TH AND 59TH STREETS (APN: 165-100-027) (APPLICANTS: ANDREW SHORES AND PAUL TALANIAN)

1. Requested Action: That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-04, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM AND APPROVING GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 16005 TO CHANGE THE LAND USE DESIGNATION OF APPROXIMATELY 7.25 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED WEST OF HUDSON STREET BETWEEN 60TH AND 59TH STREETS (APN: 165-100-027) FROM LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL – COUNTRY NEIGHBORHOOD (LDR) TO MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MDR)

2. That the City Council receive and file the Notice of Decision, initiating the commencement of a ten-day appeal period for Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37052.
C. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AN AMENDMENT TO THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) ANNUAL ACTION PLAN FOR 2018-2019

Requested Action: That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-05, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING A SUBSTANTIAL AMENDMENT TO THE 2018-2019 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) ANNUAL ACTION PLAN

D. PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE ANNEXATION OF TERRITORY (ZONE 2-B - VALLEY SQUARE, LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF MISSION BOULEVARD AND PYRITE STREET TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO. 89-1-CONSOLIDATED (THE “DISTRICT”) AND THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF ASSESSMENTS WITHIN SUCH TERRITORY

Requested Action: That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-06, entitled:


E. PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE ANNEXATION OF TERRITORY (ZONE K - JURUPA ESTATES, LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF JURUPA ROAD AND PYRITE STREET TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO. 89-1-CONSOLIDATED (THE “DISTRICT”) AND THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF ASSESSMENTS WITHIN SUCH TERRITORY

Requested Action: That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-07, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, ORDERING THE ANNEXATION OF TERRITORY (ZONE K; NORTHEAST CORNER OF JURUPA ROAD AND PYRITE

F. PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE ANNEXATION OF TERRITORY (ZONE C – PM 37062) TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO. 89-1-CONSOLIDATED (THE “DISTRICT”) AND THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF ASSESSMENTS WITHIN SUCH TERRITORY (CONTINUED FROM THE DECEMBER 20, 2018 MEETING)

Requested Action: That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-08, entitled:


13. COUNCIL BUSINESS

A. UPDATE ON OVERHEAD STREET BANNER POLES

Requested Action: That the City Council receive the update on Overhead Street Banner Poles and provide further direction to staff.

B. RESOLUTION AMENDING SECTION 2 OF RESOLUTION NO. 2015-03, ESTABLISHING THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE BY ADDING MEMBERS APPOINTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL AND MAKING NEW APPOINTMENTS IF THE RESOLUTION IS ADOPTED

Requested Action: That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-09, entitled:
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY AMENDING SECTION 2 OF RESOLUTION NO. 2015-03, ESTABLISHING THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE BY ADDING MEMBERS APPOINTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL

14. CITY COUNCIL MEMBER ORAL/WRITTEN REPORTS REGARDING REGIONAL BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

A. MAYOR BRIAN BERKSON

1. UPDATE ON THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING OF JANUARY 9, 2019

2. UPDATE ON THE METROLINK/SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY MEETING OF JANUARY 11, 2019

3. UPDATE ON THE MOBILE SOURCE AIR POLLUTION REDUCTION REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING OF JANUARY 17, 2019

B. MAYOR PRO TEM ANTHONY KELLY, JR.

1. UPDATE ON THE NORTHWEST TRANSPORTATION NOW COALITION MEETING OF JANUARY 10, 2019

2. UPDATE ON THE NORTHWEST MOSQUITO AND VECTOR CONTROL DISTRICT MEETING OF JANUARY 17, 2019

C. COUNCIL MEMBER CHRIS BARAJAS

1. UPDATE ON THE WESTERN COMMUNITY ENERGY BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING OF JANUARY 9, 2019

D. COUNCIL MEMBER LORENA BARAJAS

1. UPDATE ON THE WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNTY REGIONAL CONSERVATION AUTHORITY MEETING OF JANUARY 7, 2019

E. COUNCIL MEMBER MICHEAL GOODLAND

1. UPDATE ON THE WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS BOARD MEETING OF JANUARY 7, 2019

15. CITY ATTORNEY’S REPORT
16. COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS AND COMMENTS

17. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn to the Regular Meeting of February 7, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. at the City Council Chamber, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509.

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 City Council or other services, please contact Jurupa Valley City Hall at (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, Jurupa Valley City Council Members in connection with a matter subject to discussion or consideration at an open meeting of the City Council 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 Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509, at the time the writing is distributed to all, or a majority of, Jurupa Valley City Council Members. The City Council may also post the writing on its Internet website at www.jurupavalley.org.

Agendas and Minutes are posted on the City’s website at www.jurupavalley.org.
MINUTES
OF THE SPECIAL MEETING
OF THE JURUPA VALLEY CITY COUNCIL
December 11, 2018

The meeting was held at the Jurupa Valley City Council Chamber, 8930 Limonite Avenue,
Jurupa Valley, CA 90259

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL
   - Micheal Goodland, Mayor
   - Brian Berkson, Mayor Pro Tem
   - Anthony Kelly, Jr., Council Member
   - Verne Lauritzen, Council Member
   - Laura Roughton, Council Member

   Mayor Goodland called the special meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. He announced that Council Members Verne Lauritzen and Laura Roughton were absent.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE was led by Council Member Anthony Kelly, Jr.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

   A motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Berkson, seconded by Council Member Kelly, to approve the Agenda.

   Ayes: Berkson, Goodland, Kelly
   Noes: None
   Absent: Lauritzen, Roughton

4. INSTALLATION OF NEWLY ELECTED COUNCIL MEMBERS

   A. CERTIFICATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE CONSOLIDATED GENERAL ELECTION HELD ON NOVEMBER 6, 2018

   Staff Report presented by Victoria Wasko, City Clerk

   A motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Brian Berkson, seconded by Council Member Anthony Kelly, to adopt Resolution No. 2018-75, entitled:

   A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, RECITING THE FACTS OF THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION HELD ON NOVEMBER 6, 2018 DECLARING THE RESULTS THEROF AND SUCH OTHER MATTERS AS PROVIDED BY LAW
Ayes: Berkson, Goodland, Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: Lauritzen, Roughton

B. SWEARING-IN OF NEW COUNCIL MEMBERS BY CITY CLERK AND PRESENTATION OF CERTIFICATES OF ELECTION

The City Clerk administered the oath of office to newly elected Council Members Lorena Barajas, Chris Barajas, and Brian Berkson.

After taking the oath of office, Lorena Barajas and Chris Barajas took their seats at the dais.

Mayor Goodland congratulated newly elected Council Members Lorena Barajas, Chris Barajas, and Brian Berkson on their election and re-election to the City Council.

5. PUBLIC APPEARANCE/COMMENTS

Dan Shapiro conveyed congratulations to the newly elected Council Members. He stated that he was very pleased and he looks forward to working with the new City Council.

6. INTRODUCTIONS, ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, COUNCIL COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council Member Anthony Kelly congratulated and welcomed the newly elected Council Members, stating that he looks forward to continuing a positive working relationship.

Mayor Pro Tem Brian Berkson thanked all those who supported his re-election to Council District 3, stating that he will continue to serve all the City’s constituents. He congratulated Lorena Barajas and Chris Barajas on their election to the City Council and added that he looks forward to working together for the betterment of the community.

Council Member Lorena Barajas stated that she was truly honored to serve on the City Council. She expressed appreciation to everyone who supported her, stating that she is ready to work hard on behalf of the citizens of Jurupa Valley.

Council Member Chris Barajas thanked everyone who supported him and who came out this evening to share this special occasion with him. He expressed appreciation to the residents of Council District 5 who supported him and for putting their trust in him. He looks forward to moving the City forward.

Mayor Goodland congratulated the newly elected City officials. He stated that he looks forward to working together to ensure continued growth and progress in the City of Jurupa Valley.
7. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the City Council, Mayor Goodland adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

The next meeting of the Jurupa Valley City Council will be held December 20, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. at the City Council Chamber, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509.

Respectfully submitted,

_____________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
The meeting was held at the Jurupa Valley City Council Chamber, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA

1. **7:00 P.M. - CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
   - Micheal Goodland, Mayor
   - Brian Berkson, Mayor Pro Tem
   - Chris Barajas, Council Member
   - Lorena Barajas, Council Member
   - Anthony Kelly, Jr., Council Member

   Mayor Goodland called the regular meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

2. **INVOCATION** was given by Pastor David De La Cruz, Beacon Hill Assembly of God Church.

3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** was led by Council Member Chris Barajas.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

   Council Member Lorena Barajas requested that the Agenda be re-arranged in order to consider Items 14.A and 14.B prior to the Consent Calendar.

   A motion was made by Council Member Chris Barajas, seconded by Mayor Micheal Goodland, to approve the Agenda with Items 14.A and 14.B to be considered before the Consent Calendar.

   **Ayes:** C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
   **Noes:** None
   **Absent:** None

5. **CITY COUNCIL REORGANIZATION**

   Pursuant to Resolution No. 2011-02, at its last regular City Council meeting in December, the City Council shall select from among its members a Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem to serve for the following year. The Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem shall take office on January 1 of each year. The term of office for the Mayor and the Mayor Pro Tem shall be a calendar year from January 1 through December 31.

   **A. ELECTION OF MAYOR**

   Mayor Goodland explained the nomination procedure.
There were no public comments.

Council Member Anthony Kelly nominated Mayor Pro Tem Brian Berkson to serve as Mayor. There being no further nominations, the nominations were closed. Mayor Pro Tem Brian Berkson received a majority vote and was elected to serve as Mayor for a term expiring December 31, 2019.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None
Abstained: B. Berkson

B. ELECTION OF MAYOR PRO TEM

Mayor Pro Tem Brian Berkson nominated Council Member Anthony Kelly, Jr. to serve as Mayor Pro Tem. There being no further nominations, the nominations were closed. Council Member Anthony Kelly, Jr. received a majority vote and was elected to serve as Mayor Pro Tem for a term expiring December 31, 2019.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

6. PRESENTATIONS

A. RECOGNITION TO OUTGOING MAYOR MICHEAL GOODLAND

Mayor Pro Tem Berkson and members of the Council expressed appreciation to Micheal Goodland and thanked him for his service as Mayor. Mayor Pro Tem Berkson commended Mr. Goodland for his commitment to military veterans and his support to the community. Council Member Kelly thanked Mr. Goodland for being a mentor and a friend. The Council presented Mr. Goodland with a gavel plaque in appreciation of his leadership as Mayor.

Mayor Goodland stated that it has been an honor to serve and he appreciates his colleagues on the Council and what they contribute to the City.

7. PUBLIC APPEARANCE/COMMENTS

Leah Peterson, Public Affairs Manager, Southern California Gas Company, spoke regarding a “balanced energy approach” that can work for everyone to reach California’s climate action and greenhouse gas emissions regulations that must be reached by 2030. She described the benefits of natural gas and added that consumers want choice.
George Ruiz, representing the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, announced that volunteers are being sought for the annual Homeless Point-in-Time Count which will take place on January 29, 2019. He explained the importance of this event as the data collected will be used to develop programs and strategies to end homelessness. Interested persons may visit www.rivcoexchange.com to register.

Reynaldo Gutierrez stated that he was presented with a notice of violation from the City’s Code Enforcement Division. He voiced concern that when he visited City Hall to discuss this issue he was subjected to verbal abuse and intimidation and he would like this matter investigated.

Mayor Goodland asked City staff to look into this matter.

8. INTRODUCTIONS, ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, COUNCIL COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council Member Anthony Kelly, Jr. thanked members of the audience and members of his family who were in attendance this evening. He wished everyone a happy holiday and he looks forward to serving the residents of Jurupa Valley in 2019.

Mayor Pro Tem Brian Berkson conveyed best wishes for a Happy Holiday and a safe and healthy New Year.

Mayor Micheal Goodland wished everyone a very Merry Christmas and a safe and healthy New Year. He encouraged citizens to drive carefully as there is increased traffic this time of year.

9. CITY MANAGER’S UPDATE

A. DISCUSSION OF JANUARY 3, 2019 COUNCIL MEETING

City Manager Gary Thompson discussed a recommendation to cancel the January 3, 2019 Council meeting due to the upcoming Christmas holiday. He advised that there are no items for the Agenda and past practice has been to cancel the first meeting in January.

By consensus, the City Council cancelled the January 3, 2019 meeting. The next regular meeting will be held January 17, 2019.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

City Manager Gary Thompson reported that last week, a large box truck damaged the City Hall roof when the driver tried to turn around in the parking lot. Fortunately, it was caught on the City Hall’s security camera.
10. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. DECEMBER 6, 2018 REGULAR MEETING

A motion was made by Council Member Anthony Kelly, Jr., seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Brian Berkson, to approve the Minutes of the December 6, 2018 regular meeting.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

The following items were taken out of order:

14. COUNCIL BUSINESS

A. APPOINTMENTS TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND ANNUAL RECONFIRMATION PROCESS

In accordance with Ordinance No. 2013-11, the terms of the City’s Planning Commissioners shall be subject to reconfirmation by the City Council.

Mayor Goodland read a statement encouraging his colleagues on the Council to make an informed decision not based on personality but rather based on qualifications and their desire for the betterment of the community.

Staff report presented by City Clerk Victoria Wasko.

Mayor Goodland welcomed the following individuals who expressed an interest in serving on the Planning Commission: Mariana Lopez, Penny Newman, Arlene Pruitt, Brenda Reynolds, and George Ruiz. He invited each candidate to give a brief overview of their qualifications to serve on the Planning Commission.

The applicant presentations followed.

Pauline Cook expressed her interest in serving on the Planning Commission. She outlined her background, education, and experience.

Betty Anderson expressed her view that applicants for the Planning Commission should be required to submit a Letter of Interest as members are often asked to make tough decisions that will have a lasting impact in the community. She suggested that any project with an EIR should be referred to the City Council.

A motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Berkson, seconded by Council Member Chris Barajas, to re-appoint Arlene Pruitt to the Planning Commission for a term expiring in December 2022.
A motion was made by Council Member Chris Barajas, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Brian Berkson, to appoint Penny Newman to the Planning Commission for a term expiring in December 2022.

A yes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

A motion was made by Council Member Lorena Barajas, seconded by Council Member Anthony Kelly, Jr., to appoint Mariana Lopez to the Planning Commission for a term expiring in December 2022.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

Mayor Micheal Goodland expressed appreciation to George Ruiz for his steadfast leadership on the Planning Commission.

A motion was made by Council Member Anthony Kelly, Jr., seconded by Council Member Chris Barajas, to reconfirm the appointment of Planning Commissioner Corey Moore.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

A motion was made by Mayor Micheal Goodland, seconded by Council Member Anthony Kelly, Jr., to reconfirm the appointment of Planning Commissioner Guillermo Silva.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

B. APPOINTMENTS TO THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE AND ANNUAL RECONFIRMATION PROCESS

In accordance with Resolution No. 2017-67, the terms of the members of the City’s Traffic Safety Committee shall be subject to reconfirmation by the City Council in December of each year.
Staff report presented by City Clerk Victoria Wasko.

Mayor Goodland welcomed the following individuals who expressed an interest in serving on the Traffic Safety Committee: Hugo Bustamante, Carol Crouch, Robert Galindo, Mayra Jackson, and Jake Orta. He invited each candidate to give a brief overview of their qualifications to serve on the Traffic Safety Committee.

The applicant presentations followed.

A motion was made by Mayor Micheal Goodland, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Brian Berkson, to re-appoint Carol Crouch to the Traffic Safety Committee for a term expiring in December 2020.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

A motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Brian Berkson, seconded by Council Member Anthony Kelly, Jr., to re-appoint Jake Orta to the Traffic Safety Committee for a term expiring in December 2020.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

A motion was made by Council Member Chris Barajas, seconded by Council Member Anthony Kelly, Jr., to reconfirm the appointment of Hugo Bustamante as an alternate on the Traffic Safety Committee for a term expiring in December 2020.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

Mayor Pro Tem Berkson asked the City Attorney if it would be possible to expand the Traffic Safety Committee to increase the number of members.

City Attorney Peter Thorson responded that the Committee may be expanded by bringing the matter back to the Council to revisit the issue.

11. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. COUNCIL APPROVAL OF A MOTION TO WAIVE THE READING OF THE TEXT OF ALL ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS INCLUDED IN THE AGENDA
Requested Action: That the City Council waive the reading of the text of all ordinances and resolutions included in the agenda.

B. CONSIDERATION OF CHECK REGISTER IN THE AMOUNT OF $3,059,023.92

Requested Action: That the City Council ratify the check registers dated November 28 and December 7 as well as the payroll register dated December 5, 2018.

C. CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A FEE FOR PRIORITY AND NON-PRIORITY APPLICATIONS FOR EXEMPTED COMMERCIAL CANNABIS ACTIVITIES PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 11.45 OF THE JURUPA VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE – REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

Requested Action: That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2018-77, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, ESTABLISHING A FEE FOR PRIORITY AND NON-PRIORITY APPLICATIONS FOR EXEMPTED COMMERCIAL CANNABIS ACTIVITIES PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 11.45 OF THE JURUPA VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE

D. APPROVAL OF CITY HOLIDAY SCHEDULE – REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

Requested Action: That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2018-78, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, DESIGNATING HOLIDAYS ON WHICH CITY OFFICES SHALL BE CLOSED FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2019

E. FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES BETWEEN THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY AND PSOMAS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION SERVICES FOR THE LIMONITE AVENUE WIDENING, BAIN TO HOMESTEAD PROJECT, CIP PROJECT NO. 17-B.2

1. Requested Action: That the City Council approve Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement between Psomas and the City of Jurupa Valley to provide focused surveys for Limonite Avenue Widening, Bain to Homestead Project in an amount not-to-exceed $68,500 and authorize the City
Manager to execute the Amendment in substantially the form attached and in such form as approved by the City Attorney; and

2. That the City Council appropriate $68,500 of unencumbered Development Impact Fee (DIF) funds to the Project account to fund the total project costs.

F. ADOPTION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN ANNEX FROM THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY OPERATIONAL AREA MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN AS REQUIRED BY THE FEDERAL DISASTER MITIGATION AND COST REDUCTION ACT OF 2000

Requested Action: That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2018-79, entitled:


G. NOTICE OF PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION TO APPROVE MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 18200 (EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TTM32722), A PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT FOR NOTICING THE ADVISORY AGENCY’S (PLANNING COMMISSION) DECISION OF GRANTING A 2ND ONE (1) YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME AND MINOR CHANGE NO. 1 FOR TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 32722 (HACIENDA PROPERTIES, LLC), NORTH OF MISSION BOULEVARD, WEST OF CAMINO REAL (APNS: 174-170-039 & 041) – REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

Requested Action: That the City Council receive and file the Notice of Decision, initiating the commencement of a ten-day appeal period.

H. NOTICE OF PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION TO APPROVE MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 16119 (TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 37109 AND VARIANCE NO. 18006), A PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT FOR NOTICING THE ADVISORY AGENCY’S (PLANNING COMMISSION) DECISION OF APPROVING A SUBDIVISION OF A PROPERTY LOCATED IN RUBIDOUX AT THE NORTHERLY TERMINOUS OF RENEE AVENUE WITH AN ADDRESS OF 4077 RIVERVIEW DRIVE (APN: 182-303-005)
Requested Action: That the City Council receive and file the Notice of Decision, initiating the commencement of a ten-day appeal period.

I. APPROVAL OF PARCEL MAP 36976 LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF DE FOREST CIRCLE BETWEEN HOPKINS STREET AND NOBEL COURT INCLUDING ACCEPTANCE OF OFFERS OF DEDICATION, APPROVAL OF SURVEY MONUMENTATION AGREEMENT, AND ACCEPTANCE OF MONUMENTATION BOND (DAVIS JCR MIRA LOMA INDUSTRIAL LAND INVESTORS, LLC) – REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Requested Action: That the City Council approve Parcel Map 36976 and accept the dedications as follows:

a. Accept the offers of dedication of easement for emergency vehicle access purposes over portions of Parcels 1 as shown on Parcel Map 36976.

2. Authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to sign Parcel Map 36976.

3. Approve and authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to execute the Agreement for Placement of Survey Monuments.

4. Accept the Monument Bond in the amount of $3,900.

A motion was made by Council Member Anthony Kelly, Jr., seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Brian Berkson, to approve the Consent Calendar, with the exception of Items 11.C, 11.D, 11.G, and 11.I, which were removed for further discussion.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

12. CONSIDERATION OF ANY ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR

11.C CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A FEE FOR PRIORITY AND NON-PRIORITY APPLICATIONS FOR EXEMPTED COMMERCIAL CANNABIS ACTIVITIES PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 11.45 OF THE JURUPA VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE

Mayor Pro Tem Brian Berkson requested that Item 11.C be removed from the Consent Calendar to publicly clarify that allowing commercial cannabis activity was a voter approved Initiative which included language suggesting the proposed fee and it is not a city sponsored issue.
City Manager Gary Thompson clarified that the proposed fee was stated in the ballot measure language.

A motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Brian Berkson, seconded by Council Member Anthony Kelly, Jr., to adopt Resolution No. 2018-77, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, ESTABLISHING A FEE FOR PRIORITY AND NON-PRIORITY APPLICATIONS FOR EXEMPTED COMMERCIAL CANNABIS ACTIVITIES PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 11.45 OF THE JURUPA VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

11.D APPROVAL OF CITY HOLIDAY SCHEDULE

Council Member Chris Barajas requested that Item 11.D be removed from the Consent Calendar for further discussion. He stated that Christmas Eve has always been a time to rest and relax with family and friends and he would support adding Christmas Eve as an additional City paid holiday.

Further discussion followed.

A motion was made by Council Member Chris Barajas, seconded by Council Member Lorena Barajas, to adopt Resolution No. 2018-78, as amended to include Christmas Eve as an additional paid holiday in 2019 and include ½ day vacation for Christmas Eve this year, as entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, DESIGNATING HOLIDAYS ON WHICH CITY OFFICES SHALL BE CLOSED FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2019

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

G. NOTICE OF PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION TO APPROVE MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 18200 (EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TTM32722), A PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT FOR NOTICING THE ADVISORY AGENCY’S (PLANNING COMMISSION) DECISION OF GRANTING A 2ND ONE (1) YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME AND MINOR CHANGE NO. 1 FOR TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 32722 (HACIENDA PROPERTIES, LLC), NORTH OF MISSION BOULEVARD, WEST OF CAMINO REAL (APNS: 174-170-039 & 041)
Mayor Micheal Goodland requested that Item 11.G be removed from the Consent Calendar for further discussion.

City Manager Gary Thompson provided additional information and responded to Council’s questions.

A motion was made by Mayor Micheal Goodland, seconded by Council Member Anthony Kelly, Jr., to receive and file the Notice of Decision, initiating the commencement of a ten-day appeal period.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

I. APPROVAL OF PARCEL MAP 36976 LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF DE FOREST CIRCLE BETWEEN HOPKINS STREET AND NOBEL COURT INCLUDING ACCEPTANCE OF OFFERS OF DEDICATION, APPROVAL OF SURVEY MONUMENTATION AGREEMENT, AND ACCEPTANCE OF MONUMENTATION BOND (DAVIS JCR MIRA LOMA INDUSTRIAL LAND INVESTORS, LLC)

Council Member Chris Barajas requested that Item 11.I be removed from the Consent Calendar for further discussion.

Thomas Merrell, Planning Director, provided additional information and responded to Council’s questions.

A motion was made by Council Member Chris Barajas, seconded by Council Member Lorena Barajas, to approve Parcel Map 36976 and accept the dedications as follows: 1) accept the offers of dedication of easement for emergency vehicle access purposes over portions of Parcels 1 as shown on Parcel Map 36976; 2) authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to sign Parcel Map 36976; 3) approve and authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to execute the Agreement for Placement of Survey Monuments; and 4) accept the Monument Bond in the amount of $3,900.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

Council Member Chris Barajas stated that as an active member of the Jurupa Valley community and as a candidate for City Council, he has shared his concerns related to the Pilot Flying J and he had expressed strong feelings of opposition. He spoke with the City Attorney and discussed the need for the City Council Members to act fairly and review all of the comments of the community and the developer before making a decision. His desire is to do what is best for the
community and he also wants his comments not to create an issue for the city, therefore, he will recuse himself from this matter and he will allow the rest of the Council to decide this matter.

*Council Member Chris Barajas stepped down from the dais and left the Council Chamber.*

*Mayor Goodland called a short recess at 9:20 p.m. He reconvened the meeting at 9:40 p.m.*

13. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**


Tamara Campbell, Principal Planner, presented the staff report.

Ernie Perea, the City’s CEQA consultant, presented information related to the environmental impacts of the proposed project.

Shawn Nevill, Senior Project Manager, representing T&B Planning, gave an overview of the Environmental Impact Report process and their findings. He offered to answer any questions.

Further discussion followed.

Thomas Merrell, Planning Director, provided additional information and responded to Council’s questions.

Mayor Goodland opened the public hearing and called for any public comments.

Brandon Parks, representing Pilot Travel Centers, (applicant), spoke in support of the project, highlighting the entryway, the number of truck parking spots, the removal of blight, the thoroughness of the environmental review, and the economic benefits of the project. He offered to answer any questions.

Graciela Larios, representing the Center for Environmental Justice, (appellant) explained what it is to live in the Mira Loma Village, pointing out that one resident recently received a double lung transplant. She voiced concern that the
project will cause negative health impacts, additional truck traffic, and diesel air pollution.

Mayor Goodland read a text message from Jeff Goshman, voicing support of the project as it will provide a safe location for local truck parking.

Rene Benavides spoke in support of the project, stating that he is a member of the trucking industry. He outlined the following reasons why he supports the project: 1) the California Air Resources Board is requiring more efficient diesel exhaust systems; 2) the project will provide an opportunity to provide a safe and convenient rest area; 3) it will bring jobs to the community and; 4) it will provide additional revenue to the City.

Joe Rajkovacz, representing Western States Trucking Association, spoke in support of the project, stating that many of their members reside in the City of Jurupa Valley. He spoke about the proposed environmental effects, stating that the California Air Resources Board has the most aggressive standards for diesel engines and today’s diesel engines are 90% cleaner. He added that truck drivers need a safe place to rest and fatigue is a big factor when there are no places to park.

Diana Sanchez, voiced opposition to the project, stating that as a student at Jurupa Valley High School, she is concerned about the additional truck traffic and the poor air quality that the project will bring. She voiced concern that if the project is approved, it will be by choosing profit over the lives of students and the health of the citizens of Jurupa Valley.

Spencer Rogers spoke in support of the project, stating that it will be beneficial to the community. He stated that these trucks are already in the city and the travel center will provide a location for truck parking that will reduce the truck idling that is already occurring in the city. He added that the travel center will also attract other businesses. He encouraged the Council to look at the facts of the EIR. (George Ruiz donated his time to Mr. Rogers)

Robert Garcia, representing the Jurupa Unified School District, stated that the JUSD Board adopted a resolution opposing the project as the Board has a responsibility to ensure that all students who reside within its boundaries have a right to a toxic-free, healthy, and safe K-12 public education. He noted numerous studies show that diesel exhaust exposure in school age children results in asthma, premature death and chronic heart disease.

Debbie Martinez, spoke in opposition to the project, stating that she has grown up in the community and she now suffers from reduced lung capacity due to the elevated pollution levels. She outlined the asthma related illnesses that occur in Riverside County and she encouraged the Council to vote no on the project.
Dania De Ramon spoke in opposition to the project, stating that the City of Jurupa Valley is already overburdened with air pollution and a “countless amount of warehouses and trucks.” She stated that she circulated petitions with over 700 signatures from residents who do not want this project.

Italia Garcia, representing the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice spoke in opposition to the project, stating that she would like the city to prioritize “smart strategic planning.” She added that truckers that live in the city will not be using the truck stop and there could be other options to create revenue for the city.

Rachel Lopez spoke in opposition to the project, stating that residents fought very hard to become a city in order to have a voice in future development. She encouraged the Council to bring in businesses that will create a healthier community. She asked the Council to consider the health and welfare of the residents before they vote.

David Zaft, representing the California Attorney General’s Office, asked the Council to keep in mind the commitment they made to the families that live in Mira Loma Village over 5 years ago. He stated that this project will be built in close proximity to the proposed truck route restriction on Etiwanda Avenue. He asked the Council to consider that the residents of Mira Loma Village are already heavily impacted by truck traffic from existing warehouse facilities and suffer from some of the worst air quality in the state.

Stephen Anderson spoke in opposition to the project, stating that the EIR does not fully address the impacts to the City’s water supply, air pollution, traffic congestion, and resulting crime.

Betty Anderson referred to the children’s health study which was conducted by USC which detailed the long-term effects of air pollution on the health of children. One of the areas studied was in Mira Loma and the study showed that many of these children had stunted lung growth. She voiced concern regarding the EIR and provided comments related to the underground diesel tanks, the economic impacts, and the impact of idling diesel engines. (Jacqueline Lee donated her time to Ms. Anderson)

Allen Hernandez, Executive Director, Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice, spoke in opposition to the project. He stated that the USC study prompted an air monitor to be put in Mira Loma and it has detected fine particulate pollution. He stated that the Pilot Flying J project will just make things worse for the community.

Andrea Vidaurre, representing the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice, spoke in opposition to the project, stating that studies have shown the level of air pollution that exists in the community. She questioned how
the project will be consistent with the Environmental Justice Element of the General Plan. She asked the Council to consider the amount of truck idling that the project will create for the Mira Loma area.

Melissa Ragole, Board Member for the Jurupa Unified School District, spoke in opposition to the project. She asked the Council to consider the negative impacts caused by the proposed project and to seek out better businesses for the community.

Penny Newman spoke in opposition to the project as it will be in close proximity to the residents of Mira Loma Village and it will add more pollution. She voiced concern that the Pilot Flying J project will create diesel exhaust and diesel exhaust is a known carcinogen.

Mark Ostoich, 550 E. Hospitality Lane, San Bernardino, representing the applicant addressed some of the previous comments. He stated that much of the testimony against the project was not based on facts. There were insinuations about the data in the Environmental Impact Report; however, the opponents have produced no facts. He outlined the impacts that were independently studied and described the conclusion that there is no potential for a significant health risk impact from the proposed project. He added that the project is a permitted land use in the M-M zone under the City’s zoning code.

There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed.

Further discussion followed regarding the project’s site plan.

Mayor Pro Tem Berkson questioned the height of the sign. He suggested reducing the height as a 100 ft. sign is not warranted. He questioned how the idling of trucks and security will be monitored. He questioned whether the Sheriff has jurisdiction to cite individuals who are violating the truck idling restrictions.

Thomas Merrell, Planning Director, clarified that violations of the Conditions of Approval will affect the applicant’s ability to operate. He stated that the Air Quality Management District requires that no idling signs be posted on the site and the enforcement may be built into the Conditions of Approval.

City Attorney Peter Thorson clarified that idling violations may be written as two citations; one to the truck driver for violating the Conditions of Approval and one to the owner.

Further discussion followed.
A motion was made by Mayor Micheal Goodland, seconded by Council Member Anthony Kelly, Jr., to pass and adopt Resolution No. 2018-80, with an adjustment to the height of the sign to no more than 75 ft., entitled:


Ayes: B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: L. Barajas
Absent: C. Barajas

Council Member Chris Barajas returned to the dais.

B. PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE ANNEXATION OF TERRITORY (ZONE 2-A – SERRANO BUSINESS PARK) TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO. 89-1-CONSOLIDATED (THE “DISTRICT”) AND THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF ASSESSMENTS WITHIN SUCH TERRITORY
Steve Loriso, City Engineer, presented the staff report.

Mayor Goodland opened the public hearing and called for any public comments.

There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed.

A motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Berkson, seconded by Council Member Kelly, Jr., to pass and adopt Resolution No. 2018 81, entitled:


Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

C. PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE ANNEXATION OF TERRITORY (ZONE C – PM 37062) TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO. 89-1-CONSOLIDATED (THE “DISTRICT”) AND THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF ASSESSMENTS WITHIN SUCH TERRITORY

Steve Loriso, City Engineer, presented the staff report. He recommended that the Council continue this matter to the January 17, 2019 meeting.

Mayor Goodland opened the public hearing and called for any public comments.

A motion was made by Mayor Micheal Goodland, seconded by Council Member Chris Barajas to continue the public hearing to the January 17, 2019 meeting.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None
C. APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES AND ALTERNATES TO REGIONAL BOARDS AND COMMITTEES (ORAL REPORT)

City Clerk Victoria Wasko presented the staff report.

Mayor Goodland called for nominations for the City’s regional boards and committees.

a. By consensus, the City Council appointed Lorena Barajas as the representative to the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority and Anthony Kelly, Jr., as the alternate for a term expiring December, 2019.

   Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
   Noes: None
   Absent: None

b. By consensus, the City Council appointed Brian Berkson as the representative to the Riverside County Transportation Commission and Chris Barajas as the alternate for a term expiring December, 2019.

   Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
   Noes: None
   Absent: None

c. By consensus, the City Council appointed Anthony Kelly, Jr. as the representative to the Riverside Transit Agency and Brian Berkson as the alternate for a term expiring December, 2019.

   Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
   Noes: None
   Absent: None

d. By consensus, the City Council appointed Micheal Goodland as the representative to the Western Riverside Council of Governments and Lorena Barajas as the alternate for a term expiring December, 2019.

   Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
   Noes: None
   Absent: None

e. By consensus, the City Council appointed Chris Barajas as the representative to the Western Community Energy Board of Directors and Brian Berkson as the alternate for a term expiring December, 2019.
f. By consensus, the City Council appointed Anthony Kelly, Jr., as the representative to the Northwest Mosquito and Vector Control District for a term expiring December, 2020. (No alternate required)

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

g. By consensus, the City Council appointed Gary Thompson as the representative and Alan Kreimeier as the alternate to the Public Entity Risk Management Authority for a term expiring December, 2019.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

h. A motion was made by Council Member Anthony Kelly, Jr., seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Brian Berkson, to approve travel and/or reimbursement of expenses to attend upcoming conferences for each of the above-mentioned boards, commissions and or committees in accordance with the City’s Travel Reimbursement Policy.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None

2. CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING A REVISED FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION FORM 806 REFLECTING THE APPOINTMENTS MADE TO THE REGIONAL BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

City Clerk Victoria Wasko presented the staff report.

A motion was made by Council Member Anthony Kelly, Jr., seconded by Council Member Chris Barajas to adopt Resolution No. 2018-83, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, APPROVING A REVISED FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION FORM 806 REGARDING THE APPOINTMENT OF COUNCIL MEMBERS TO COMPENSATED POSITIONS

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None
15. CITY COUNCIL MEMBER ORAL/WRITTEN REPORTS REGARDING REGIONAL BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

A. MAYOR MICHEAL GOODLAND

1. Mayor Goodland gave an update on the Western Community Energy Joint meeting of the Board of Directors and Technical Advisory Committee held December 12, 2018.


B. COUNCIL MEMBER BRIAN BERKSON

1. Mayor Pro Tem Berkson gave an update on the Riverside County Transportation Commission meeting of December 12, 2018.


C. COUNCIL MEMBER ANTHONY KELLY, JR.


16. CITY ATTORNEY’S REPORT

City Attorney Peter Thorson had no report.

17. COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS AND COMMENTS

18. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the City Council, Mayor Goodland adjourned the meeting at 1:41 a.m.

The next meeting of the Jurupa Valley City Council will be held January 17, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. at the City Council Chamber, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509.
Respectfully submitted,

Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
STAFF REPORT

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER
BY: ALAN KREIMEIER, ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 10.B

CHECK REGISTERS

RECOMMENDATION

That the City Council ratify the check registers dated December 13, 20, 2018 and January 3, 2019 as well as the payroll registers dated December 19, 2018 and January 2, 4, 2019.

The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley authorizes expenditures through the annual budget process. The FY 2018-19 Budget was adopted on June 7, 2018. Expenditures not included in the annual budget process are approved by resolution throughout the fiscal year.

ANALYSIS

All expenditures on the attached check registers have been approved by the City Council and are in conformance with the authority provided by Section 37208 of the Government Code.

OTHER INFORMATION

None.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Check registers:

12/13/18 $  476,522.06
12/20/18 $ 1,585,090.13
01/03/19 $ 1,020,449.22
Payroll registers:

12/19/18 $ 43,353.29
01/02/19 $ 59,308.55
01/04/19 $ 4,617.87

TOTAL $ 3,189,341.12

ALTERNATIVES

1. Not ratify the attached check registers.

Prepared by:  Submitted by:

[Signature]

Alan Kreimeier  Gary S. Thompson
Administrative Services Director  City Manager

Attachments:

### Final Check List
City of Jurupa Valley

Bank: chase CHASE BANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Invoice</th>
<th>Inv Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
<th>Check Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10914</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>AT&amp;T MOBILITY</td>
<td>2872779339291</td>
<td>11/22/2018</td>
<td>10/23/18-11/22/18 CELL SERVI</td>
<td>976.20</td>
<td>976.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10916</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>CA:IFORNIA ASS. OF CODE, E300009458</td>
<td>300009458</td>
<td>11/9/2018</td>
<td>MEMBERSHIP DUES CALEND</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300009440</td>
<td>11/9/2018</td>
<td>MEMBERSHIP DUES CALEND</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300009958</td>
<td>11/9/2018</td>
<td>MEMBERSHIP DUES CALEND</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0011207718</td>
<td>12/2/2018</td>
<td>MA181113 PC PH NOTICE</td>
<td>312.40</td>
<td>312.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10918</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>CA:IFORNIACHoice BENEFIT3044140</td>
<td>MA181113</td>
<td>12/3/2018</td>
<td>JAN 2019 MEDICAL INSURAN</td>
<td>6,862.79</td>
<td>6,862.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10920</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>CIVIC SOLUTIONS, INC</td>
<td>120418</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>NOV 2018 PROF SERVICES</td>
<td>137,100.00</td>
<td>137,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10921</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>CORONA MOTORSPORTS</td>
<td>112918</td>
<td>11/29/2018</td>
<td>POLICE USE VEHICLE</td>
<td>21,203.78</td>
<td>21,203.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voucher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10922</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>CROWN CASTLE</td>
<td>MA18020</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>PLAN REIMB</td>
<td>31.88</td>
<td>31.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Final Check List
City of Jurupa Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Invoice</th>
<th>Inv Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
<th>Check Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14201</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4415 CESSNA S</td>
<td>175.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14207</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4444 CESSNA S</td>
<td>175.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14208</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4428 CESSNA S</td>
<td>175.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14209</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4412 CESSNA S</td>
<td>175.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14204</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4439 CESSNA S</td>
<td>175.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14211</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5486 MISSION F</td>
<td>175.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14203</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4431 CESSNA S</td>
<td>102.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14206</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4452 CESSNA S</td>
<td>102.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14192</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4463 CESSNA S</td>
<td>102.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14193</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4471 CESSNA S</td>
<td>102.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14194</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4479 CESSNA S</td>
<td>102.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14202</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4423 CESSNA S</td>
<td>102.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14196</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5424 FLABOB A</td>
<td>30.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14210</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5494 MISSION F</td>
<td>30.29</td>
<td>1,902.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 10924     | 12/13/2018 | EDISON - SOUTHERN CALIF            | 2-38-272-9683         | 12/4/2018 | TRAFFIC SIGNAL ELECTRIC           | 6,616.77    |             |
|           |            | EDISON - SOUTHERN CALIF            | 2-36-249-4541         | 12/4/2018 | CITY HALL ELECTRIC CHARG          | 2,018.74    |             |
| 10925     | 12/13/2018 | ENGINEERING RESOURCES (51362)      | 11/29/2018 SIGNAL LIGHT ELECTRIC CH        | 87.58       |             |             |             |
| 10926     | 12/13/2018 | ENTERPRISE HOLDING, INC. 19444476  | 11/7/2018 RIV DR WIDENING PROJECT          | 2,688.00    |             |             |             |
| 10927     | 12/13/2018 | FASTENAL COMPANY                   | CAJUR29107            | 11/21/2018 | PW SUPPLIES                        | 232.80      |             |
| 10928     | 12/13/2018 | FRONTIER HOMES                     | BD2016-12281          | 12/11/2018 | BLDG REIMB-12653 BERYL W          | 151.49      |             |
| 10929     | 12/13/2018 | GRANICUS, AKA GOVDELIKEFQ-4075    | 12/13/2018 COMM. CLOUD/GOVDELIVER            | 6,420.00    |             |             |             |
| 10930     | 12/13/2018 | HARDY & HARPER, INC. 45050-Revised | 45050- Revised        | 10/31/2018 | 42ND ST. SEWER IMPROVEMENT        | 55,122.07   |             |

Page: 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Invoice</th>
<th>Inv Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
<th>Check Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10931</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>HD SUPPLY CONSTRUCTION.5000332929</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/19/2018</td>
<td>COLD MIX ASPHALT</td>
<td>3,371.25</td>
<td>3,371.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10933</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>JURUPA COMMUNITY SERVIC21846-002</td>
<td>2164-002</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>1,205.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24035-002</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>950.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41535-002</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>767.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41542-002</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>745.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23830-003</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>718.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30161-003</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>683.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21576-002</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>653.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21573-004</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>613.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42322-002</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>422.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30163-003</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>317.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30162-003</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>262.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15160-002</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>WATER &amp; SEWER</td>
<td>232.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21562-002</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>231.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30160-003</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>164.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34405-003</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>155.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21575-002</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>140.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37986-004</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>123.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21574-005</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>104.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30159-003</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>93.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22280-002</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37985-003</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>82.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41478-001</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>WATER &amp; SEWER</td>
<td>42.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10934</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>LOWE'S HIW, INC</td>
<td>120218</td>
<td>12/2/2018</td>
<td>CITY HALL SUPPLIES</td>
<td>263.85</td>
<td>263.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10935</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>MACADEE ELECTRICAL, CON4755</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/30/2018</td>
<td>LIMONITE/AVE JUAN BAUTIS'</td>
<td>6,473.00</td>
<td>6,473.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10936</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>MCE CORPORATION</td>
<td>1809025</td>
<td>10/3/2018</td>
<td>SEP 2018 - ADDITIONAL SER'</td>
<td>1,652.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1809026</td>
<td>10/3/2018</td>
<td>SEP 2018 - ADDITIONAL SER'</td>
<td>1,069.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10937</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>MG2</td>
<td>MA18026</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>PLAN REIMB</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10938</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>OFFICE DEPOT, INC</td>
<td>242543641001</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>81.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>240340126001</td>
<td>12/3/2018</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>77.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td>Check Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10939</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>ORTIZ, ROGELIO</td>
<td>18572</td>
<td>11/27/2018</td>
<td>BLDG DEPT STAFF JACKETS</td>
<td>2,766.03</td>
<td>2,766.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10940</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>PRECISION SIGN AND GRAPH-INV-2499</td>
<td>71471</td>
<td>12/3/2018</td>
<td>CHRISTMAS TREE LIGHTING</td>
<td>320.84</td>
<td>320.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10941</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>PUMPMAN, INC.</td>
<td>71472</td>
<td>11/29/2018</td>
<td>54TH &amp; MARLATT PUMP STAI</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10942</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>RICHARDS WATSON GERSHC219486</td>
<td>11/16/2018</td>
<td>OCT 2018 PROF SVCS.</td>
<td>183,849.05</td>
<td>183,849.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10943</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>ROSAS, RODOLFO</td>
<td>MA18029</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>PLAN REIMB</td>
<td>82.75</td>
<td>82.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10944</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>SANTA FE BUILDING MAINT</td>
<td>17398</td>
<td>11/30/2018</td>
<td>NOV 2018 CITY HALL MAINTE</td>
<td>3,049.02</td>
<td>3,049.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10945</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, EM1590</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/30/2018</td>
<td>LAB TESTING</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10946</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>SUPERIOR PAVEMENT MARKI10290</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/13/2018</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STRIPING MAINTEN</td>
<td>1,081.01</td>
<td>1,081.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10947</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>THE GAS COMPANY</td>
<td>120418</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>NOV 2018 GAS SERVICE</td>
<td>80.74</td>
<td>80.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10948</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>TYLER TECHNOLOGIES</td>
<td>045-244471</td>
<td>12/1/2018</td>
<td>JAN-DEC 2019 STWE SUPPC</td>
<td>7,188.29</td>
<td>7,188.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10949</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>UNIFIRST CORPORATION</td>
<td>3251346863</td>
<td>11/5/2018</td>
<td>UNIFORM CLEANING - NOVEI</td>
<td>57.65</td>
<td>57.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3251344415</td>
<td>10/29/2018</td>
<td>UNIFORM CLEANING - OCTO</td>
<td>46.55</td>
<td>46.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>325134659</td>
<td>10/1/2018</td>
<td>UNIFORM CLEANING - OCTO</td>
<td>44.93</td>
<td>44.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3251352010</td>
<td>11/19/2018</td>
<td>UNIFORM CLEANING - NOVEI</td>
<td>41.21</td>
<td>41.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3251337092</td>
<td>10/8/2018</td>
<td>UNIFORM CLEANING - OCTO</td>
<td>41.21</td>
<td>41.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3251339542</td>
<td>10/15/2018</td>
<td>UNIFORM CLEANING - OCTO</td>
<td>41.21</td>
<td>41.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3251341967</td>
<td>10/22/2018</td>
<td>UNIFORM CLEANING - OCTO</td>
<td>41.21</td>
<td>41.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10950</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>VACANT PROPERTY SECURITY VS89529</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/2018</td>
<td>SECURITY EQUIPMENT INST</td>
<td>1,460.68</td>
<td>1,460.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10951</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>VAVRINEK, TRINE, DAY &amp; CO., VT17984</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/27/2018</td>
<td>AUDITING SERVICES</td>
<td>5,500.00</td>
<td>5,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10952</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>WEST VALLEY WATER DISTRICT9375745400</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>METER#83339266 - 1090 HALL</td>
<td>40.84</td>
<td>40.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10953</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>WEX BANK</td>
<td>56854872</td>
<td>11/30/2018</td>
<td>WEX FLEET CARD</td>
<td>1,800.44</td>
<td>1,800.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td>Check Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10954</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>WILLIAM LYON HOMES</td>
<td>BD2017-14796</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11689 CAMINO.</td>
<td>211.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14791</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11629 CAMINO.</td>
<td>138.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14789</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11605 CAMINO.</td>
<td>138.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14792</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11641 CAMINO.</td>
<td>138.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-13970</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4929 IMPATIENT1</td>
<td>102.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14838</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5028 VIOLAS C1</td>
<td>93.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14839</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5040 VIOLAS C1</td>
<td>93.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14840</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5052 VIOLAS C1</td>
<td>93.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14841</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5053 VIOLAS C1</td>
<td>93.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14842</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5041 VIOLAS C1</td>
<td>93.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14843</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5029 VIOLAS C1</td>
<td>93.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-13975</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4914 IMPATIENT1</td>
<td>66.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14787</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11581 CAMINO.</td>
<td>66.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14790</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11617 CAMINO.</td>
<td>66.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14795</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11677 CAMINO.</td>
<td>66.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD2017-14797</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>WILLIAM LYON HOMES</td>
<td>BD2017-14791</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4889 SNAP DRAA</td>
<td>30.30</td>
<td>1,976.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub total for CHASE BANK: 476,522.06
### Final Check List

City of Jurupa Valley

**Bank:** chase CHASE BANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Invoice</th>
<th>Inv Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
<th>Check Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10955</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>AIKYUM INC.</td>
<td>121418</td>
<td>12/19/2018</td>
<td>REFUND FOR OVERPAYMENT</td>
<td>204.01</td>
<td>204.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10956</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>BMW MOTORCYCLES OF, RIV6019880</td>
<td>6019906</td>
<td>8/21/2018</td>
<td>MOTORCYCLE MAINT - SHERIFF</td>
<td>3,704.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>6019906</td>
<td>8/24/2018</td>
<td>MOTORCYCLE MAINT - SHERIFF</td>
<td>1,071.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6019906</td>
<td>7/24/2018</td>
<td>MOTORCYCLE MAINT - SHERIFF</td>
<td>629.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6019906</td>
<td>8/30/2018</td>
<td>MOTORCYCLE MAINT - SHERIFF</td>
<td>348.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6019906</td>
<td>8/30/2018</td>
<td>MOTORCYCLE MAINT - SHERIFF</td>
<td>214.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10957</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA CHAMBER OF CCC11262410</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/2018</td>
<td>2019 EMPLOYEE POSTERS &amp;</td>
<td>137.83</td>
<td>137.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10958</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPERS P 0011207257</td>
<td>0011201911</td>
<td>11/30/2018</td>
<td>NOTICE OF UNSCHEDULED</td>
<td>385.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>0011201912</td>
<td>11/17/2018</td>
<td>MA16119-PC PH NOTICE (PE)</td>
<td>330.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0011201912</td>
<td>11/17/2018</td>
<td>MA16146-PC PH NOTICE (PE)</td>
<td>321.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0011201912</td>
<td>11/17/2018</td>
<td>MA18200-PHN NOTICE (PE)</td>
<td>299.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201811-330</td>
<td>11/29/2018</td>
<td>SAND FOR SANDBAGS</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>201811-332</td>
<td>11/29/2018</td>
<td>SAND FOR SANDBAGS</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10960</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>CDG MATERIALS, INC.</td>
<td>201811-333</td>
<td>12/9/2018</td>
<td>DEC 2018 PHONE &amp; INTERNET</td>
<td>1,366.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>201812-48</td>
<td>12/9/2018</td>
<td>DEC 2018 BUSINESS VOICE</td>
<td>1,486.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201811-330</td>
<td>12/9/2018</td>
<td>DEC 2018 BUSINESS VOICE</td>
<td>119.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>201811-332</td>
<td>12/9/2018</td>
<td>DEC 2018 BUSINESS VOICE</td>
<td>617.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10962</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>CITY OF BREA. - ACCOUNT RASIT0000614</td>
<td>396012</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>NOV 2018 IT SERVICES</td>
<td>1,256,859.23</td>
<td>1,256,859.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10964</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, SHE0000034262</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>10/11/16 - 11/7/18 POLICE SET</td>
<td>1,256,859.23</td>
<td>1,256,859.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>EXTRA DUTY 11/1/18 &amp; 11/15/18</td>
<td>710.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>EXTRA DUTY 10/4/18 &amp; 10/18/18</td>
<td>546.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10967</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, TLM.TL0000014376</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/27/2018</td>
<td>IP13-005 OCT2018 TRAFFIC SEF</td>
<td>14,969.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Page: 1**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Invoice</th>
<th>Inv Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
<th>Check Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10968</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>00836</td>
<td>DE LAGE LANDEN FINANCIAL61611403</td>
<td>12/8/2018</td>
<td>DEC 2018 COPIER LEASE</td>
<td>665.45</td>
<td>665.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td>Check Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-39-045-7315</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>CFD 2014-001 LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>525.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0064</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>290.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0296</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>258.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-9533</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>61.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-9033</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>42.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-914-7931</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>32.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-707-4222</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>31.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-9140</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0510</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>30.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8951</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>29.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0403</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8365</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8514</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8571</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8571</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0486</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-914-8079</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>27.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8217</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8829</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8886</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0692</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8258</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8308</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8324</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8662</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8696</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8720</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-9793</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0585</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>27.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-617-0027</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>25.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-6094</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>18.59</td>
<td>3,160.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Final Check List
City of Jurupa Valley

### Bank: chase CHASE BANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Invoice</th>
<th>Inv Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
<th>Check Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-38-499-7185</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>799.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-33-840-4775</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>466.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-467-0477</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>CDF 14-002 STREET LIGHT E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>384.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-33-840-6655</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>252.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-500-0898</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>178.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-499-9512</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-36-296-0767</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-500-2613</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-500-1482</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-467-0402</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>CDF 2013-001 STREET LIGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-39-859-7088</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>SIGNAL LIGHT ELECTRIC CH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-40-702-6715</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-40-778-4933</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>CFD 14-001 STREET LIGHT EI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-499-9868</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-40-777-8042</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-40-721-2992</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-500-0625</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-500-1276</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>LMD STL 5JV VARIOUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-500-2357</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>LMD STL 15JV VARIOUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-500-2506</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-506-3359</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-507-8613</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-39-935-7235</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>SIGNAL LIGHT ELECTRIC CH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-500-2852</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-901-7450</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-499-7938</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-500-1078</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-500-3082</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-40-448-6672</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-499-8381</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-39-006-1497</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 10971 | 12/20/2018 | JOE A. GONSALES & SON                  | 157028  | 11/18/2018 | DEC 2018 LEGISLATIVE SER\   | 3,000.00    | 7,913.85    |

Voucher:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Invoice</th>
<th>Inv Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
<th>Check Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10972</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>JURUPA COMMUNITY SERVICE</td>
<td>23875-003</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>JCSD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>421.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23829-003</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>JCSD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>380.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25472-003</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>JCSD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>268.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23343-002</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>JCSD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>233.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21933-002</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>JCSD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>209.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23342-003</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>JCSD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>173.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40163-003</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>IRR WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>171.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28035-003</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>9801 FAIRFOR (IRR)</td>
<td>142.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10973</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>JURUPA COMMUNITY SERVICE</td>
<td>40265-002</td>
<td>12/12/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>458.83</td>
<td>2,734.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41009-002</td>
<td>12/12/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>348.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40916-002</td>
<td>12/12/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>274.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40164-002</td>
<td>12/12/2018</td>
<td>IRR WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>244.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42064-002</td>
<td>12/12/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>180.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21722-002</td>
<td>12/12/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>69.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21845-002</td>
<td>12/12/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>66.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21723-002</td>
<td>12/12/2018</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>55.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10975</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>MCE CORPORATION</td>
<td>1811005</td>
<td>12/1/2018</td>
<td>NOV 2018 STREET &amp; ROW M.</td>
<td>51,789.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1811032</td>
<td>12/7/2018</td>
<td>NOV2018 ADDITIONAL SVCS-</td>
<td>1,963.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1811031</td>
<td>12/7/2018</td>
<td>NOV2018 ADDITIONAL SVCS-</td>
<td>920.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1811034</td>
<td>12/7/2018</td>
<td>NOV2018 ADDITIONAL SVCS-</td>
<td>887.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1811033</td>
<td>12/7/2018</td>
<td>NOV2018 ADDITIONAL SVCS-</td>
<td>345.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10976</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>NEC FINANCIAL SERVICES, LIO002168630</td>
<td>11/30/2018</td>
<td>DEC 2018 PHONE SYSTEM R</td>
<td>1,014.21</td>
<td>1,014.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10977</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>OFFICE DEPOT, INC</td>
<td>244349989001</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>106.73</td>
<td>106.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10978</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>ORTIZ, ROGELIO</td>
<td>18578</td>
<td>12/3/2018</td>
<td>BLDG DEPT. STAFF JACKETS</td>
<td>969.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18577</td>
<td>12/3/2018</td>
<td>MOBILE FOOD VENDOR DEC</td>
<td>266.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121818</td>
<td>12/19/2018</td>
<td>DONATIONS: JV HOLIDAY OP</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10980</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>PUBLIC AGENCY RETIREMEN41818</td>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>OCT 2018 REP FEES</td>
<td>318.27</td>
<td>318.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td>Check Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10981</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>RICHARDS WATSON GERSHC219779</td>
<td>12/11/2018 NOV 2018 PROF SVCS</td>
<td>146,601.59</td>
<td>146,601.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10982</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>RUBIDOUX COMMUNITY SVC:1505820000</td>
<td>12/10/2018 RCSD LLMD WATER CHARGE</td>
<td>3,621.52</td>
<td>2,780.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1505800000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1505810000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1506000000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1502671000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1505840000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/10/2018 RCSD LLMD WATER CHARGE</td>
<td>2,619.19</td>
<td>1,172.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/10/2018 RCSD LLMD WATER CHARGE</td>
<td>281.75</td>
<td>82.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/10/2018 RCSD LLMD WATER CHARGE</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>10,589.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/2018 SEP-DEC 2018 RECYCLE</td>
<td>567.27</td>
<td>567.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10983</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>SHRED-IT USA</td>
<td>8126200659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/2018 SEP-DEC 2018  RECYCLE</td>
<td>567.27</td>
<td>567.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10984</td>
<td>12/20/2018</td>
<td>WEST COAST ARBORISTS, IN142996</td>
<td>11/30/2018 ZONE 16 TREE MAINTENANC</td>
<td>28,036.00</td>
<td>18,111.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/30/2018 NOV 2018 TREE MAINT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/30/2018 ZONE 14 TREE MAINTENANC</td>
<td>6,370.00</td>
<td>3,465.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/30/2018 ZONE 21 TREE MAINTENANC</td>
<td>1,260.00</td>
<td>57,242.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/13/2018 CLOSING BILL</td>
<td>856.21</td>
<td>856.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub total for CHASE BANK: 1,585,090.13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Invoice</th>
<th>Inv Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
<th>Check Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10986</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>00240 AMERICAN FORENSIC NURSE71429</td>
<td>71449</td>
<td>10/15/2018</td>
<td>LAB WORK SHERIFF'S DEPT</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25363</td>
<td>10/15/2018</td>
<td>LAB WORK SHERIFF'S DEPT</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10987</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>00097 AWESOME AWARDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>NAME PLATES</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10988</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>01366 CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPERS P0011210020</td>
<td>00112100214</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>12/20/18 PUBLIC HEARING (R)</td>
<td>468.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0011210012</td>
<td>12/4/2018</td>
<td>MA16045 LEGAL NOTICE</td>
<td>453.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0011210164</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>12/20/18 PUBLIC HEARING(RE)</td>
<td>435.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0011210006</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>SEEKING APLCNT TRAFFIC S</td>
<td>224.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>12/20/18 APPEAL OF PILOT J</td>
<td>194.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10989</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>00089 COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, TLM.TL0000014347</td>
<td>TL0000014333</td>
<td>10/30/2018</td>
<td>SLF FLASHER PROJECT BILLI</td>
<td>51,135.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TL0000014406</td>
<td>10/19/2018</td>
<td>SLF SEP 2018 COSTS</td>
<td>16,704.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10990</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>01020 CRIME SCENE STERI-CLEAN, 38865</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/27/2018</td>
<td>#P16-010 TRFC SGNL MISSIIC</td>
<td>3,862.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38888</td>
<td>10/28/2018</td>
<td>BIOHAZARD CLEANUP SRVS</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38951</td>
<td>11/4/2018</td>
<td>BIOHAZARD CLEANUP SRVS</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10991</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>00836 DE LAGE LANDEN FINANCIAL61863175</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/27/2018</td>
<td>BIOHAZARD CLEANUP SRVS</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/22/2018</td>
<td>JAN 2019 COPIER LEASE</td>
<td>1,255.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page: 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Invoice</th>
<th>Inv Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
<th>Check Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-39-606-9478</td>
<td>12/29/2018 SIGNAL LIGHT ELECTRIC CH.</td>
<td>81.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-010-3776</td>
<td>12/21/2018 CFD IRR ELECTRICAL CHARC</td>
<td>32.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8118</td>
<td>12/21/2018 LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>32.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-41-136-1215</td>
<td>12/21/2018 CFD IRR ELECTRICAL CHARC</td>
<td>28.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-39-859-5173</td>
<td>12/21/2018 CFD IRR ELECTRICAL CHARC</td>
<td>28.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-39-859-5223</td>
<td>12/21/2018 CFD IRR ELECTRICAL CHARC</td>
<td>27.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-885-5948</td>
<td>12/21/2018 LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>26.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8035</td>
<td>12/21/2018 LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>26.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-380-7605</td>
<td>12/21/2018 CFD IRR ELECTRICAL CHARC</td>
<td>26.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-7615</td>
<td>12/21/2018 LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>26.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-7821</td>
<td>12/21/2018 LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>26.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-41-192-2446</td>
<td>12/21/2018 LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>26.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-010-3867</td>
<td>12/21/2018 CFD IRR ELECTRICAL CHARC</td>
<td>26.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0718</td>
<td>12/21/2018 LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-885-6102</td>
<td>12/21/2018 LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>26.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0767</td>
<td>12/21/2018 LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>25.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8175</td>
<td>12/21/2018 LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>25.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-010-3874</td>
<td>12/21/2018 CFD IRR ELECTRICAL CHARC</td>
<td>25.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-010-3693</td>
<td>12/21/2018 CFD IRR ELECTRICAL CHARC</td>
<td>25.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-7961</td>
<td>12/21/2018 LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>17.40</td>
<td>2,760.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 10994  | 1/3/2019 | 01278  | FAIR HOUSING CNCL OF RIVE | 120518 | 12/5/2018 FAIR HOUSING & LANDLORD | 1,366.23    | 1,366.23    |
| 10995  | 1/3/2019 | 00587  | FASTENAL COMPANY | CAJUR29666 | 12/7/2018 PW SUPPLIES | 337.17      |             |
|        |          |        | CAJUR29769 |       | 12/7/2018 PW SUPPLIES               | 294.82      |             |
|        |          |        | 239903 | 6/13/2018 TOWING SERVICES - SHERIF | 258.75      |             |
| 10997  | 1/3/2019 | 01006  | HARDY & HARPER, INC. | 45125 | 12/10/2018 3 GRINDS PJCT INV#1 NOV | 44,234.90   | 546.25      |
|        |          |        | 45091  | 11/27/2018 5678 PAULA ST R&R INV #1 | 11,800.00   |             |
| 10998  | 1/3/2019 | 01039  | HINDERLITER, DE LLAMAS & ,30274IN | 12/6/2018 | 12/6/2018 SALES TAX 4TH QRT & AUDIT | 46,925.52   | 46,925.52   |
| 10999  | 1/3/2019 | 00033  | HR GREEN | 122121 | 10/25/2018 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES | 626,428.39  | 626,428.39  |
### Final Check List
City of Jurupa Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Invoice</th>
<th>Inv Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
<th>Check Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11000</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>01679</td>
<td>JURUPA UNIFIED SCHOOL DIST 4943</td>
<td>12/18/2018</td>
<td>INV 4943 JV 2018 HOLIDAY O!</td>
<td>1,395.00</td>
<td>1,395.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11001</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>00848</td>
<td>MOBILE MODULAR STORAGE 1819696</td>
<td>12/8/2018</td>
<td>STORAGE CONTAINERS #666</td>
<td>211.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/3/2018</td>
<td>STORAGE CONTAINER #5484</td>
<td>112.17</td>
<td>323.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11002</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>00775</td>
<td>MUNICIPAL CODE CORPORATION 00322092</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>MYMUNICODE 12/1/18-11/30/17</td>
<td>1,225.00</td>
<td>1,225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11003</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>01585</td>
<td>PEPE'S INC</td>
<td>82825</td>
<td>TOWING SRVS SHERIFF'S IUser</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11004</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>01689</td>
<td>PLACEWORKS, INC.</td>
<td>67370</td>
<td>CS17003-NOV'18AGUAMANS/</td>
<td>6,308.27</td>
<td>6,308.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11005</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>01304</td>
<td>PLLTE HOMES</td>
<td>010219</td>
<td>16-11643,9492,9493,11668,1C7</td>
<td>98,406.00</td>
<td>98,406.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bank: chase CHASE BANK
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Invoice</th>
<th>Inv Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
<th>Check Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11006</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>PULTE HOMES</td>
<td>BD2016-11597</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4782 HELEN BE</td>
<td>319.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11595</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4806 HELEN BE</td>
<td>319.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11659</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4767 HELEN BE</td>
<td>283.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11656</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4803 HELEN BE</td>
<td>283.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11602</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4722 HELEN BE</td>
<td>247.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11660</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4755 HELEN BE</td>
<td>247.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11649</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11120 DAY DR./I</td>
<td>247.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11598</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4770 HELEN BE</td>
<td>247.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11650</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11212 CORAL D</td>
<td>247.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-9492</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4869 HOT CREE</td>
<td>247.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11695</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11132 DAY DR./I</td>
<td>237.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11662</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4731 HELEN BE</td>
<td>211.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11589</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11046 DANE DR</td>
<td>175.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11607</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4650 HELEN BE</td>
<td>175.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11593</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4830 HELEN BE</td>
<td>175.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-9493</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4881 HOT CREE</td>
<td>175.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11590</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11034 DANE DR</td>
<td>140.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11596</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4794 HELEN BE</td>
<td>138.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11643</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4621 OSCAR ST1</td>
<td>138.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11606</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4662 HELEN BE</td>
<td>138.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11681</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4775 PRESTON</td>
<td>138.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11605</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4674 HELEN BE</td>
<td>102.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11599</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4758 PRESTON</td>
<td>102.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11668</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4766 PRESTON</td>
<td>102.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11670</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4790 PRESTON</td>
<td>66.50</td>
<td>4,912.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11007</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>PUMPMAN, INC.</td>
<td>215884</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>541TH &amp; MARLATT PUMP STA1</td>
<td>4,180.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>215885</td>
<td>12/14/2018</td>
<td>58TH &amp; MARLATT PUMP STA1</td>
<td>4,180.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71522</td>
<td>12/7/2018</td>
<td>ETIWANDA/HOLMES PUMP S</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>8,610.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td>Check Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11008</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>01253 SOFTSCAPES CORPORATION</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>11/1/2018</td>
<td>LLMD LANDSCAPE MAINT NC</td>
<td>10,125.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>12/6/2018</td>
<td>LLMD LANDSCAPE MAINT. DI</td>
<td>8,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>11/14/2018</td>
<td>LLMD MAINTENANCE JUL 20'</td>
<td>6,972.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>11/14/2018</td>
<td>LLMD MAINTENANCE JUL 20'</td>
<td>3,650.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>12/7/2018</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT OCT 2018 ZONE</td>
<td>2,764.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>12/7/2018</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT OCT 2018 ZONE</td>
<td>2,537.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>11/14/2018</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT JUL 2018 RANG</td>
<td>1,475.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>12/7/2018</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT OCT 2018 ZONE</td>
<td>1,094.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>12/7/2018</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT OCT 2018 ZONE</td>
<td>808.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>12/7/2018</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT OCT 2018 ZONE</td>
<td>380.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>12/7/2018</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT OCT 2018 ZONE</td>
<td>334.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>11/20/2018</td>
<td>LLMD MAINTJUL2018LIMON T</td>
<td>307.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>12/7/2018</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT OCT 2018 ZONE</td>
<td>219.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>12/7/2018</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT OCT 2018 ZONE</td>
<td>215.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>11/1/2018</td>
<td>LLMD LANDSCAPE MAINT NC</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>12/6/2018</td>
<td>LLMD LANDSCAPE MAINT. DI</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>39,395.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOUTHWEST SITE SERVICES</td>
<td>26621</td>
<td>12/7/2018</td>
<td>PORTABLE RENTAL - DOWNE</td>
<td>911.50</td>
<td>911.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11009</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>01706 STATE OF CALIFORNIA DOJ, [340390</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/7/2018</td>
<td>LAB WORK SHERIFF'S DEP C</td>
<td>315.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111010</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>00246 STATE WATER RES CONTROLSW0159619</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/2018</td>
<td>10/1/18- 9/30/19 ANNUAL PER</td>
<td>35,577.00</td>
<td>35,577.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11012</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>00370 TCTALFUNDS</td>
<td>121918</td>
<td>12/19/2018</td>
<td>DEC 2018 POSTAGE</td>
<td>2,039.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11013</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>00052 UNITED PUMPING SERVICES, INV155601</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/30/2018</td>
<td>PRESSURE WASH SIDEWALK</td>
<td>6,713.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11014</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>01519 WEST VALLEY WATER DISTRICT121318</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>METER #63339266- 1090 HAFL</td>
<td>42.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub total for CHASE BANK: 1,020,449.22
# CASH REQUIREMENTS

CASH REQUIRED FOR NEGOTIABLE CHECKS &/OR ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFERS (EFT) FOR CHECK DATE 12/19/18: $43,353.29

## TRANSACTION SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFER (EFT)</td>
<td>43,353.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH REQUIRED FOR NEGOTIABLE CHECKS &amp;/OR EFT</td>
<td>43,353.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REMAINING DEDUCTIONS / WITHHOLDINGS / LIABILITIES</td>
<td>10,095.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH REQUIRED FOR CHECK DATE 12/19/18</td>
<td>53,449.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFER

Your financial institution will initiate transfer to Paychex at or after 12:01 A.M. on transaction date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANS. DATE</th>
<th>BANK NAME</th>
<th>ACCOUNT NUMBER</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>JPMORGAN CHASE BANK,</td>
<td>xxxxx8176</td>
<td>Direct Deposit</td>
<td>Net Pay Allocations</td>
<td>33,915.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EFT FOR 12/18/18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BANK DRAFT AMOUNTS &amp; OTHER TOTALS</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33,915.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANS. DATE</th>
<th>BANK NAME</th>
<th>ACCOUNT NUMBER</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/18</td>
<td>JPMORGAN CHASE BANK,</td>
<td>xxxxx8176</td>
<td>Taxpay®</td>
<td>Employee Withholdings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>712.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fed Income Tax</td>
<td>5,575.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Income Tax</td>
<td>2,066.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Disability</td>
<td>292.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Withholdings</td>
<td>8,647.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employer Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>712.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Unemploy</td>
<td>75.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Emp Train</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Liabilities</td>
<td>790.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EFT FOR 12/19/18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BANK DRAFT AMOUNTS &amp; OTHER TOTALS</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9,437.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EFT**

43,353.29

## REMAINING DEDUCTIONS / WITHHOLDINGS / LIABILITIES

Paychex does not remit these funds. You must ensure accurate and timely payment of applicable items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANS. DATE</th>
<th>BANK NAME</th>
<th>ACCOUNT NUMBER</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/18</td>
<td>Refer to your records for account Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Employee Deductions</td>
<td>6,638.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>401A Contributions</td>
<td>46,497.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>401a EE Catch Up</td>
<td>-7,690.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>401a EE Pretax</td>
<td>-34,513.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>457b EE Catch Up</td>
<td>230.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>457b EE Pretax</td>
<td>2,033.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Pretax FSA</td>
<td>80.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CASH REQUIREMENTS

CASH REQUIRED FOR NEGOTIABLE CHECKS &/OR ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFERS (EFT) FOR CHECK DATE 01/02/19: $59,308.55

TRANSACTION SUMMARY

SUMMARY BY TRANSACTION TYPE -
TOTAL ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFER (EFT) 59,308.55
CASH REQUIRED FOR NEGOTIABLE CHECKS &/OR EFT 59,308.55
TOTAL REMAINING DEDUCTIONS / WITHHOLDINGS / LIABILITIES 18,411.86
CASH REQUIRED FOR CHECK DATE 01/02/19 77,720.41

TRANSACTION DETAIL

ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFER - Your financial institution will initiate transfer to Paychex at or after 12:01 A.M. on transaction date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANS. DATE</th>
<th>BANK NAME</th>
<th>ACCOUNT NUMBER</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>BANK DRAFT AMOUNTS &amp; OTHER TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/02/19</td>
<td>JPMORGAN CHASE BANK</td>
<td>xxxxx8176</td>
<td>Direct Deposit</td>
<td>Net Pay Allocations 43,071.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02/19</td>
<td>JPMORGAN CHASE BANK</td>
<td>xxxxx8176</td>
<td>Taxpay®</td>
<td>Employee Withholdings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicare 916.72</td>
<td>43,071.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fed Income Tax 8,485.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Income Tax 3,296.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Disability 632.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Withholdings 13,333.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employer Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicare 916.72</td>
<td>16,237.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Unemploy 1,924.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Emp Train 62.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Liabilities 2,903.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EFT FOR 01/02/19 59,308.55

TOTAL EFT 59,308.55

REMAINING DEDUCTIONS / WITHHOLDINGS / LIABILITIES - Paychex does not remit these funds. You must ensure accurate and timely payment of applicable items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANS. DATE</th>
<th>BANK NAME</th>
<th>ACCOUNT NUMBER</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/02/19</td>
<td>Refer to your</td>
<td>xxxxx8176</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Employee Deductions</td>
<td>14,970.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>records for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>401A Contributions</td>
<td>1,807.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>account Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>401a EE Pretax</td>
<td>2,463.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>457b EE Catch Up</td>
<td>230.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>457b EE Pretax</td>
<td>2,033.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Post-Tax Other In</td>
<td>282.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Pretax Den Vis Ch</td>
<td>397.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Pretax FSA</td>
<td>80.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Pretax Medical</td>
<td>7,536.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Pretax Other Ins</td>
<td>138.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Deductions</td>
<td>14,970.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0079 A790-3990  City Of Jurupa Valley
Run Date 12/31/18 01:47 PM
Period Start - End Date 12/16/18 - 12/29/18
Check Date 01/02/19
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# CASH REQUIREMENTS

**CASH REQUIRED FOR NEGOTIABLE CHECKS &/OR ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFERS (EFT) FOR CHECK DATE 01/04/19: $4,617.87**

## TRANSACTION SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFER (EFT)</td>
<td>$4,617.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH REQUIRED FOR NEGOTIABLE CHECKS &amp;/OR EFT</td>
<td>$4,617.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REMAINING DEDUCTIONS / WITHHOLDINGS / LIABILITIES</td>
<td>$4,465.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH REQUIRED FOR CHECK DATE 01/04/19</td>
<td>$9,083.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TRANSACTION DETAIL

**ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFER** - Your financial institution will initiate transfer to Paychex at or after 12:01 A.M. on transaction date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANS. DATE</th>
<th>BANK NAME</th>
<th>ACCOUNT NUMBER</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/03/19</td>
<td>JPMORGAN CHASE BANK,</td>
<td>xxxxx8176</td>
<td>Direct Deposit</td>
<td>Net Pay Allocations</td>
<td>3,442.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/03/19</td>
<td>JPMORGAN CHASE BANK,</td>
<td>xxxxx8176</td>
<td></td>
<td>Check Amounts</td>
<td>585.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/04/19</td>
<td>JPMORGAN CHASE BANK,</td>
<td>xxxxx8176</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taxpay®</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EFT FOR 01/03/19</td>
<td>4,027.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BANK DRAFT AMOUNTS &amp; OTHER TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>3,442.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>585.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANS. DATE</th>
<th>BANK NAME</th>
<th>ACCOUNT NUMBER</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>114.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fed Income Tax</td>
<td>28.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Disability</td>
<td>79.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Withholdings</strong></td>
<td>222.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employer Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>114.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Unemployment</td>
<td>245.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Emp Train</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>368.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EFT FOR 01/04/19</td>
<td>590.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL EFT</strong></td>
<td>$4,617.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## REMAINING DEDUCTIONS / WITHHOLDINGS / LIABILITIES

**Paychex does not remit these funds. You must ensure accurate and timely payment of applicable items.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANS. DATE</th>
<th>BANK NAME</th>
<th>ACCOUNT NUMBER</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/04/19</td>
<td>Refer to your records for account Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Employee Deductions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>457b EE Pretax</td>
<td>3,554.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Post-Tax Other In</td>
<td>112.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Pretax Den Vis Ch</td>
<td>109.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Pretax FSA</td>
<td>225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Pretax Other Ins</td>
<td>149.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Deductions</strong></td>
<td>4,159.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF REPORT

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2019
TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER
BY: KEITH CLARKE, BUILDING OFFICIAL
SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 10.C

APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO AGREEMENT FOR PURCHASE, INSTALLATION, CONFIGURATION, MAINTENANCE, SUPPORT AND TRAINING OF LASERFICHE SOFTWARE SYSTEM AND DOCUMENT SCANNING SERVICES

RECOMMENDATION

That the City Council approve amendment No. 1 to the agreement between the City of Jurupa Valley and ECS Imaging, Inc. for the purchase, installation, configuration, maintenance, support and training of the Laserfiche software system and documentation scanning services.

ANALYSIS

On March 28, 2017, the City Manager approved a new contract with ECS Imaging Inc. for the installation, configuration, maintenance, support and training of the Laserfiche software system and documentation scanning services. The maximum contract amount for these services was $25,000 or $8,333.33 per year for a 3-year period ending on 3/27/2020.

Since then, due to the large amount of development activity that has occurred in the City of Jurupa Valley, the amount of plans and documents that staff has sent to ECS Imaging Inc. has reached the maximum contract amount. In light of this staff recommends approval of this contract amendment which will result in the following changes to the original contract:

1. Increases the maximum contract amount from $8,333.33 per year to $25,000 per year.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The cost for these services will be $25,000 per year for 3 years. These costs will be offset 100% by the scanning fees that are collected when building permits are issued.

ALTERNATIVES

1. The Council may elect not to increase the maximum contract amount, however, the scanning and conversion to an electronic format of permit documents will cease.

Prepared by:

[Signature]
Keith Clarke
Building Official

Submitted by:

[Signature]
Gary Thompson
City Manager

Reviewed by:

[Signature]
George A. Wentz
Deputy City Manager

Reviewed by:

[Signature]
Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Reviewed by:

[Signature]
Peter M. Thorson
City Attorney

Attachments:

1. Amendment No. 1 to Agreement for purchase, installation, configuration, maintenance, support and training of laserfiche software system and document scanning services.
This Amendment No. 1 (“First Amendment”) to the March 9, 2017 Agreement for Purchase, Installation, Configuration, Maintenance, Support and Training of Laserfiche Software System and Document Scanning Services (“Agreement”) between the City of Jurupa Valley, a California municipal corporation (“City”) and ECS Imaging, Inc., a California corporation (“Contractor”) is dated January 17, 2019, and is between City and Contractor.

RE  CITALS

A. City and Contractor entered into the Agreement for, among other services, document scanning services.

B. City and Contractor desire to amend the Agreement to extend the term of the Agreement for one succeeding term of twelve (12) months and to modify the compensation amount.

The parties therefore agree as follows:

Section 1. Paragraph A of Section 1 of the Agreement is hereby amended to read as follows:

“A. Initial Term. Except for the license granted hereby for City’s use of the Laserfiche software system described and set forth in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein as though set forth in full, this Agreement shall commence on March 28, 2017 through March 27, 2021 (“initial term”), unless extended or sooner terminated pursuant to the provisions of this Agreement.”

Section 2. Paragraph B of Section 1 of the Agreement is hereby amended to read as follows:

“B. Extension of Term. The initial term of this Agreement may be extended for no more than one (1) succeeding term of twelve (12) months, by written agreement of Contractor and the City Council or the City Manager, as authorized, executed at least thirty (30) calendar days before expiration of any term. Nothing in this Agreement requires either party to extend this Agreement or to enter into negotiations regarding the extension of this Agreement.”

Section 3. Paragraph B of Section 6 of the Agreement is hereby amended to read as follows:

“B. Document Scanning Services. City agrees to cause Contractor to be paid monthly for document scanning services, in accordance with the payment rates and terms and the schedule of payment as set forth in Exhibit A, based upon document scanning services actually performed during the period of March 28, 2017 through March 27, 2018 of the initial term of the
Agreement. For the period of March 28, 2018 through March 27, 2021, City agrees to cause Contractor to be paid monthly for document scanning services, in accordance with the payment rates and terms as set forth in this Paragraph B. The total compensation amount for the document scanning services shall not exceed (1) Two Thousand Two Hundred Fifty Dollars ($2,250.00) for the period of March 28, 2017 through March 27, 2018 of the initial term of the Agreement, and (2) Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars ($25,000.00) per 12-months for the period of March 28, 2018 through March 27, 2021 of the initial term of this Agreement, unless additional payment is approved as provided in this Agreement. Contractor shall submit invoices monthly for actual document scanning services performed. Invoices shall be submitted between the first and fifteenth business day of each month, for services provided in the previous month. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of each invoice as to all non-disputed fees. If City disputes any of Contractor’s fees it shall give written notice to Contractor within thirty (30) days of receipt of an invoice of any disputed fees set forth on the invoice.”

Section 4. Paragraph C of Section 6 of the Agreement is hereby amended to read as follows:

“C. Additional Services. Contractor shall not be compensated for any services rendered in connection with its performance of this Agreement that are in addition to those set forth herein, unless such additional services are authorized in advance and in writing by the City Council or the City Manager, as authorized. Any additional services authorized by the City Council shall be compensated at a rate mutually agreed to by the parties. Any additional services authorized by the City Manager, including pursuant to an extension of or amendment to this Agreement, shall be compensated at a rate mutually agreed to by the parties, subject to a total maximum compensation amount for document scanning services and all additional services of Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars ($25,000.00) per 12-month period and only if the funds for the additional services are included in the adopted budget.”

Section 5. The person or persons executing this First Amendment on behalf of Contractor warrants and represents that he or she has the authority to execute this First Amendment on behalf of Contractor and has the authority to bind Contractor to the performance of its obligations hereunder.

Section 6. Except as expressly modified or supplemented by this First Amendment, all other provisions of the Agreement shall remain unaltered and in full force and effect. In the event of a conflict between the provisions of this First Amendment and the provisions of the Agreement, the provisions of this First Amendment shall control.

[signature page follows]
The parties are signing this First Amendment on the date stated in the introductory clause.

CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

By: ______________________
   Gary S. Thompson, City Manager

ATTEST:

By: ______________________
   Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

ESC IMAGING, INC.

By: ______________________
   Debbie Bodewin, Senior Vice President

By: ______________________
   ______________________, Chief Finance Officer/COO

Signatures of two corporate officers required pursuant to California Corporations Code Section 313, unless corporate documents authorize only one person to sign this Agreement on behalf of the corporation.
STAFF REPORT

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER
BY: VICTORIA WASKO, CMC, CITY CLERK

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 10.D

AUTHORIZING THE DESTRUCTION OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE CITY RECORDS

RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-01, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, AUTHORIZING THE DESTRUCTION OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE CITY RECORDS

BACKGROUND

The City’s records are an important asset of the City; however, over time various records lose their legal, fiscal, or administrative significance. The City Clerk’s office is recommending that the City Council approve the destruction of obsolete records that have reached the end of their retention and have no further legal, fiscal, or administrative value. The proposed resolution complies with the City’s Records Management Policy which was adopted by Resolution No. 2018-06. The intent of this policy is to apply efficient and economical management methods to the creation, utilization, maintenance, retention, preservation, and disposal of City records.

ANALYSIS

Following the adoption of a City resolution and approval by the City Attorney, City staff may destroy inactive records when they have satisfied all legal retention requirements. Destruction is carried out in accordance with the City’s Record Retention Schedules and pursuant to Government Code Section 34090.
OTHER INFORMATION

As part of a comprehensive records management program, the records retention schedules assist the City in affecting the prompt disposal of records no longer needed, the storage of records that must be retained temporarily after they are no longer needed for current operations, and the preservation of records which are of historical or enduring value.

An efficient record keeping system monitors all phases of a record and its lifespan. Keeping records beyond their retention period creates a burden for staff, creates the necessity for additional storage space, creates a more complex process for responding to public records requests, and exposes the City to unnecessary liability.

The attached resolution includes a list of obsolete City records that are requested for destruction.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Decline to accept the resolution at this time.

Prepared by:  Submitted by:

Victoria Wasko, CMC  Gary S. Thompson
City Clerk  City Manager

Reviewed by:

Peter M. Thorson
City Attorney

Attachments:

1. Resolution No. 2019-01
2. Exhibit A – List of Obsolete City Records Scheduled for Destruction
3. Records Retention Schedules
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-01

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, AUTHORIZING THE DESTRUCTION OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE CITY RECORDS

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that:

Section 2. At their February 15, 2018 meeting, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2018-06 approving the City of Jurupa Valley Records Management Policies and Procedures Manual; and

Section 3. the City of Jurupa Valley Records Management Policies and Procedures Manual contains the records retention and disposition schedules for all City departments. The records retention and disposition schedules are a comprehensive listing of records created or maintained by the City, the length of time each record should be retained, and the legal retention authority. If no legal retention authority is cited, the retention period is based on state law and standard records management practice; and

WHEREAS, Government Code section 34090 provides that, with the approval of the City Council and the written consent of the City Attorney, the head of a City department may destroy certain city records, documents, instruments, books or papers under the Department Head’s charge, without making a copy, if the records are no longer needed; and

WHEREAS, a list of the records, documents, instruments, books or papers proposed for destruction is attached hereto as Exhibit A and shall hereafter be referred to collectively as the “Records”; and

WHEREAS, the Records do not include any records affecting title to real property or liens upon real property, court records, records required to be kept by statute, records less than two years old, video or audio recordings that are evidence in any claim or pending litigation, or the minutes, ordinances or resolutions of the City Council or any City board or commission; and

WHEREAS, the City Clerk agrees that the proposed destruction conforms to the City’s retention and disposition schedules; and

WHEREAS, the City Attorney consents to the destruction of the Records; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley finds and determines that the Records are no longer required and may be destroyed.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley authorizes the City Clerk or her designated representative to destroy the Records as shown as Exhibit ‘A” without retaining a copy.

PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED, by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 17th day of January, 2019.

________________________________
Brian Berkson
Mayor

ATTEST:

________________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA   )
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  )  ss.
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY )

I, Victoria Wasko, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-01 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 17th day of January, 2019 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, this 17th day of January, 2019.

______________________________
Victoria Wasko, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
ATTACHMENT “A”

List of Records Proposed for Destruction
# RECORDS FOR DESTRUCTION
CITY CLERK’S OFFICE
TO BE DESTROYED JANUARY 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILE NO.</th>
<th>RETENTION</th>
<th>CREATION YEAR</th>
<th>DESTROY YEAR</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Closed + 5 yrs</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Agreement - J&amp;S Striping, Inc. (Pavement Markings, Curb Painting)</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Closed + 5 yrs</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Agreement – United Pacific Services, Inc. (Tree Trimming Services)</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Closed + 5 yrs</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Agreement – DeGuire Weed Abatement (Weed Abatement Services)</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Closed + 5 yrs</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Agreement – T&amp;B Planning, Inc. (Initial Study – CV Communities, TTM 36391)</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Closed + 5 yrs</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Agreement – Larry Vesely, Architect (Sam’s Western Wear Remodeling)</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Closed + 5 yrs</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Agreement – Albert A. Webb Associates (Van Buren Blvd., Phase 1)</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Closed + 5 yrs</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Agreement – RBF Consulting, Inc. (Preparation of an Initial Study for TTM 31894, Highland Park)</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Closed + 5 yrs</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Agreement – David Taussig &amp; Associates (Public Finance Consulting Services)</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Closed + 5 yrs</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Agreement – EPD Solutions, Inc. (EIR for the Pedley Crossings Shopping Center)</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Closed + 5 yrs</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Agreement – AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (Localized Ponded Area Drainage Study)</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILE NO.</td>
<td>RETENTION</td>
<td>CREATION YEAR</td>
<td>DESTROY YEAR</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>CY + 2</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>City Council Agendas</td>
<td>Scanned as a permanent record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>CY + 2</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Speaker Cards</td>
<td>Information is in the Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>CL+2</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Certificates of Liability Insurance</td>
<td>Obsolete/Expired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>CY + 5</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Check Registers</td>
<td>Scanned as a permanent record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>CY + 2</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Preliminary 20 Day Notices/Stop Notices</td>
<td>Expired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Closed + 5 yrs</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Claims Against the City</td>
<td>Closed or Settled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
California Government Code Sections 34090-34090.7, plus other applicable state and federal codes govern retention and destruction of records. Original public records may not be destroyed until the passage of 2 years and until the other requirements of Section 34090 et seq. have been met. Litigation, claims, complaints, audits and/or investigations suspend destruction until they are settled/resolved.

It is the policy of the City of Jurupa Valley that duplicates and copies distributed to various departments for informational purposes may be destroyed by the departments whenever they are no longer required for reference purposes (G.C. 34090.7). All City Council staff reports shall be maintained permanently by the City Clerk’s Office.

The following retention pertains to original records maintained by the department that prepared the record.

### CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
### RECORD RETENTION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Agreements and Administrative Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-01</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Infrastructure, MOU, Litigation Settlement, Subdivision, Franchise/Tolling and Development Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-02</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements (Departmental)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+5 GC 34090, 34090.5, CCP 337</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure, leases, agency or regional cooperative agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-03</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements (Departmental)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+5 GC 34090, 34090.5, CCP 337</td>
<td>Maintenance, consultant and professional services, leased equipment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEGENDS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>After Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>After Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>After Disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/NR</td>
<td>Destroy When No Longer Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>After Termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Until Disposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>Until Superseeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDI</td>
<td>Electronic Document Imaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</td>
<td>RECORD CATEGORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-04</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>City Commissions, Boards and Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110-01</td>
<td>Commission, Committee &amp; Agency Agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110-02</td>
<td>Commission, Committee &amp; Agency Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110-03</td>
<td>Planning Commission Resolutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110-04</td>
<td>Commission, Committee &amp; Agency Appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110-05</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110-06</td>
<td>Planning Commission recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-01</td>
<td>City Council Agenda Packets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-02</td>
<td>City Council Agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-03</td>
<td>City Council Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-04</td>
<td>City Council Recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-05</td>
<td>City Council Speaker Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-06</td>
<td>City Council Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-07</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-08</td>
<td>Reorganization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGENDS:

AA AFTER AUDIT  AS AFTER SETTLED  CL CLOSED  P PERMANENT
AC AFTER CLOSED AT AFTER TERMINATION E ELECTION UD UNTIL DISPOSED
AD AFTER DISPOSITION C CURRENT L LIFE US UNTIL SUPERSEDED
D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT T TERM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120-09</td>
<td>City Council Resolutions</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Originals must be kept in perpetuity. Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>City Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-01</td>
<td>General Correspondence Files</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-02</td>
<td>Administrative Policies</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US GC 34090</td>
<td>Until superseded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-03</td>
<td>Calendars</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-04</td>
<td>Department Procedures</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US 2 year minimum GC 34090</td>
<td>Until superseded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-05</td>
<td>Departmental Reports, Updates</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>US 2 year minimum GC 34090</td>
<td>Until superseded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-06</td>
<td>Goals and Objectives, City-wide</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C + 2 GC 34090</td>
<td>Active until revised/rescinded/superseded/Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-07</td>
<td>Work/Vacation Schedules</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>City History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140-01</td>
<td>Certificates, Presentations, Proclamations</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Historical value Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140-02</td>
<td>City Incorporation, History</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Historical value Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140-03</td>
<td>City Seal/Logo</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Historical value Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140-04</td>
<td>Misc. Maps</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Historical value Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Insurance, Risk Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-01</td>
<td>Certificates of Liability</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td>Kept for duration of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-02</td>
<td>City Insurance Policies</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-03</td>
<td>Worker’s Compensation Insurance</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Jurisdictions, Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGENDS:

AA AFTER AUDIT
AC AFTER CLOSED
AD AFTER DISPOSITION
D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
E AFTER ELECTION
L AFTER LIFE
P PERMANENT
T TERM
UD AFTER TERMINATION
US AFTER UNTIL SUPERSEDED
V AFTER VOLUME
W AFTER WASTE
X AFTER XEROGRAPHY
Y AFTER YIELD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>160-01</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Infrastructure, MOU, Litigation Settlement, Franchise/Tolling and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160-02</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements (Departmental)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+5 GC 34090, 34090.5, CCP 337</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure, leases, agency or regional cooperative agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160-03</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements (Departmental)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+5 GC 34090, 34090.5, CCP 337</td>
<td>Maintenance, consultant and professional services, leased equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160-04</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Organizations, At Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-01</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Infrastructure, MOU, Litigation Settlement, Franchise/Tolling and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-02</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements (Departmental)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+5 GC 34090, 34090.5, CCP 337</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure, leases, agency or regional cooperative agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-03</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements (Departmental)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+5 GC 34090, 34090.5, CCP 337</td>
<td>Maintenance, consultant and professional services, leased equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-04</td>
<td>Correspondence, Bulletins, Newsletters</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-05</td>
<td>Franchise Agreements</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Public Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGENDS:**

- AA AFTER AUDIT
- AC AFTER CLOSED
- AD AFTER DISPOSITION
- D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
- ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING
- ELECTION
- CURRENT
- DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
- PERMANENT
- TERMINATION
- DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
- UNTIL DISPOSED
- UNTIL SUPERSEDED
- T TERM
### CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
### RECORD RETENTION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>180-01</td>
<td>Press Releases</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-02</td>
<td>Public Inquiry and Complaints</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-03</td>
<td>Public Relations, promotions, events, ceremonies</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190-01</td>
<td>Council Initiated Studies and Surveys</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C + 2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>FINANCIAL SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-01</td>
<td>Bid Notices, Advertisements</td>
<td>CC, PLAN, ENG</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+4, GC 34090, CCP 343, 349, GC 911.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-02</td>
<td>Check/Payroll Register</td>
<td>CC, FIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7AA GC 34090</td>
<td>Keep originals 5 years; images for 7 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-03</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-04</td>
<td>Preliminary 20 Day Notice, Stop Notices</td>
<td>CC, PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-05</td>
<td>Quarterly Financial Statements</td>
<td>FIN, CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7 AA GC 34090, CCP 337</td>
<td>Keep originals 5 years; images for 7 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-01</td>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7 AA GC 34090</td>
<td>Keep originals 5 years; images for 7 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-02</td>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7 AA GC 34090</td>
<td>Keep originals 5 years; images for 7 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-03</td>
<td>Annual Financial Reports</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-04</td>
<td>Appropriations Limit</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-05</td>
<td>Approved Budget</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGENDS:**

AA AFTER AUDIT  AS AFTER SETTLED  CL CLOSED  P PERMANENT
AC AFTER CLOSED  AT AFTER TERMINATION  E ELECTION  UD UNTIL DISPOSED
AD AFTER DISPOSITION  C CURRENT  L LIFE  US UNTIL SUPERSEDED
D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT  T TERM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORDB SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>210-06</td>
<td>Budget Adjustments</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-07</td>
<td>Budget Working Paper Files</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-08</td>
<td>Copies of Employee Paychecks and Direct Deposit Stubs</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7 AA GC 34090</td>
<td>Keep originals and images for 7 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-09</td>
<td>Deferred Compensation</td>
<td>HR, FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090, P 29 CFR 1627.3</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-10</td>
<td>Demands and Warrants</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-11</td>
<td>Fiscal Analysis</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-12</td>
<td>General Ledger File/AJE/BJE</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P, 7 AA GC 34090 CCP 337</td>
<td>General Ledger Permanent Journal Entries 7 AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-13</td>
<td>Internal Service Funds</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7 AA GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-14</td>
<td>Master Chart of Accounts</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-15</td>
<td>Payroll Deduction/Benefit Reports</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2/P GC 34090, P 29 CFR 1627.3</td>
<td>Payroll Deductions C+2, Benefit Reports Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-16</td>
<td>Payroll Files (W-2, EDD, 941, etc.)</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090, CFR 1627.3</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-17</td>
<td>Payroll Reports</td>
<td>HR, FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P 29 CFR 1627.3</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-18</td>
<td>Payroll Systems Reports</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6 AA GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-19</td>
<td>Petty Cash Files</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7 AA GC 34090</td>
<td>Keep originals 5 years; images for 7 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-20</td>
<td>Proposed Budget</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-21</td>
<td>State Controller’s Report (City)</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-22</td>
<td>State Revenues</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGENDS:

AA AFTER AUDIT
AC AFTER CLOSED
AD AFTER DISPOSITION
D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
ELECTION
CURRENT
TERM

P PERMANENT
UD UNTIL DISPOSED
US UNTIL SUPERSEDED
## CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
### RECORD RETENTION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>210-23</td>
<td>Time Sheets</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7 AA GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-24</td>
<td>Unemployment Compensation Files</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7 AT GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-25</td>
<td>PTO Leave</td>
<td>HR, FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7 AA GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-26</td>
<td>Vouchers and Voucher Register (Cash Disbursement Journal)</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7 AA GC 34090</td>
<td>Keep originals 5 years; images for 7 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-27</td>
<td>Worker’s Compensation</td>
<td>FIN, HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5 AT GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Assessment Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220-01</td>
<td>Assessments/Special Districts</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220-02</td>
<td>Assessments/Special Districts Maintenance</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220-03</td>
<td>Assessment Information and Reference Papers</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Bonds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230-01</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4 AA GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230-02</td>
<td>Bank Investment Agreement</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230-03</td>
<td>Bond Development and Performance</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230-04</td>
<td>Bond Issuance Files</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230-05</td>
<td>Brokers/Dealers</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230-06</td>
<td>Certificates of Deposit Information</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230-07</td>
<td>Investment Information Files</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4 AA GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230-08</td>
<td>State of California Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF)</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4 AA GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240-01</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4 AA GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240-02</td>
<td>Development Impact Fees</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGENDS:**

- **AA** AFTER AUDIT
- **AC** AFTER CLOSED
- **AD** AFTER DISPOSITION
- **D/NR** DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
- **AS** AFTER SETTLED
- **AT** AFTER TERMINATION
- **C** CURRENT
- **CL** CLOSED
- **L** LIFE
- **P** PERMANENT
- **TERM**
- **UD** UNTIL DISPOSED
- **US** UNTIL SUPERSEDED
# CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
## RECORD RETENTION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>240-03</td>
<td>Fee Schedules</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240-04</td>
<td>Franchise Fees</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240-05</td>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240-06</td>
<td>User Fee Studies</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>250</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lien Agreements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-01</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>260</strong></td>
<td><strong>Permits and Licenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260-01</td>
<td>Business Registration</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5 AT GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260-02</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260-03</td>
<td>Permits, Regulations</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>270</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purchasing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270-01</td>
<td>AP Checks (Numerical Listing)</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7 AA GC 34090</td>
<td>Keep originals 5 years; images for 7 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270-02</td>
<td>Authorization to Purchase other than Bid</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US GC 6254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270-03</td>
<td>Bank Deposit Files</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7 AA GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270-04</td>
<td>Bank Reconciliation</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7 AA GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270-05</td>
<td>Bank Statements</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7 AA GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270-06</td>
<td>Check Stubs, Cancelled/Voided Checks</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7 AA GC 34090</td>
<td>Includes payroll, cancelled and voided checks. Keep originals 5 years; images for 7 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270-07</td>
<td>Leases of Equipment, Material</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270-08</td>
<td>Purchasing Policy and Procedures</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US GC 6254</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270-09</td>
<td>RFQ's/RFP's</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3 Successful 2 Unsuccessful GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGENDS:**

- AA AFTER AUDIT
- AC AFTER CLOSED
- AD AFTER DISPOSITION
- D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
- AS AFTER SETTLED
- AT AFTER TERMINATION
- C CURRENT
- T TERM
- CL CLOSED
- E ELECTION
- L LIFE
- P PERMANENT
- UD UNTIL DISPOSED
- US UNTIL SUPERSEDED
# CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
## RECORD RETENTION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>270-10</td>
<td>Signature Cards and Authority</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270-11</td>
<td>Vendor’s Lists</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D/NR GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Revenues and Taxation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280-01</td>
<td>Census Files</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D/NR GC 34090</td>
<td>Not a City record (Census data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280-02</td>
<td>Daily Cash Receipts</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7 AA GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280-03</td>
<td>Permits and Permit Fees</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280-04</td>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7 AA GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280-05</td>
<td>Weed Abatement</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+7 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Reimbursement Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290-01</td>
<td>Sewer and Water Reimbursement Agreements</td>
<td>CC, FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>LEGAL AND LEGISLATIVE SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-01</td>
<td>City Attorney Opinions</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US +2 GC 34090</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-02</td>
<td>Code Enforcement Citations/Liens</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5 AS/P GC 34090</td>
<td>Lien permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-03</td>
<td>Moratoriums</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Elections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310-01</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310-02</td>
<td>Boundary Files</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310-03</td>
<td>Campaign Statements</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P/E +7 GC 81009(b)</td>
<td>Elected permanent Nonelected Election+7 Elected permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310-04</td>
<td>Council District Maps</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310-05</td>
<td>Election Historical Files</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Historical Permanent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGENDS:**

- AA AFTER AUDIT
- AC AFTER CLOSED
- AD AFTER DISPOSITION
- D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
- AS AFTER SETTLED
- AT AFTER TERMINATION
- C CURRENT
- T TERM
- CL CLOSED
- E ELECTION
- L LIFE
- P PERMANENT
- UD UNTIL DISPOSED
- US UNTIL SUPERSEDED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>310-06</td>
<td>Election Reference Papers</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310-07</td>
<td>Nomination Petition Files</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P EC 17100</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310-08</td>
<td>Initiative, Referendum and Recall Petitions</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+8 Months EC 17200, 17400; GC 7253.5 EC 14700 + GC 3756:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>FPPC Administration</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090.7</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320-01</td>
<td>Conflict of Interest Code</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320-02</td>
<td>Ethics Training</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+7 GC 34090, GC 81109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320-03</td>
<td>FPPC Form 800 Series</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>81009</td>
<td>Elected 7 years after termination, Nonelected Election+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320-04</td>
<td>Statements of Economic Interest</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>AT+7 E+5 81009(e), 81009(b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 6254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330-01</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 6254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330-02</td>
<td>Brown Act</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 6254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330-03</td>
<td>Maddy Act</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 6254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Liability Administration</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340-01</td>
<td>Accident/Injury Reports</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+2 GC 34090</td>
<td>(other than industrial-related injury reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340-02</td>
<td>Certificates of Insurance, other (from a third party for various projects naming the City as additional insured)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td>Kept for duration of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340-03</td>
<td>City Insurance Policies (i.e. City liability insurance, property insurance, disability insurance)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGENDS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AA AFTER AUDIT</th>
<th>AS AFTER SETTLED</th>
<th>CL CLOSED</th>
<th>P PERMANENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC AFTER CLOSED</td>
<td>AT AFTER TERMINATION</td>
<td>E ELECTION</td>
<td>UD UNTIL DISPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD AFTER DISPOSITION</td>
<td>C CURRENT</td>
<td>L LIFE</td>
<td>US UNTIL SUPERSEDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT</td>
<td>T TERM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
### RECORD RETENTION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>340-04</td>
<td>Claims Against the City</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7 AS GC 34090(d); CCP 337 et seq. until settled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340-05</td>
<td>Claims on Behalf of the City</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5 AS GC 34090(d); CCP 337 et seq. until settled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340-06</td>
<td>Commercial Crime Bonds</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340-07</td>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>CC, FIN, CA</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 911.2, 945.6, 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340-08</td>
<td>Litigation (Case Files)</td>
<td>CC, FIN, CA</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+10 GC 911.2, 945.6, 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340-09</td>
<td>Police Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+3 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340-10</td>
<td>Subpoenas</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td>Ordinances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350-01</td>
<td>Ordinances</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350-02</td>
<td>Proof of Publication</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CC+2 GC 34090, CCP 343</td>
<td>Original kept with Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>360</strong></td>
<td>Gifts and Bequests to City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360-01</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360-02</td>
<td>Donations to the City</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C + 2 GC 34090</td>
<td>Books, art, gifts, donations, exhibits, theatre, music, special events, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>400</strong></td>
<td>MUNICIPAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-01</td>
<td>Code Amendments, Building, Fire, Electrical Plumbing Codes</td>
<td>BLDG, PLAN, CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090, H+S 19850, GC 4003, GC 4004</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-02</td>
<td>Building and Code Violations</td>
<td>BLDG, CE</td>
<td>CL + 2 GC34090d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGENDS:**

- **AA** AFTER AUDIT
- **AC** AFTER CLOSED
- **AD** AFTER DISPOSITION
- **D/NR** DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
- **AT** AFTER TERMINATION
- **CC** CURRENT
- **CL** CLOSED
- **E** ELECTION
- **T** TERM
- **L** LIFE
- **P** PERMANENT
- **UD** UNTIL DISPOSED
- **US** UNTIL SUPERSEDED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400-03</td>
<td>Public Nuisance</td>
<td>BLDG, CE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-04</td>
<td>Rubbish and Weed Abatement</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-05</td>
<td>Massage Parlors</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-06</td>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-07</td>
<td>Noise Abatement</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-08</td>
<td>Abandoned Vehicles</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-04</td>
<td>Sign regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410-01</td>
<td>Community Development Block Grant Projects</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410-02</td>
<td>Economic Development Projects</td>
<td>CM, PLAN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410-03</td>
<td>Multiple Family Housing</td>
<td>PLAN, CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410-04</td>
<td>Homeowner’s Assistance Programs</td>
<td>PLAN, CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410-05</td>
<td>HUD Consolidated Plan</td>
<td>PLAN, CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420-01</td>
<td>Environmental Initial Study, Environmental Impact Report, Environmental Assessments</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>General Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430-01</td>
<td>General Plan, Elements, Sphere of Influence</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430-02</td>
<td>Development Code and Amendments</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>Land Use Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-01</td>
<td>Appeals to the City Council</td>
<td>PLAN, CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090; CCP583.320</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-02</td>
<td>Certificates of Compliance</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-03</td>
<td>Certificates of Non-Conforming Structure</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGENDS:

- AA AFTER AUDIT
- AC AFTER CLOSED
- AD AFTER DISPOSITION
- D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
- AS AFTER SETTLED
- AT AFTER TERMINATION
- C CURRENT
- T TERM
- CL CLOSED
- E ELECTION
- L LIFE
- P PERMANENT
- UD UNTIL DISPOSED
- US UNTIL SUPERSEDED
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## CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
### RECORD RETENTION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>440-04</td>
<td>Change of Zone</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-05</td>
<td>Conditional Use Permit Files</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090, H+S 19850, GC 4003, GC 4004</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-06</td>
<td>Development Agreements</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-07</td>
<td>Extension of Time</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-08</td>
<td>Findings of Public Convenience or Necessity</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-09</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>10 GC 34090</td>
<td>Departmental Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-10</td>
<td>Home Occupation Permit</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-11</td>
<td>Landscape Agreements, Bonds, Plans, Specifications</td>
<td>PLAN, PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-12</td>
<td>Massage Establishment</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-13</td>
<td>Master Plan</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-14</td>
<td>Minor Exception</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-15</td>
<td>Modifications (includes minor, major, review)</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090, H+S 19850, GC 4003, GC 4004</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-16</td>
<td>Parcel Merger</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-17</td>
<td>Plans (Maps, plan drawings, exhibits, photos, zoning, tentative subdivision, parcel, land use maps, aerial photos, etc.)</td>
<td>BLDG, PLAN, PW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090(d), 34090.5</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-18</td>
<td>Pre-Application Review, Pre-Development Conference</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+2 GC 34090, 34090.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-19</td>
<td>Procedures (Specific department procedures)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090(d)</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-20</td>
<td>Reports and Studies</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGENDS:**

- **AA** AFTER AUDIT
- **AC** AFTER CLOSED
- **AD** AFTER DISPOSITION
- **D/NR** DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
- **E** ELECTION
- **L** LIFE
- **P** PERMANENT
- **T** TERM
- **UD** UNTIL DISPOSED
- **US** UNTIL SUPERSEDED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>440-21</td>
<td>Second Unit Permits</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-22</td>
<td>Sign Permits</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-23</td>
<td>Site Development Permits</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-24</td>
<td>Specific Plans/Specific Plan Amendments</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-25</td>
<td>Temporary Event Permits</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>AT+2 GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-26</td>
<td>Temporary Signs</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090(d)</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-27</td>
<td>Temporary Use Permits</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090d</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-28</td>
<td>Tentative Map Files/Tentative Tract Maps</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090, H+S 19850, GC 4003, GC 4004</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-29</td>
<td>Tentative Parcel Map Files</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090, H+S 19850, GC 4003, GC 4004</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-30</td>
<td>Variance Files</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090, H+S 19850, GC 4003, GC 4004</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-31</td>
<td>Waivers of Final Map</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-32</td>
<td>Zoning Interpretations</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-33</td>
<td>Zoning Verification Letters</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>Lot Line Adjustments</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450-01</td>
<td>Lot Line Adjustments</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>Planning Studies and Reviews</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460-01</td>
<td>Studies, Annexations, Sphere of Influence, Architectural Review</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470-01</td>
<td>Multi-Family Housing, Mobile Home, Accessory Dwelling Units</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>Public Improvements, Waivers</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGENDS:
- AA AFTER AUDIT
- AS AFTER SETTLED
- CL CLOSED
- P PERMANENT
- AC AFTER CLOSED
- AT AFTER TERMINATION
- E ELECTION
- UD UNTIL DISPOSED
- AD AFTER DISPOSITION
- C CURRENT
- L LIFE
- US UNTIL SUPERSEDED
- D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
- T TERM
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>480-01</td>
<td>Waiver of Public Improvements</td>
<td>PLAN, PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 MUNICIPAL UTILITIES,</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION, FLOOD</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-01 Capital Improvement Program</td>
<td>PW, FIN, CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520 Flood Control</td>
<td>Administration - Correspondence</td>
<td>PW, ENG</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520-2 Flood Control Projects, Flood Zones</td>
<td>PW, ENG</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530 Storm Drains</td>
<td>Storm Drain Projects</td>
<td>PW, ENG</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530-1 Storm Drain Projects</td>
<td>PW, ENG</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530-2 National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)</td>
<td>PW, ENG</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540 Streets, Alleys, Sidewalks, Street Lights</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ENG/PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-01 General Correspondence</td>
<td>ENG/PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-02 Encroachment Permits</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-03 Excavation Permits</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-04 Grading Permits</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-05 Grading Plans</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-06 Encroachment Permits</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-07 Excavation Permits</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-08 Grading Permits</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-09 Street Improvements</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-10 Street and Alley Vacations</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-11 Street Light Maintenance</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGENDS:

AA AFTER AUDIT  AS AFTER SETTLED  CL CLOSED  P PERMANENT
AC AFTER CLOSED  AT AFTER TERMINATION  E ELECTION  UD UNTIL DISPOSED
AD AFTER DISPOSITION  C CURRENT  L LIFE  US UNTIL SUPERSEDED
D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT  T TERM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>540-12</td>
<td>Measure A</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-13</td>
<td>Blueprints (submitted for permits)</td>
<td>BLDG, PLAN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+2 GC 34090(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-14</td>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>PW, ENG</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-15</td>
<td>Encroachment Permits</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-16</td>
<td>Excavation Permits</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-17</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-18</td>
<td>Grading Permits</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-19</td>
<td>Improvement Plans – Street</td>
<td>PW, ENG</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-20</td>
<td>Inspectors Daily Reports</td>
<td>PW, ENG</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-21</td>
<td>Medians</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-22</td>
<td>Off-Site Plans (Ramps, Sidewalks, Curbs)</td>
<td>PW, ENG</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-23</td>
<td>Regional Standard Drawings and Specifications for Public Works</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-24</td>
<td>Right of Entry</td>
<td>CE, PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-25</td>
<td>Slopes</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>550</strong></td>
<td><strong>Traffic Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-01</td>
<td>Street Inventory</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-02</td>
<td>Street Maintenance and Repairs (Not related to a claim or lawsuit)</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-03</td>
<td>Street Maintenance and Repairs (Related to Claim against the City)</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7 AS GC 34090(d); CCP 337 et seq. until settled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-04</td>
<td>Street Maintenance and Repairs (Related to Claim on behalf of the City)</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5 AS GC 34090(d); CCP 337 et seq. until settled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-05</td>
<td>Street Names and Signs</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-06</td>
<td>Street Numbering</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGENDS:**

- AA AFTER AUDIT
- AS AFTER SETTLED
- CL CLOSED
- P PERMANENT
- AC AFTER CLOSED
- AT AFTER TERMINATION
- E ELECTION
- UD UNTIL DISPOSED
- AD AFTER DISPOSITION
- C CURRENT
- L LIFE
- US UNTIL SUPERSEDED
- D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
- T TERM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>550-07</td>
<td>Speed Surveys</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-08</td>
<td>Street Maps</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-09</td>
<td>Topographical Traffic Maps</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-10</td>
<td>Traffic Requests – Public Inquiry</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-11</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Maintenance</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L GC 34090</td>
<td>Life of signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-12</td>
<td>Traffic Signals</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L GC 34090</td>
<td>Life of signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-13</td>
<td>Traffic Studies and Surveys</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+2 GC 34090</td>
<td>Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-14</td>
<td>Speed Surveys</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-15</td>
<td>Street Maps</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-16</td>
<td>Topographical Traffic Maps</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560-01</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements, including CALTRANS, Transportation Agreements and Supplements</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+5 GC 34090, 34090.5, CCP 337</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure, leases, agency or regional cooperative agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560-02</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560-03</td>
<td>Bike Trails</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>Underground Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570-01</td>
<td>Underground Utilities Districts</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td>Electric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575-01</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575-02</td>
<td>SCE Transmission Lines</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-01</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-02</td>
<td>Sewer and Wastewater, Hazardous Waste</td>
<td>CC/PW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Legends:**

- **AA** After Audit
- **AC** After Closed
- **AD** After Disposition
- **D/NR** Destroy When No Longer Relevant
- **CL** Closed
- **C** Current
- **E** Election
- **P** Permanent
- **T** Term
- **UD** Until Disposed
- **US** Until Superseded
# CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY  
**RECORD RETENTION SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>SARI Line, Solid Waste Management, Recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590-01</td>
<td>Administration, Correspondence</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590-02</td>
<td>Water Districts, Wells, Waterlines, Rubidoux Canal, Water Treatment Plants</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>PERSONNEL SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-01</td>
<td>Administration, Policies</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-02</td>
<td>Individual Personnel Folders</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+10 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-03</td>
<td>Management Compensation Plan</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-04</td>
<td>Oaths of Office</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T+6 GC 34090, 29 USC 1113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-05</td>
<td>Personnel Policy File</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US + 2 GC 34090</td>
<td>Until Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-06</td>
<td>Salary Survey Files</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US + 2 GC 34090</td>
<td>Until Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>Deferred Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610-01</td>
<td>Employee Benefit Plans</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>Employee Services and Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620-01</td>
<td>Employee Benefit Plans</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620-02</td>
<td>Employee Recognition</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C + 2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620-03</td>
<td>Organizational Charts</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C + 2 GC 34090</td>
<td>Until Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620-04</td>
<td>Salary Schedules</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620-05</td>
<td>Worker’s Compensation</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>AS+30 CCR 14311, 15400.2, CA Labor Code 110-139.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGENDS:**

- **AA** AFTER AUDIT
- **AC** AFTER CLOSED
- **AD** AFTER DISPOSITION
- **D/NR** DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
- **E** ELECTION
- **L** LIFE
- **P** PERMANENT
- **UD** UNTIL DISPOSED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>620-06</td>
<td>Worker’s Compensation (Litigated)</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P CCR 14311, 15400.2, CA Labor Code 110-139.6</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620-07</td>
<td>Worker’s Compensation, General</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2 GC 34090</td>
<td>General information, not specific to an individual or case file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630-01</td>
<td>Classification Specifications</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630-02</td>
<td>Employee Organization Files</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630-03</td>
<td>Employment Eligibility Verification</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>AT+3 GC 34090</td>
<td>3 years after termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630-04</td>
<td>Grievances, Complaints and Investigations</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>AS+10 GC 34090</td>
<td>10 years after investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630-05</td>
<td>Job Applications – Not Hired</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 29 CFR 1627.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630-06</td>
<td>Job Applications - Hired</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7 AT GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630-07</td>
<td>Recruitment File</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>AC+3 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>Training Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640-01</td>
<td>Emergency Management Training</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C + 2 GC 34090</td>
<td>Until Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640-02</td>
<td>Employee Training</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C + 2 GC 34090</td>
<td>Until Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>Safety Programs</td>
<td>HR, PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650-01</td>
<td>Accident, Investigation Safety Files</td>
<td>HR, PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650-02</td>
<td>Compliance Reports (EED, SCO, OSHA, etc.)</td>
<td>HR, PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650-03</td>
<td>Safety Manual</td>
<td>HR, PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C + 2 GC 34090</td>
<td>Until Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650-04</td>
<td>Safety Reports, Minutes</td>
<td>HR, PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>Public Health and Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700-01</td>
<td>Homeless Shelters, Health Care Facilities</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGENDS:
AA AFTER AUDIT       AS AFTER SETTLED       CL CLOSED       P PERMANENT
AC AFTER CLOSED      AT AFTER TERMINATION   E ELECTION       UD UNTIL DISPOSED
AD AFTER DISPOSITION C CURRENT       L LIFE       US UNTIL SUPERSEDED
D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT T TERM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700-02</td>
<td>Cannabis, Medical Marijuana</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700-03</td>
<td>State Department of Health</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>Alcohol and Drug Abuse, Gangs</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710-01</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720-01</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>California Prison System</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730-01</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740-01</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements (Departmental)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+5 GC 34090, 34090.5, CCP 337</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure, leases, agency or regional cooperative agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740-02</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>Environmental Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-01</td>
<td>Air Resources Board</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-02</td>
<td>California Energy Commission</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-03</td>
<td>CEQA, Environmental Initial Study, Environmental Impact Report, Environmental Assessments</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-04</td>
<td>Mosquito Abatement, Malathion Spraying (Medfly)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-05</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGENDS:**

- AA AFTER AUDIT
- AS AFTER SETTLED
- AC AFTER CLOSED
- AT AFTER TERMINATION
- AD AFTER DISPOSITION
- C CURRENT
- D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
- ELECTION
- L LIFE
- T TERM
- CL CLOSED
- PERMANENT
- UD UNTIL DISPOSED
- US UNTIL SUPERSEDED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>760-01</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements (Departmental)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+5 GC 34090, 34090.5, CCP 337</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure, leases, agency or regional cooperative agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760-02</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760-03</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>FIN, CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760-04</td>
<td>Fire Stations, Mutual Aid</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td>Police Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-01</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements (Departmental)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+5 GC 34090, 34090.5, CCP 337</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure, leases, agency or regional cooperative agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-02</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-03</td>
<td>Highway Patrol</td>
<td>FIN, CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-04</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780</td>
<td>Pornography</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780-01</td>
<td>General Correspondence, Reports</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790</td>
<td>Disaster Preparedness and Civil Defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790-01</td>
<td>Community Resources</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790-02</td>
<td>Disaster Reporting Files</td>
<td>HR, CM</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790-03</td>
<td>Emergency Operations Plan</td>
<td>HR, CM</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Adopted by Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>PUBLIC SERVICE FACILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810-01</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements (Departmental)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+5 GC 34090, 34090.5, CCP 337</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure, leases, agency or regional cooperative agreements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGENDS:**

- AA AFTER AUDIT
- AS AFTER SETTLED
- CL CLOSED
- P PERMANENT
- AC AFTER CLOSED
- AT AFTER TERMINATION
- E ELECTION
- UD UNTIL DISPOSED
- AD AFTER DISPOSITION
- C CURRENT
- L LIFE
- US UNTIL SUPERSEDED
- D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
- T TERM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>810-02</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>Civic Center – City Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820-01</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820-02</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825</td>
<td>Maintenance Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825-01</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>Community Facilities Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830-01</td>
<td>Administration, Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830-02</td>
<td>Administration, Bonds, Reports, Contracts</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840-01</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td>Landscape and Street Lighting Maintenance Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850-01</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850-02</td>
<td>Administration, Landscaping and Lighting Maintenance Districts</td>
<td>CC, PW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860-01</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements (Departmental)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+5 GC 34090, 34090.5, CCP 337</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure, leases, agency or regional cooperative agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860-02</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870-01</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements (Departmental)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+5 GC 34090, 34090.5, CCP 337</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure, leases, cooperative agreements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGENDS:**

- AA AFTER AUDIT
- AC AFTER CLOSED
- AD AFTER DISPOSITION
- D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
- AS AFTER SETTLED
- AT AFTER TERMINATION
- C CURRENT
- T TERM
- CL CLOSED
- E ELECTION
- L LIFE
- P PERMANENT
- UD UNTIL DISPOSED
- US UNTIL SUPERSEDED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORd SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>870-02</td>
<td>Contracts and Park Development Agreement</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Infrastructure, MOU, and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870-03</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870-04</td>
<td>Tree Trimming and Removal</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875</td>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875-01</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880-01</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880-02</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements (Departmental)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+5 GC 34090, 34090.5, CCP 337</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure, leases, agency or regional cooperative agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890-01</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890-02</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements (Departmental)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+5 GC 34090, 34090.5, CCP 337</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure, leases, agency or regional cooperative agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>895</td>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>895-01</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>REAL ESTATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900-01</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900-02</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>Deeds and Easements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910-01</td>
<td>Archeological Sites</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910-02</td>
<td>Easement Grants to City</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGENDS:

AA AFTER AUDIT       AS AFTER SETTLED       CL CLOSED       P PERMANENT
AC AFTER CLOSED      AT AFTER TERMINATION   E ELECTION       UD UNTIL DISPOSED
AD AFTER DISPOSITION C CURRENT           L LIFE           US UNTIL SUPERSEDED
D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT T TERM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>910-03</td>
<td>Easements Granted by City</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910-04</td>
<td>Eminent Domain Acquisition</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910-05</td>
<td>Irrevocable Offers of Dedication</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910-06</td>
<td>Quitclaims</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910-07</td>
<td>Vacations</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>Leasing of Property</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920-01</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920-02</td>
<td>Property Lease Files</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td>Sale and Acquisition of Property</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930-01</td>
<td>Appraisals</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930-02</td>
<td>Asset Management Inventory</td>
<td>FIN, PW, CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930-03</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>STAFF SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010</td>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010-01</td>
<td>Computer Hardware Reference</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D/NR GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010-02</td>
<td>Computer Software Reference</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D/NR GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010-03</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements (Departmental)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+5 GC 34090, 34090.5, CCP 337</td>
<td>Maintenance, consultant and professional services, leased equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010-04</td>
<td>General Correspondence</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020-01</td>
<td>Contracts and Agreements (Departmental)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+5 GC 34090, 34090.5, CCP 337</td>
<td>Maintenance, consultant and professional services, leased equipment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGENDS:**

- **AA** AFTER AUDIT
- **AC** AFTER CLOSED
- **AD** AFTER DISPOSITION
- **D/NR** DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
- **CL** CLOSED
- **E** ELECTION
- **T** TERM
- **P** PERMANENT
- **UD** UNTIL DISPOSED
- **US** UNTIL SUPERSEDED
- **C** CURRENT
- **L** LIFE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1020-02</td>
<td>Equipment Inventory</td>
<td>FIN, PW, CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020-03</td>
<td>Inventory of Supplies</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020-04</td>
<td>Routine Video Monitoring (including routine building security recording system)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+1 34090.6</td>
<td>In the event that the recordings are evidence in any claim filed or any pending litigation, they shall be preserved until pending litigation is resolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030</td>
<td>Records Control and Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-01</td>
<td>Department Inventories and Worksheets</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-02</td>
<td>Filing Systems and Procedures</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US GC 6254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-03</td>
<td>Imaging/Microfilming Program</td>
<td>CC, BUILDING</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US GC 6254 Building Plans P GC 34090 H&amp;S 19850</td>
<td>Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-04</td>
<td>Mail Log</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-05</td>
<td>Disk to Disk Backup-Nightly</td>
<td>BREA</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1 day GC 34090.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-06</td>
<td>Records Destruction Authorization Files and Certificates</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-07</td>
<td>Records Management Program</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-08</td>
<td>Request for Records</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CL+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-09</td>
<td>Retention Schedules</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P GC 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-10</td>
<td>Telephone Record Books</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 34090</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040</td>
<td>Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040-01</td>
<td>Fuel Records File (Gasoline, Oil, etc.)</td>
<td>PW, FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040-02</td>
<td>Salvage and Surplus Sales</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C+2 AD GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGENDS:

AA AFTER AUDIT
AC AFTER CLOSED
AD AFTER DISPOSITION
D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
ELECTION
FIN
PW
CC
N
BREA

P GC 34090
US GC 6254
GC 34090 H&S 19850
C+2 34090
C+2 GC 34090
C+2 34090
C+2 AD GC 34090

D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
T TERM
## CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
### RECORD RETENTION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD SERIES FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>RECORD CATEGORY</th>
<th>RECORD HOLDER (IF SPECIFIED)</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT IMAGING</th>
<th>RETENTION AND LEGAL CITATION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1040-03</td>
<td>Vehicle Maintenance Policy</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US GC 34090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040-04</td>
<td>Vehicle Registration Records</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L GC 34090 VC 9900</td>
<td>Title transfers when sold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGENDS:**

- AA AFTER AUDIT
- AC AFTER CLOSED
- AD AFTER DISPOSITION
- D/NR DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER RELEVANT
- AS AFTER SETTLED
- AT AFTER TERMINATION
- C CURRENT
- CL CLOSED
- E ELECTION
- L LIFE
- N
- P PERMANENT
- T TERM
- UD UNTIL DISPOSED
- US UNTIL SUPERSEDED
- PERMANENT
STAFF REPORT

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER
BY: STEVE R. LORISO, P.E., CITY ENGINEER/DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 10.E

AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES BETWEEN THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY AND ONWARD ENGINEERING FOR ENGINEERING DESIGN SERVICES FOR THE 2018-2019 ADA IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (18-B.1)

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the City Council approve an agreement between Onward Engineering and the City of Jurupa Valley for the 2018-2019 ADA Improvement Project in an amount not-to-exceed $26,900 and authorize the City Manager to execute the Agreement in substantially the form attached and in such final form as approved by the City Attorney; and

2. Authorize the City Manager to execute scope of services amendments not to exceed 10% of the total agreement, pursuant to requirements set forth in the agreement.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting of April 19, 2018, the City Council approved the FY 2018/19 – 2019/20 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). This CIP included the 2018-2019 ADA Improvement Project. This project will provide for six (6) ADA accessible parking stalls, two (2) of which will be van accessible, along Mission Boulevard between Riverview Drive and Crestmore Road where there is currently designated on-street parking.

On December 4, 2018 the City released a Request for Proposals for the study of Mission Boulevard for the selection of the most efficient locations for the parking stalls as well as final design, special provisions and engineer’s cost estimate for the Project.
ANALYSIS

On December 20, 2018 the City received three (3) proposals:

- Hernandez, Kroone & Associates
- Onward Engineering

All proposals were reviewed by members of the City’s public works staff in accordance with the selection process identified in the RFP. It was determined that Onward Engineering was the most qualified firm to provide these services.

Although the design consultant is responsible for selecting the most efficient locations for the accessible parking stalls, city staff will make the final determination as to where the stalls will be installed.

Staff does not believe that topographic survey will be necessary to complete the design, therefore, it is recommended not to award the two optional items included in Onward’s proposal at this time.

OTHER INFORMATION

Previous Actions:

- None

FINANCIAL IMPACT

A Not-to-exceed fee proposal of $26,900 was negotiated with Onward for the 2018-2019 ADA Improvement Project and determined to be fair and reasonable.

The FY 2018/19 CIP has sufficient budget for award of this contract. The source of funds is from the City’s Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

No General Fund monies are required to fulfill the obligation of this agreement.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Do not approve Agreement as recommended.
2. Provide alternate direction to staff.
Prepared by:

Chase Keys, E.I.T.
CIP Manager

Reviewed by:

Reviewed by:

Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Approved as to form:

Peter Thorson
City Attorney

Attachments:

1) Agreement, Project No. 18-B.1

Reviewed by:

Steve R. Lorio, P.E.
City Engineer/Director of Public Works

Reviewed by:

Reviewed by:

George A. Wentz
Deputy City Manager

Submitted by:

Gary S. Thompson
City Manager
AGREEMENT FOR CONSULTANT SERVICES BETWEEN THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY AND ONWARD ENGINEERING FOR PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES FOR THE 2018-2019 ADA IMPROVEMENT PROJECT IN THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

(PUBLIC WORKS PROFESSIONAL SERVICES)

THIS AGREEMENT is made and effective as of January 17, 2019, between the City of Jurupa Valley ("City") and Onward Engineering ("Consultant"). In consideration of the mutual covenants and conditions set forth herein, the parties agree as follows:

1. **Term**

   This Agreement shall commence on January 17, 2019, and shall remain and continue in effect until tasks described herein are completed in accordance with the Scope of Services, but in no event later than June 30, 2019, unless sooner terminated pursuant to the provisions of this Agreement.

2. **Services**

   Consultant shall perform the services and tasks described and set forth in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein as though set forth in full. Consultant shall complete the tasks according to the schedule of performance which is also set forth in Exhibit A.

3. **Performance**

   Consultant shall at all time faithfully, competently and to the best of his or her ability, experience, and talent perform all tasks described herein. Consultant shall employ, at a minimum, generally accepted standards and practices utilized by persons engaged in providing similar services as are required of Consultant hereunder in meeting its obligations under this Agreement.

4. **Payment**

   The City agrees to cause Consultant to be paid monthly, in accordance with the payment rates and terms and the schedule of payment as set forth in Exhibit B, Payment Rates and Schedule, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference as though set forth in full, based upon actual time spent on the above tasks. This amount shall not exceed twenty six thousand nine hundred dollars ($26,900.00) for the total term of the Agreement unless additional payment is approved as provided in this Agreement.

   A. Consultant shall not be compensated for any services rendered in connection with its performance of this Agreement which are in addition to those set forth herein, unless such additional services are authorized in advance and in writing by the City Council.

   B. Consultant shall submit invoices monthly for actual services performed. Invoices shall be submitted between the first and fifteenth business day of each month, for
services provided in the previous month. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) days of receipt of each invoice as to all non-disputed fees. If the City disputes any of consultant’s fees it shall give written notice to Consultant within 30 days of receipt of an invoice of any disputed fees set forth on the invoice.

5. **Suspension or Termination of Agreement Without Cause**

The City may at any time, for any reason, with or without cause, suspend or terminate this Agreement, or any portion hereof, by serving upon the consultant at least ten (10) days prior written notice. Upon receipt of said notice, the Consultant shall immediately cease all work under this Agreement, unless the notice provides otherwise. If the City suspends or terminates a portion of this Agreement such suspension or termination shall not make void or invalidate the remainder of this Agreement.

A. In the event this Agreement is terminated pursuant to this Section, the City shall pay to Consultant the actual value of the work performed up to the time of termination, provided that the work performed is of value to the City. Upon termination of the Agreement pursuant to this Section, the Consultant will submit an invoice to the City pursuant to Section 4.

6. **Default Of Consultant**

A. The Consultant’s failure to comply with the provisions of this Agreement shall constitute a default. In the event that Consultant is in default for cause under the terms of this Agreement, City shall have no obligation or duty to continue compensating Consultant for any work performed after the date of default and can terminate this Agreement immediately by written notice to the Consultant. If such failure by the Consultant to make progress in the performance of work hereunder arises out of causes beyond the Consultant’s control, and without fault or negligence of the Consultant, it shall not be considered a default.

B. If the City Manager or his delegate determines that the Consultant is in default in the performance of any of the terms or conditions of this Agreement, he or she shall serve the Consultant with written notice of the default. The Consultant shall have (10) days after service upon it of said notice in which to cure the default by rendering a satisfactory performance. In the event that the Consultant fails to cure its default within such period of time, the City shall have the right, notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, to terminate this Agreement without further notice and without prejudice to any other remedy to which it may be entitled at law, in equity or under this Agreement.

7. **Prevailing Wages**

Consultant shall pay prevailing wages to the extent required by and in accordance with the requirements of Labor Code Sections 1720 et. seq. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 1773 of the Labor Code of the State of California, the City Council has obtained the general prevailing rate of per diem wages and the general rate for holiday and overtime work in this locality for each craft, classification, or type of workman needed to execute by this Consultant from the Director of the Department of Industrial Relations. Copies may be obtained from the California Department of Industrial Relations Internet website at [http://www.dir.ca.gov](http://www.dir.ca.gov). Consultant shall provide a copy of prevailing wage rates to any staff or sub-contractor hired, and
shall pay the adopted prevailing wage rates as a minimum. Consultant shall comply with the provisions of Sections 1773.8, 1775, 1776, 1777.5, 1777.6, and 1813 of the Labor Code. Pursuant to the provisions of 1775 of the Labor Code, Consultant shall forfeit to the City, as a penalty, the sum of $50.00 for each calendar day, or portion thereof, for each laborer, worker, or mechanic employed, paid less than the stipulated prevailing rates for any work done under this contract, by him or by any sub-contractor under him, in violation of the provisions of the Agreement.

8. **Ownership Of Documents**

Consultant shall maintain complete and accurate records with respect to sales, costs, expenses, receipts and other such information required by City that relate to the performance of services under this Agreement. Consultant shall maintain adequate records of services provided in sufficient detail to permit an evaluation of services. All such records shall be maintained in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and shall be clearly identified and readily accessible. Consultant shall provide free access to the representatives of City or its designees at reasonable times to such books and records, shall give City the right to examine and audit said books and records, shall permit City to make transcripts there from as necessary, and shall allow inspection of all work, data, documents, proceedings and activities related to this Agreement. Such records, together with supporting documents, shall be maintained for a period of two (2) years after receipt of final payment.

A. Upon completion of, or in the event of termination or suspension of this Agreement, all original documents, designs, drawings, maps, models, computer files containing data generated for the work, surveys, notes and other documents prepared in the course of providing the services to be performed pursuant to this Agreement shall become the sole property of the City and may be used, reused or otherwise disposed of by the City without the permission of the Consultant. With respect to computer files containing data generated for the work, Consultant shall make available to the City, upon reasonable written request by the City Manager, the necessary computer software and hardware for purposes of accessing, compiling, transferring and printing computer files.

B. With respect to the design of public improvements, the Consultant shall not be liable for any injuries or property damage resulting from the reuse of the design at a location other than that specified in Exhibit A, without the written consent of the Consultant.

9. **Indemnification**

A. **Indemnity for Design Professional Services.** In connection with its design professional services, but subject to the limitations of Section 2 of this Agreement, Consultant shall hold harmless and indemnify City, its elected officials, officers, employees, designated volunteers and those City agents serving as independent contractors in the role City officials (collectively "Indemnities"), with respect to any and all claims, demands, liabilities, losses, costs or expenses, including reimbursement of reasonable attorney fees and costs of defense (collectively "Claims"), including but not limited to Claims relating to death or injury to any person and injury to any property which arise out of, pertain to, or relate in whole or in part to the negligence, recklessness, or willful misconduct of Consultant or any of its officers,
employee, sub-consultants, or agents in the performance or its professional services under this Agreement.

B. Other Indemnities. In connection with any and all claims, demands, damages, liabilities, losses, costs or expenses, including attorneys’ fees and costs of defense (collectively, “Damages” hereinafter) not covered by Paragraph 9.A. above, but subject to the limitations of Section 2 of this Agreement, Consultant shall defend, hold harmless and indemnify the Indemnitees with respect to any and all Claims, including but not limited to, Claims relating to death or injury to any person and injury to any property, which arise out of, pertain to, or relate to acts or omissions of Consultant or any of its officers, employees, subcontractors, or agents in the performance of this Agreement, except for such loss or damage arising from the negligence or willful misconduct of the City, as determined by final arbitration or court decision or by the agreement of the parties. Consultant shall defend Indemnitees in any action or actions filed in connection with any such Claims with counsel of City’s choice, and shall pay all costs and expenses, including all attorneys’ fees and experts’ costs actually incurred in connection with such defense. Consultant’s duty to defend pursuant to this Section 9.B. shall apply independent of any prior, concurrent or subsequent misconduct, negligent acts, errors or omissions or Indemnitees.

10. Insurance Requirements

A. Consultant shall procure and maintain for the duration of the contract insurance against claims for injuries to persons or damages to property, which may arise from or in connection with the performance of the work hereunder by the Consultant, its agents, representatives, or employees.

1) Minimum Scope of Insurance. Coverage shall be at least as broad as:

a) Insurance Services Office Commercial General Liability form No. CG 00 01 11 85 or 88.

b) Insurance Services Office Business Auto Coverage form CA 00 01 06 92 covering Automobile Liability, code 1 (any auto). If the Consultant owns no automobiles, a non-owned auto endorsement to the General Liability policy described above is acceptable.

c) Worker’s Compensation insurance as required by the State of California and Employer’s Liability Insurance. If the Consultant has no employees while performing under this Agreement, worker’s compensation insurance is not required, but Consultant shall execute a declaration that it has no employees.

d) Professional liability insurance shall be written on a policy form providing professional liability for the Consultant’s profession.

2) Minimum Limits of Insurance. Consultant shall maintain limits no less than:
a) General Liability: One million dollars ($1,000,000) per occurrence for bodily injury, personal injury and property damage. If Commercial General Liability Insurance or other form with a general aggregate limit is used, either the general aggregate limit shall apply separately to this project/location or the general aggregate limit shall be twice the required occurrence limit.

b) Automobile Liability: One million dollars ($1,000,000) per accident for bodily injury and property damage.

c) Worker’s Compensation as required by the State of California; Employer’s Liability: One million dollars ($1,000,000) per accident for bodily injury or disease.

d) Professional liability insurance in the amount of one million dollars ($1,000,000) per claim and in the aggregate.

3) Deductibles and Self-Insured Retentions. Any deductibles or self-insured retentions shall not exceed $25,000 unless otherwise approved in writing by the City Manager in his sole discretion.

B. Other Insurance Provisions. The general liability and automobile liability policies are to contain, or be endorsed to contain, the following provisions:

1) The City, its elected officials, officers, employees, designated volunteers and those City agents serving as independent contractors in the role City officials (“Additional Insured”) shall be covered as insured’s as respects: liability arising out of activities performed by or on behalf of the Consultant; products and completed operations of the Consultant; premises owned, occupied or used by the Consultant; or automobiles owned, leased, hired or borrowed by the Consultant. The coverage shall contain no special limitations on the scope of protection afforded to the Additional Insureds.

2) For any claims related to this project, the Consultant’s insurance coverage shall be primary insurance as respects the Additional Insureds. Any insurance or self-insured maintained by the Additional Insureds shall be excess of the Consultant’s insurance and shall not contribute with it.

3) Any failure to comply with reporting or other provisions of the policies including breaches of warranties shall not affect coverage provided to the Additional Insureds.

4) The Consultant’s insurance shall apply separately to each insured against whom claim is made or suit is brought, except with respect to the limits of the insurer’s liability.

5) Each insurance policy required by this clause shall be endorsed to state that the insurer shall endeavor to provide thirty (30) days’ prior written notice, by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the City prior to any action to suspend, void, cancel or otherwise reduce in coverage or in limits.
6) Within one (1) business day following receipt by Consultant of any notice correspondence or notice, written or oral, of an action or proposed action to suspend, void, cancel or otherwise reduce in coverage or in limits of the required insurance, Consultant shall notify City of such action or proposed action.

C. **Acceptability of Insurers.** Insurance is to be placed with insurers with a current A.M. Best’s rating of no less than A-:VII, unless otherwise acceptable to the City. Self insurance shall not be considered to comply with these insurance requirements.

D. **Verification of Coverage.** Consultant shall furnish the City with original endorsements effecting coverage required by this clause. The endorsements are to be signed by a person authorized by that insurer to bind coverage on its behalf. The endorsements are to be on forms provided by the City. All endorsements are to be received and approved by the City before work commences. As an alternative to the City’s forms, the Consultant’s insurer may provide complete, certified copies of all required insurance policies, including endorsements affecting the coverage required by these specifications.

E. **Modifications.** City Manager may, with the consent of the City Attorney, waive the provisions of this paragraph or provided for other forms of insurance as may be necessary to enable the City to receive adequate insurance protection as contemplated in this section.

11. **Independent Contractor**

A. **Consultant is and shall at all times remain as to the City a wholly independent contractor.** The personnel performing the services under this Agreement on behalf of Consultant shall at all times be under Consultant’s exclusive direction and control. Neither City nor any of its officers, employees, agents, or volunteers shall have control over the conduct of Consultant or any of Consultant’s officers, employees, or agents except as set forth in this Agreement. Consultant shall not at any time or in any manner represent that it or any of its officers, employees or agents are in any manner officers, employees or agents of the City. Consultant shall not incur or have the power to incur any debt, obligation or liability whatever against City, or bind City in any manner.

B. **No employee benefits shall be available to Consultant in connection with the performance of this Agreement.** Except for the fees paid to Consultant as provided in the Agreement, City shall not pay salaries, wages, or other compensation to Consultant for performing services hereunder for City. City shall not be liable for compensation or indemnification to Consultant for injury or sickness arising out of performing services hereunder.

12. **Legal Responsibilities**

The Consultant shall keep itself informed of all local, State and Federal ordinances, laws and regulations which in any manner affect those employed by it or in any way affect the performance of its service pursuant to this Agreement. The Consultant shall at all times observe and comply with all such ordinances, laws and regulations. The City, and its officers and employees, shall not be liable at law or in equity occasioned by failure of the Consultant to comply with this section.
13. **Confidentiality: Release Of Information**

A. All information gained by Consultant in performance of this Agreement shall be considered confidential and shall not be released by Consultant without City’s prior written authorization.

B. Consultant, its officers, employees, agents or subcontractors, shall not without written authorization from the City Manager or unless requested by the City Attorney, voluntarily provide declarations, letters of support, testimony at depositions, response to interrogatories or other information concerning the work performed under this Agreement or relating to any project or property located within the City. Response to a subpoena or court order shall not be considered “voluntary” provided Consultant gives City notice of such court order or subpoena.

14. **Assignment**

The Consultant shall not assign the performance of this Agreement, nor any part thereof, nor any monies due hereunder, without prior written consent of the City. City consents to the use of the sub-consultants described in Exhibit A to this Agreement provided the costs of such sub-consultants shall be borne by the Consultant and shall not exceed the costs described in Paragraph 5 of this Agreement.

15. **General Provisions**

A. **Notices**

Any notices which either party may desire to give to the other party under this Agreement must be in writing and may be given either by (I) personal service, (ii) delivery by a reputable document delivery service, such as but not limited to, Federal Express, that provides a receipt showing date and time of delivery, or (iii) mailing in the United States Mail, certified mail, postage prepaid, return receipt requested, addressed to the address of the party as set forth below or at any other address as that party may later designate by Notice. Notice shall be effective upon delivery to the addresses specified below or on the third business day following deposit with the document delivery service or United States Mail as provided above.

**To City:**
City of Jurupa Valley  
8930 Limonite Avenue  
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509  
Attention: City Manager

**To Consultant:**
Onward Engineering  
300 S. Harbor Boulevard  
Suite 814  
Anaheim, CA 92805  
Attention: Majdi Ataya
B. Licenses. At all times during the term of this Agreement, Consultant shall have in full force and effect, all licenses required of it by law for the performance of the services described in this Agreement.

C. Governing Law; Venue

1) The City and Consultant understand and agree that the laws of the State of California shall govern the rights, obligations, duties and liabilities of the parties to this Agreement and also govern the interpretation of this Agreement.

2) Any litigation concerning this Agreement shall take place in the municipal, superior, or federal district court with geographic jurisdiction over the City of Jurupa Valley. In the event such litigation is filed by one party against the other to enforce its rights under this Agreement, the prevailing party, as determined by the Court’s judgment, shall be entitled to reasonable attorney fees and litigation expenses for the relief granted.

D. Prohibited Interest. No officer, or employee of the City of Jurupa Valley who has participated in the development of this Agreement or its administration shall have any financial interest, direct or indirect, in this Agreement, the proceeds thereof, the Consultant, or Consultant’s sub-contractors, during his/her tenure or for one year thereafter. The Consultant hereby warrants and represents to the City that no officer or employee of the City Council or City of Jurupa Valley has any interest, whether contractual, non-contractual, financial or otherwise, in this transaction, or in the business of the Consultant or Consultant’s sub-Consultants on this project. Consultant further agrees to notify the City in the event any such interest is discovered whether or not such interest is prohibited by law or this Agreement.

E. Entire Agreement. This Agreement contains the entire understanding between the parties relating to the obligations of the parties described in this Agreement. All prior or contemporaneous agreements, understandings, representations and statements, oral or written, are merged into this Agreement and shall be of no further force or effect. Each party is entering into this Agreement based solely upon the representations set forth herein and upon each party’s own independent investigation of any and all facts such party deems material.

F. Time is of Essence. In carrying out the provisions of this Agreement, both parties acknowledge and agree that time is of the essence.

G. Authority To Execute This Agreement. The person or persons executing this Agreement on behalf of Consultant warrants and represents that he or she has the authority to execute this Agreement on behalf of the Consultant and has the authority to bind Consultant to the performance of its obligations hereunder.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed the day and year first above written.

CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

Gary S. Thompson
City Manager

ATTEST:

Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM

Peter M. Thorson
City Attorney

ONWARD ENGINEERING

By: 
Name: ____________________________
Title: ____________________________

By: 
Name: ____________________________
Title: ____________________________

[SIGNATURES OF TWO CORPORATE OFFICERS OR CORPORATE AUTHORITY RESOLUTION REQUIRED]
Our corporate culture thrives on innovation, and we are dedicated to keeping up with industry standards and new technologies. As a company, we feel it’s important to base our goals and objectives on a solid foundation of good corporate ethics. This section is our proposed scope of work for design engineering services integrated with the site-specific tasks outlined in the City of Jurupa Valley’s Request for Proposal, to which no exceptions are taken.

PHASE 1: SITE RESEARCH

1. KICK-OFF & PUBLIC OUTREACH MEETINGS

OE will set up a design kick-off meeting with City staff at the beginning of the project to discuss the scope of work, objectives, design criteria, technical requirements, coordination, establishing guidelines, and detailing the project schedule. It is important that the scope of work and schedule be reviewed and finalized by the City at this meeting to ensure a smooth and successful project.

2. RESEARCH & REVIEW AVAILABLE DATA

The OE team will compile and review all records and documents from the City. Existing documentation research that will be reviewed includes the County, City, utility, and other pertinent records and documents, existing street, signal, storm drain, gas, sewer, and water main improvement plans, topographic data maps, record drawings, utility plans, survey centerline and private property monument data, and other important information.

3. UTILITY RESEARCH & NOTIFICATIONS

OE will conduct a detailed local utility investigation to confirm the most recent contacts for all affected utilities and cross-reference the findings with any information provided by the City. Utility notification letters and any available construction plans will be issued to affected utility owners at the commencement of the project, 50% completion phase, and 100% completion phase. Information provided by the utility owners will be integrated into the construction plans.

4. SITE EVALUATION

OE will verify records, drawings, and data, document surrounding land uses and existing ADA ramp/parking stall locations, assess current street, parking, and sidewalk configurations for suitable ADA parking stall locations, and prepare a photo log of key project areas.

5. TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY (OPTIONAL)

A topographic survey may be required if it is determined that the construction of curb ramps is required adjacent to the parking stalls. CL Surveying and Mapping would provide any surveying services required. The topographic survey would extend approximately 20 feet from either end of the proposed parking stalls and from the back of sidewalk to the median in the center of the street.
PHASE 2: PRELIMINARY DESIGN

6: BASE SHEETS

The base maps will be prepared using the research records, aerial photographs, topographic survey (if required), site visit findings, and underground utility line records obtained from as-built plans from utility companies.

7: 50% & 90% PS&E

Once the site evaluation, topographic survey (if required), and base maps for the project area have been completed and the six final parking stall locations and designs have been approved by the City, OE will immediately begin preparation of the PS&E to make submissions at 50% and 90% completion.

Prior to submitting hard copies to the City and to other affected agencies and utility companies, OE will submit electronic copies (in AutoCAD and PDF formats) to the City for review and feedback. OE will coordinate a Plan Check Meeting with the City for each submittal following the distribution of electronic copies. OE will also prepare a summary of the submittal review comments and scanned red-lined plans in electronic format on CD.

PHASE 3: FINAL DESIGN

8: 100% & FINAL PS&E

Once the City has completed the second review of the PS&E, OE will incorporate the plan check comments into the 100% PS&E Submittal. If upon submittal of the 100% PS&E package it is noted that minor changes are needed, OE will incorporate all necessary changes.

PHASE 4: BID ASSISTANCE & CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT

OE will provide ongoing support services during the bid phase and during construction. If requested, we will respond to Requests for Information, prepare and issue addenda, review submittals and shop drawings, attend kickoff meetings and other monthly meetings, assist the City in coordinating or obtaining permits from regulatory agencies, review and approve submittals and/or change orders, conduct a final walkthrough with City personnel, certify the project completion, co-ordinate construction staking or monument surveys, and provide as-built drawings. Revisions to the PS&E package or providing additional administrative support as noted above can be done at the City’s request on time and material using the hourly rates in our fee proposal. Additionally, we can provide full-service construction management and inspection services upon City request.
# Resource Allocation Matrix

**To Provide Civil Engineering Services to the City of Jurupa Valley for the 2018-2019 ADA Improvement Project**

### Site Research Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Majdi Ataya</th>
<th>Justin Smeets</th>
<th>Ryan Dennis</th>
<th>Sub-Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kick-off Meeting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Review Available Data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Research and Notification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Research Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>LS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Preliminary Design Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Majdi Ataya</th>
<th>Justin Smeets</th>
<th>Ryan Dennis</th>
<th>Sub-Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Sheets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% PS&amp;E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% PS&amp;E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preliminary Design Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td><strong>LS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Final Design Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Majdi Ataya</th>
<th>Justin Smeets</th>
<th>Ryan Dennis</th>
<th>Sub-Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% &amp; Final PS&amp;E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Design Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>LS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bid Assistance & Construction Support Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Majdi Ataya</th>
<th>Justin Smeets</th>
<th>Ryan Dennis</th>
<th>Sub-Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bid Assistance &amp; Construction Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bid Assistance &amp; Construction Support Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>LS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Majdi Ataya</th>
<th>Justin Smeets</th>
<th>Ryan Dennis</th>
<th>Sub-Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>172</strong></td>
<td><strong>LS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Optional Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Majdi Ataya</th>
<th>Justin Smeets</th>
<th>Ryan Dennis</th>
<th>Sub-Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Topographic Survey - 6 Ramp Locations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Custom Ramp Detail - Per Ramp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optional Items Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>LS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hourly rates above are our hours from the fee schedule. Any additional work will be negotiated utilizing those hourly rates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>TASKS</th>
<th># OF DAYS</th>
<th>BEGIN DATE</th>
<th>END DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 SITE RESEARCH PHASE</td>
<td>2 NTP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/18/19</td>
<td>1/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Kick-off Meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/21/19</td>
<td>1/21/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Research and Review Available Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/22/19</td>
<td>1/24/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Utility Research and Notification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/25/19</td>
<td>1/28/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Site Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/25/19</td>
<td>1/28/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 PRELIMINARY DESIGN PHASE</td>
<td>7 Base Sheets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/29/19</td>
<td>1/31/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 50% PS&amp;E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2/1/19</td>
<td>2/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Utility Research and Notification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/11/19</td>
<td>2/11/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Submit 50% PS&amp;E to City</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/8/19</td>
<td>2/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 City Review of 50% PS&amp;E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2/11/19</td>
<td>2/15/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 90% PS&amp;E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2/18/19</td>
<td>2/21/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 Submit 90% PS&amp;E to City</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/21/19</td>
<td>2/21/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 City Review of 90% PS&amp;E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2/22/19</td>
<td>2/28/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FINAL DESIGN PHASE</td>
<td>15 100% and Final PS&amp;E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3/1/19</td>
<td>3/4/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 Utility Research and Notification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/5/19</td>
<td>3/5/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 BID ASSISTANCE/SUPPORT PHASE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3/4/19</td>
<td>3/5/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT B

PAYMENT RATES AND SCHEDULE
# Fee Schedule

to Provide Civil Engineering Services
to the City of Jurupa Valley
for the 2018-2019 ADA Improvement Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE RESEARCH PHASE</th>
<th>MAJI ATAYA (QA/QC MANAGER)</th>
<th>JUSTIN SMEETS (PROJECT MANAGER)</th>
<th>DAYTON LOWE (PROJECT ENGINEERS)</th>
<th>SUB-CONSULTANT (OPTIONAL)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Kick-off Meeting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$645.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Research and Review Available Data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$2,180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Utility Research and Notification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$4,110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Site Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$2,110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Research Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,045.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRELIMINARY DESIGN PHASE</th>
<th>MAJI ATAYA (QA/QC MANAGER)</th>
<th>JUSTIN SMEETS (PROJECT MANAGER)</th>
<th>DAYTON LOWE (PROJECT ENGINEERS)</th>
<th>SUB-CONSULTANT (OPTIONAL)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Base Sheets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$3,020.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 50% PS&amp;E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$8,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 90% PS&amp;E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$3,790.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preliminary Design Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,960.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINAL DESIGN PHASE</th>
<th>MAJI ATAYA (QA/QC MANAGER)</th>
<th>JUSTIN SMEETS (PROJECT MANAGER)</th>
<th>DAYTON LOWE (PROJECT ENGINEERS)</th>
<th>SUB-CONSULTANT (OPTIONAL)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 100% &amp; Final PS&amp;E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,895.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Design Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,895.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BID ASSISTANCE &amp; CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT PHASE</th>
<th>MAJI ATAYA (QA/QC MANAGER)</th>
<th>JUSTIN SMEETS (PROJECT MANAGER)</th>
<th>DAYTON LOWE (PROJECT ENGINEERS)</th>
<th>SUB-CONSULTANT (OPTIONAL)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Bid Assistance &amp; Construction Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bid Assistance &amp; Construction Support Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
<th>MAJI ATAYA (QA/QC MANAGER)</th>
<th>JUSTIN SMEETS (PROJECT MANAGER)</th>
<th>DAYTON LOWE (PROJECT ENGINEERS)</th>
<th>SUB-CONSULTANT (OPTIONAL)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,215.00</td>
<td>$7,625.00</td>
<td>$18,060.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$26,900.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTIONAL ITEMS (if Custom Ramps are Required)</th>
<th>MAJI ATAYA (QA/QC MANAGER)</th>
<th>JUSTIN SMEETS (PROJECT MANAGER)</th>
<th>DAYTON LOWE (PROJECT ENGINEERS)</th>
<th>SUB-CONSULTANT (OPTIONAL)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Topographic Survey - Per Ramp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,150.00</td>
<td>$1,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Custom Ramp Detail - Per Ramp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPTIONAL ITEMS TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,250.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hourly rates above are our fee schedule. Any additional work will be negotiated utilizing those hourly rates.
STAFF REPORT

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

FROM: GARY THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER

BY: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 12.A

PUBLIC HEARING FOR RECONSIDERATION OF MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 17099: CHANGE OF ZONE (CZ) NO. 17003 TO CHANGE THE ZONING CLASSIFICATION OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY FROM R-1 (ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS) TO R-4 (PLANNED RESIDENTIAL) AND TO CONSIDER AN APPEAL OF TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 37211, SUBDIVISION OF SAID PROPERTY INTO 48 LOTS FOR FUTURE SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, THREE LETTERED STREET LOTS, 2 LETTERED LOTS FOR DRAINAGE FACILITIES, AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF ASSOCIATED ON-SITE AND OFF-SITE INFRASTRUCTURE. PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018). APPLICANT: (SEQUANATA PARTNERS, LP)

RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-02, entitled:

   A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR A PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION (“SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS”) (48 UNITS) LOCATED ON 10.4 ACRES AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018)

2) That the City Council conduct a first reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2019-01, entitled:
AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY OFFICIAL ZONING MAP CHANGING THE ZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) FROM ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (R-4) ZONE

3) That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-03, entitled:


BACKGROUND

On November 15, 2018, the City Council held a public hearing to consider a request by the Applicant (“Applicant” or “Sequanota Partners, LP”) for Change of Zone (CZ) No. 17003, changing the zone of a combined 10.4-acre property from R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) and to receive and file the notice of the Planning Commission’s decision to approve Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211, a subdivision of said property into 48 lots for future single-family residential development. The November 15, 2018 City Council staff report is provided as an Attachment to this report.

The City Council heard public testimony, deliberated on the project and expressed concerns with the density of the project and potential conflicts with the proposed second story homes and the adjacent, established single family residential development (see attached November 15, 2018 City Council Minutes). The City Council, on a 3-2 vote, denied the project. With the denial of Change of Zone (CZ) No. 17003, the Planning Commission’s adoption of Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01, became null and void.
Given the Council’s concerns expressed at the November 15, 2018 City Council meeting, Mayor Goodland timely filed an appeal of TTM No. 37211 on November 20, 2018, so that all approvals come before the City Council and any changes agreed by the Applicant can be incorporated into TTM No. 37211.

On December 6, 2018, the City Council agreed to reconsider the introduction of Ordinance No. 2018-13, changing the zone of the subject 10.4-acre property from R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) and setting the public hearing for the reconsideration of Ordinance No. 2018-03 and the appeal of the Planning Commission’s decision to approve Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211 (at request of Mayor Goodland). The December 6, 2018 staff report and minutes are provided as an Attachment to this report.

The City Council voted unanimously to set the public hearing to reconsider Ordinance No. 2018-03 and the appeal by Mayor Goodland of the Planning Commission’s approval of TTM No. 32711 for the January 17, 2019 Council meeting. This report therefore, provides the analysis of the Change of Zone and Tentative Tract Map.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Applicant submitted an application for a Change of Zone from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) and Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211 to allow the subdivision of a 10.4-acre property into 48 single-family residential lots with minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet; two (2) water quality basin lots (Lot A & B) and three (3) lettered street lots (A-C). The existing General Plan land use designation of MDR (Medium Density Residential) will remain unchanged. The project’s community name is Sequanota Heights. The applicant is also requesting an exception to Section 7.10.080 (G) of Title 7 (Subdivisions) for double frontage lots on Lots 3-7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACREAGE OF PROJECT SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING POLICY AREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING ZONING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ZONING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOCATION

As shown on Exhibit 1, the project site is located north of State Route (SR) 60, east of Pacific Avenue, and southeast of Canal and Opal Streets. The property is surrounded by single-family homes to the east and west, State Route (SR) 60 to the south and Union Pacific Railroad to the north. Beyond the railroad tracks are industrial land uses. Exhibit 1 provides an aerial view of the project site. Exhibit 2 provides the existing General Plan Land Use (GPLU) designations and zoning of the site and surrounding parcels.
ANALYSIS

As the property is currently zoned R-1 (One Family Dwellings), the minimum required lot size is 7,200 square feet, with a minimum average lot width of 60 feet and a minimum average lot depth of 100 feet. Since the project proposes 48 single-family residential lots averaging 6,425 square feet, ranging from 6,000 to 11,734 square feet, with a few lots proposed with less than the average lot width and average lot depth, the project will require a Change of Zone from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) to accommodate the lots which do not meet the R-1 zone development standards.

A summary of the existing General Plan land use and existing zoning designations for the project site and surrounding properties is provided in Table 1 and maps are provided under Exhibit 2.

**TABLE 1: EXISTING AND SURROUNDING GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>State Route 60 Freeway</td>
<td>State Route 60 Freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac and Highest Density Residential (HHDR)</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: City of Jurupa Valley General Plan Land Use and Zoning Map*
GENERAL PLAN

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MDR)

The MDR land use designation provides for the development of detached single-family dwellings on parcels typically ranging from 5,500 to 20,000 square feet. The density range is from 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre, with a minimum lot size of 5,500 square feet to encourage clustering.

The project is consistent with applicable policies of the MDR land use and density level, which permits 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre. Under the current land use designation, up to 52 dwelling units are permitted. The project proposes 48 residential lots at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density.

ZONING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

R-1 ZONE (ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS)

The subject property is located within the R-1 zone and is subject to Section 9.55.020 (Development Standards), which states that the lot area of any parcel/lot shall not be less than 7,200 square feet with a minimum average lot width of 60 feet and a minimum average lot depth of 100 feet. The Applicant proposes to subdivide the 10.4-acre parcel into 48 lots as defined in Table 2.
TABLE 2: LOT SUMMARY TABLE (NET AREA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT NO.</th>
<th>AREA (SF)</th>
<th>AVG. WIDTH</th>
<th>AVG. DEPTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>65'</td>
<td>103'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,170</td>
<td>59'</td>
<td>108'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,853</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>127'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,623</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>123'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,441</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>118'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,091</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>108'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,127</td>
<td>73'</td>
<td>121'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,909</td>
<td>63'</td>
<td>121'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>66'</td>
<td>113'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6,970</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>120'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11,226</td>
<td>52'</td>
<td>154'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6,252</td>
<td>52'</td>
<td>111'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6,520</td>
<td>61'</td>
<td>108'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7,176</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>118'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6,949</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>115'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7,183</td>
<td>58'</td>
<td>112'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6,419</td>
<td>54'</td>
<td>98'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6,035</td>
<td>54'</td>
<td>102'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6,069</td>
<td>59'</td>
<td>102'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>59'</td>
<td>109'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6,158</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>112'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the majority of the proposed lots are less than the minimum development standard requirements within the R-1 zone, the applicant is requesting a Change of Zone to change the existing zone classification to R-4 (Planned Residential).

**R-4 ZONE (PLANNED RESIDENTIAL)**

According to Section 9.100.030, the R-4 zone shall not be applied to any area containing less than nine (9) acres. The subject site contains a combined total of 10.4 acres and is therefore qualified to be rezoned to R-4 with an approved Development Plan.

Pursuant to Section 9.100.050 (Subdivision and Development Plan requirements), before any structure is erected or use established in the R-4 Zone, there shall be a subdivision map recorded and a development plan approved as set forth in Section 9.100.060. The Planning Commission approved Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 and the Development Plan via Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02. The applicant intends to record the map and sell the entitled project to a home builder for future development.
LAND USE COMPATIBILITY

The proposed R-4 (Planned Residential) zone will enable the subdivision of a combined 10.4 acre parcel into 48 single-family residential lots ranging in size from 6,000 to 11,734 square feet and averaging 6,425 square feet. While adjacent property is zoned R-1 (One Family Dwellings) with single family residential development, the 7,200 square-foot lot sizes with typical 60 foot-wide lot widths are considered to be compatible with the proposed R-4 (Planned Residential) development standards.

While the R-4 zone minimum lot size requirement is 3,500 square feet, the project proposes lot sizes averaging 6,425 square feet, with lot widths and lot depths very similar to the R-1 zone development standards. As such, driving through the proposed R-4 zoned development project would be very similar to driving through an R-1 zoned project due to the similar lot width and lot depth dimensions.

The development of a 48-lot single-family housing tract, with quality architecture, landscaping and new public right-of-way improvements will serve to increase the overall property values in this neighborhood and create a cohesive and compatible neighborhood. Exhibit 3 depicts the existing and proposed zoning for the subject property:

EXHIBIT 3: EXISTING AND PROPOSED ZONING
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

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. 5 requires all the mitigation measures of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to be as conditions.

The Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration dated June 27, 2018 (provided as an attachment to this report), contains an analysis of the traffic noise impacts from SR-60 on future residents of the project. Subsequent to the preparation and circulation of the Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration, staff asked the City Attorney if an analysis of SR-60 noise impacts should be required in the CEQA documentation (in light of the CBIA v. Bay Area Air Quality Mgmt. Dist. 62 Cal. 4th 369, 2015). In that case, the California Supreme Court determined that with limited exceptions, CEQA requires only that the lead agency analyze the proposed project’s impacts on the environment – not the impacts of the existing environment on potential future users/residents of a proposed project.

As it applies to this project, for the purposes of CEQA, the analysis must focus on the noise added by the project to the noise levels at existing sensitive receptors in the area (e.g., nearby existing residences, schools, etc.). The analysis for CEQA purposes should not analyze the existing environmental noise (i.e. SR-60 Freeway) on the future residents of the project, unless there is substantial evidence that the project will have impacts that would actually exacerbate an existing condition. The analysis shows that the project will not exacerbate an existing condition (i.e. adding significant amounts of traffic to SR-60 Freeway thus increasing noise levels).

The noise analysis in the IS/MND is for informational purposes only and Mitigation Measure NOI-2-Sound Walls and Mitigation Measure NOI-3 -Interior Noise Analysis do not apply to the project for CEQA purposes.

It is important to note however, that although not a requirement of CEQA, analyzing the noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway on future residents of the project is an essential factor to protect the health of future residents. As such, staff is recommending a sound wall as discussed in the October 24, 2018 Planning Commission staff report.
Public Review Period
The public review period for the environmental document began on July 5, 2018 and ended on August 3, 2018. The City did not receive any comments.

CONCLUSION
The proposed Change of Zone No. 17003 is in conformance with the General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) and is compatible with the surrounding single-family land use development within the R-1 (One Family Dwellings) zone. The project will not be a detriment to the public health, safety and welfare and is compatible with the present and future logical development of the area, with recommended conditions of approval. Furthermore, the addition of 48 residential units promotes the City’s achievement for meeting its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) inventory as established in the City’s Housing Element.

The new neighborhood will serve to revitalize the underutilized parcel, visually improve the surrounding neighborhood, as well as foster an increase in property values and help the City attain its RHNA.

All required findings for approval have been affirmatively determined and staff therefore recommends that the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-02 and conduct a first reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2019-01 and adopt Resolution No. 2019-03, approving a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, (2) approving an exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Title 7 (Subdivisions) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, (3) approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 and (4) approving a Development Plan to Permit a Planned Residential Development consisting of a 48-lot subdivision on a combined 10.4 gross acre site.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
There are no financial impacts associated with the notice of decision or the Change of Zone as the Applicant has covered all associated costs for processing.

ALTERNATIVES
1. Approve the project, taking the following actions:
   a) Adopt Resolution No. 2019-02, entitled:
      A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR A PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION (“SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS”) (48 UNITS) LOCATED ON 10.4 ACRES AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018)

   b) Conduct a first reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2019-01, entitled:
AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY OFFICIAL ZONING MAP CHANGING THE ZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) FROM ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (R-4) ZONE

c) Adopt Resolution No. 2019-03, entitled:


2. Deny the CZ, which will deny the tract map by default.

3. Provide alternative direction to staff.

Prepared by:

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director

Submitted by:

Gary Thompson
City Manager
ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution No. 2019-02
   a) Exhibit A: Mitigated Negative Declaration with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
2. Ordinance No. 2019-01
   a) Exhibit A: Change of Zone Exhibit
3. Resolution No. 2019-03
   a) Exhibit A: Recommended Conditions of Approval
   b) Exhibit B: Mitigated Negative Declaration with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
4. November 15, 2018 City Council Staff Report (without Attachments)
5. Excerpt of the November 15, 2018 City Council Minutes
6. December 6, 2018 City Council Staff Report (without Attachments)
7. Excerpt of the Draft December 6, 2018 City Council Minutes
   a) Exhibit A: Conditions of Approval (located at end of both PC Resos)
   b) Exhibit B: Initial Study Checklist / Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (same as Attachment No. 1a)
9. October 24, 2018 Planning Commission Staff Report (without exhibits)
10. Radius Map showing 1,000 foot radius from project boundaries
11. Development Plan workbook
12. Tentative Tract Map No. 32711 and Development Plan (Sheets 1-2)
13. Architectural Set of Plans
14. Conceptual Landscape Plans (Wall/Fence and Maintenance Plan included)
January 4, 2019

Mayor Brian Berkson & City Council Members
City of Jurupa Valley
8930 Limonite Ave.
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509

Re: MA 17099, TTM 37211

Dear Mayor Berkson & City Council Members,

I wanted to thank you for voting to reconsider MA 17099, TTM 37211, Change of Zone No. 17003.

I thought it important to point out a few salient facts regarding TTM 37211.

The proposed minimum lot size is 6,000 sq. ft. for TTM 37211. Eighty Seven percent (87%) of our lots have a minimum lot width of 55'. As a point of reference the residential lots that are adjacent to our site, off of Opal, Canal Street and Patricia Drive are 7,200 sq. ft. lots with minimum lot dimensions of 60x120' (See attached Exhibit A). So from the street view it would be very difficult to notice any difference in the lot sizes.

The existing perimeter roads (Canal & Opal Street) will be with improved with curb, sidewalk and pavement adjacent to TTM 37211. In addition TTM 37211 plan updates the road circulation for the entire area.

Sewer and water upgrades. Currently, water service to the existing homes in the area is through a 2" water main. TTM 37211 will bring an 8" water main to the area. The homes located off of Patricia, Canal and Opal are currently on septic. Sewer will serve TTM 32711 and the adjacent properties will have the ability to tie into the sewer mains.

For the past seven months we have been working on a Public/Private partnership with the Riverside County Flood Control District (RCFCD) on the design of their master plan facility line C which is more fully described on Exhibit B (attached). Our draft agreement with RCFCD is that we fund the design cost of the facilities, process and pay for all environmental permits and RCFCD will fund and build the improvements. These storm drain improvements will eliminate seasonal flooding that occurs at the homes south of Canal Street, west of Opal Street. The facilities include inlet structures at the intersection of Canal and Opal Street then a 36 inch storm drain that continues south to the intersection of Street C and Opal. At this intersection there will be an additional inlet structure and then the storm drain line will transition west and increase to a 42" storm drain. The storm drain will continue in Street C until its terminus at the Sunnyslope...
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channel. The facilities also include a box culvert crossing and additional improvements to the Sunnyslope channel. The estimated cost of the improvements are $1,200,000.

Finally, as a condition of approval we are to work with the City of Jurupa Valley and CALTRANS to design and pay for the construction of a 13’ sound wall along the north side of the 60 freeway. This will reduce the freeway noise to the existing 45 homes on Patricia Drive, Canal and Opal, as well as the proposed 48 homes in TTM 37211.

Thank you for your consideration and I hope you will conclude that the benefits of TTM 37211 will improve the quality of life for a number of existing families in the City of Jurupa Valley while also providing an additional 48 homes to future residents of Jurupa Valley.

Sincerely,
Sequanota Partners, LP
By: JPMB Investments, LLC
It’s: General Partner

[Signature]

Paul Onufer  
It: Manager

Enclosures
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR A PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION (“SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS”) (48 UNITS) LOCATED ON 10.4 ACRES AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018)

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Project. Sequanata Partners, LP (the “Applicant”) has applied for Change of Zone No. 17003, Exception to Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and a Development Plan (collectively, Master Application No. 17099 or MA No. 17099) to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) in the One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone and designated Medium Density Residential (MDR) (the “Project”).

Section 2. Procedural Findings. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that:

(a) The application for MA No. 17099 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 October 24, 2018, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 17099, 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. At the conclusion of the Planning Commission hearing and after due consideration of the testimony, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01, recommending that the City Council adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approve Change of Zone No. 17003 to change the zoning classification of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres of real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) Zone. Additionally, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02, adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approving an exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and a Development Plan.
to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres of real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots.

(c) On October 26, 2018, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 with the City Clerk and a copy of the notice was mailed to the Applicant, the Applicant’s authorized agent, and all interested parties requesting a copy.

(d) On November 15, 2018, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 with the City Council, which notice was placed on the City Council’s regular meeting agenda on that date.

(e) On November 15, 2018, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the proposed Change of Zone No. 17003, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing and voted to deny the proposed Change of Zone No. 17003.

(f) On November 20, 2018, Mayor Goodland filed a timely appeal of the Planning Commission’s approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, which includes an appeal of the Planning Commission’s approval of the exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and the Development Plan (the “Appeal”). The Appeal set aside the Planning Commission’s action and made the Council the approving body.

(g) On December 6, 2018, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley adopted a motion to reconsider the introduction of Ordinance No. 2018-13, which has been re-numbered to Ordinance No. 2019-01 (which would, if adopted, approved Change of Zone No. 17003), and then set the public hearing on the introduction of Ordinance No. 2019-01 and the Appeal for the City Council’s regular meeting on January 17, 2019.

(h) On January 17, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the introduction of Ordinance No. 2019-01 and the Appeal, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing.

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

Section 3. California Environmental Quality Act Findings for Adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby makes the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of MA No. 17099 and Change of Zone No. 17003:

(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 July 5, 2018, and expired on August 3, 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) On October 24, 2018, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Project and the MND, reviewed the staff report, accepted and considered public testimony. After due consideration, the Planning Commission found that agencies and interested members of the public were afforded ample notice and opportunity to comment on the MND and the Project and approved Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01 recommending that City Council adopt the MND, adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and approve the proposed Change of Zone No. 17003.

(d) The City Council has reviewed the MND and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”), attached as Exhibit “A,” 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.

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

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

Section 4. Certification. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 17th day of January, 2019.

______________________________
Brian Berkson
Mayor
ATTEST:

_______________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk

CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA    )
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE    ) ss.
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY   )

I, Victoria Wasko, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-02 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 17th day of January, 2019 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, on the 17th day of January, 2019

________________________________
Victoria Wasko, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
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MASTER APPLICATION 17099 SUMMARY

**Change of Zone 17003:** Amend the City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential).

**Tentative Tract Map 37211:** Subdivision of the 10.4-acre property for future residential development, which will include the subdivision of the project area into 48 residential lots, 2 lettered lots for drainage facilities, and the construction of associated infrastructure. Lot sizes range from 6,000 square feet to 11,734 square feet.
1.0. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of an Initial Study Checklist

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 Checklist 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 Checklist 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 Checklist 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 Checklist/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 Checklist/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 Checklist/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 Checklist/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 Checklist/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 Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Notice of Determination will be filed with the Riverside County Clerk.

### 1.5 Initial Study Checklist/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 Initial Study Checklist determined that implementation of the proposed Project would result in **no impacts or less than significant** impacts with implementation of Plans, Policies, Programs, or Project Design Features to the environment under the following issue areas:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
The Initial Study Checklist determined that the proposed Project would result in potentially significant impacts to the following issue areas, but the Project will incorporate mitigation measures that would avoid or mitigate effects to a point where clearly no significant environmental impacts on the environment would occur:

- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Noise
- Tribal Cultural Resources

The Initial Study Checklist 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 southeast corner of Canal and Opal Streets, north of the State Route 60 freeway and east of Pacific Avenue (Refer to Exhibit 1).

The Project site is identified by the following Assessor Parcel Numbers:

- 177-130-007 and 177-142-018.

2.2 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 in September 2017.

The Project site consists of vacant land and has an elevation range of approximately 870 feet above mean sea level with a slight downward slope from north to south. Natural drainage at the site is generally interpreted to be toward the south-southwest, conforming to the natural topography in the area. The Project site has been heavily disturbed and shows evidence of recent discing, which was likely performed as part of the general site maintenance for weed abatement and fire hazard reduction purposes. Dominant plant species on the Project site include Russian thistle, black mustard (Brassica nigra), dove weed (Croton setigerus), ripgut grass (Bromus diandrus), and Menzie’s fiddleneck (Amsinckia menziesii).

Access to the Project site is provided by Canal Street (a paved roadway with no curb, gutter, or sidewalk) which abuts the northern boundary of the site; Opal Street (a paved roadway with no curb, gutter, or sidewalk) which abuts the eastern boundary of the site; and by Pacific Avenue (a paved roadway with a rolled curb and no sidewalk).
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>Canal Street with vacant land and railroad tracks further to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>State Route 60 Freeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Opal Street with single-family residential further to the east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Concrete lined flood control channel with single-family residential to the west; and Pacific Avenue with vacant land further to the west.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Inspection, September 2017*

### 2.3 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>State Route 60 Freeway</td>
<td>State Route 60 Freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac and Highest Density Residential (HHDR)</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### 2.4 Project Description

The Project Applicant, Sequanota Partners, LP, submitted the following applications to the City of Jurupa Valley, which comprise the proposed Project: Change of Zone (CZ) No. 17003 and Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211. The City of Jurupa Valley also refers to these applications as Master Application (MA) No. 17099. 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 17003**: Amend the City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential).

B. **Tentative Tract Map No. 37211**

The Project is a proposed subdivision of the 10.4-acre property for future residential development, which will include the subdivision of the Project site into 48 lots, 2 lots ("A" and "B") for water quality basins, and the construction of associated infrastructure. Residential lot sizes range from 6,000 square feet to 11,734 square feet.

**Street Improvements**

The Project proposes the following street improvements:

- Canal Street along the Project boundary will have 2 travel lanes, curb, gutter, sidewalk, and parkway landscaping within a 52-foot right-of-way.

- Pacific Avenue between Canal Street and SR-60 will have two through lanes plus median turn lane (3 lanes total), curb, gutter, sidewalk, and parkway landscaping within a 100-foot right-of-way.

- Opal Street will be improved adjacent to the Project site with 18-feet of pavement, curb, gutter, and sidewalk within a half-width right-of-way of 30-feet.

- The intersection of Pacific Avenue (NS) and proposed “C” Street (EW) will be modified to provide curb returns in ultimate location to provide northbound left turn lane and the following geometries:
  - Northbound: One left turn lane, one through lane.
  - Southbound: One shared through/right lane.
  - Eastbound: One shared left/right turn lane.

- The intersection of proposed “B” Street (NS) and Canal Street (EW) will be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on proposed “B” Street and the following:
  - Northbound: One shared left/right turn lane.
  - Eastbound: One shared through/right lane.
  - Westbound: One shared left/through lane.

- Internal streets are proposed within 48-foot and 56-foot right-of-ways and will include curb, gutter, sidewalk, and parkway landscaping.

**Drainage Infrastructure**

Onsite runoff will be conveyed in the street and collected at catch basins provided at critical points to avoid gutter flow depths exceeding top of curb for 10-year flows or right-of-way for 100-year flows. Offsite flows from the northwest end of the project will be intercepted and conveyed with a proposed Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District *Master Drainage Plan*.
storm drain pipe to the existing Sunnyslope Channel. Existing runoff on the westerly side of Opal Street will continue to be conveyed by the street towards an existing drainage swale that runs adjacent to Project site and the State Route 60 Freeway. From there the runoff will be collected by the existing drainage inlet and outlets to the Sunnyslope Channel. Treatment of first flush waters from the development will be accomplished by routing them through the proposed on-site water quality basins.

*Sewer and Water Infrastructure*

New water and sewer lines will connect to the existing facilities in Canal Street, Opal, Street and Pacific Avenue.

**B. Extension of Infrastructure**

Proposed “C” Street will be constructed across the Sunnyslope Channel. Improvements include constructing a box culvert that would entail removing a section of the flood control side walls and installing cast in place walls and top. Along with the box culvert, some remedial grading will be done to regrade portions of the access roads that exist on each side of the channel. Concurrent with the storm drain construction, sewer and water facilities will be installed under the box culvert. The reinforced concrete box culvert and associated transition walls are within the existing Sunnyslope channel. Construction of the box culvert and associated transitions walls will include the removal of approximately 7,000 square feet of the existing channel. This will also include the removal and replacement of approximately 250 feet of the existing Sunnyslope channel bottom. Additionally, the Sunnyslope Channel concrete junction structure would be reconstructed as an underground concrete junction structure. Sequanota, RCFCD and the City will also construct a 36” storm drain line (with accompanying inlet structures) at total of 1150 linear feet from the intersection of Canal Street and Opal Street, south approximately 500 feet within the Opal Street ROW, then east in the Street “C” ROW approximately 650 feet to connect to the reinforced concrete box culvert.
Project Location Map/Aerial Photo
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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</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</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.

| ☐ Aesthetics | ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources | ☐ Air Quality |
| ☒ Biological Resources | ☒ Cultural Resources | ☐ Geology /Soils |
| ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions | ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials | ☐ Hydrology / Water |
| ☐ Land Use / Planning | ☐ Mineral Resources | ☐ Quality |
| ☐ Population / Housing | ☐ Public Services | ☐ Noise |
| ☐ Transportation/Traffic | ☒ Tribal Cultural Resources | ☐ Recreation |
| ☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance | | ☐ Utilities/Service Systems |
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

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director

Printed Name/Title

June 27, 2018

Date
Appendices (Under Separate Cover or on Compact Disk)


Appendix I.  *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment*, Geotek, July 14, 2016.

Appendix J.  *Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment*, Geotek, August 11, 2016.


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,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 9.199.040.C, one (1) family residences shall not exceed forty (40) feet in height. No other building or structure shall exceed fifty (50) feet in height, unless a greater height is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.370. In no event, however, shall a building or structure exceed seventy-five (75) feet in height, unless a variance is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.270.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

The Project site is approximately 10.4 gross acres in size and is located in an area largely characterized by residential development and vacant land. The site is bounded by Canal Street, followed by vacant land, followed by a railroad easement or residential development to the north; a flood control channel, followed by residential development or Pacific Avenue, followed by vacant land to the east; State Highway 60 or a flood control channel, followed by State Route 60, to the south; and scattered residences 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 5,000 feet to the northwest of the Project site and the Rattlesnake Mountains located approximately 2,000 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 40 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 outcrops, 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 48 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. The site is bounded by Canal Street, followed by vacant land, followed by a railroad easement or residential development to the north; a flood control channel, followed by residential development or Pacific Avenue, followed by vacant land to the east; State Route 60 or a flood control channel to the south; and scattered residences to the west. In addition, the Project site is planned for low density residential uses by the General Plan and this type of development has been anticipated for the subject site.

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>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>LessThan 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 has a zoning classification of R-1 (One Family Dwellings) which allows single-family detached housing at a density of 2-5 dwelling units per acre. The Project is proposing a zone change from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential). Neither the R-1 Zone or the R-4 Zone is considered a primary agricultural zone. As such, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use.

**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 site has a zoning classification R-1 (One Family Dwellings). The Project is proposing a zone change from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential). 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.*

**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 the eastern portion of the Project site as “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. According to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the Project (Appendix G), the site has not been used for agricultural purposes since 1985. One (1) vegetation community/land cover type was mapped within the Project site, agriculture land (fallow agriculture). 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. Fallow agriculture was the only land cover type found throughout the Project site. Non-native plant species, including Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*) and brome grasses (*Bromus* spp.), were present in the fallow agricultural areas on site. As such, it is not currently providing active agricultural land of use to the local economy.

In addition, the Project site is approximately 10.4 gross acres in size and is located in an area largely characterized by residential development and vacant land. The site is bounded by Canal Street, followed by vacant land, followed by a railroad easement or residential development to the north; a flood control channel, followed by residential development or Pacific Avenue, followed by vacant land to the east; State Highway 60 or a flood control channel to the south; and scattered residences to the west. In addition, the Project site is planned for low density 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>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. 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 Study (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)
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\(_{10}\))
- Fine Particulate Matter (PM\(_{2.5}\))
- Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NO\(_x\))
- Sulphur Dioxide (SO\(_2\)), 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(_{10}))</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Particulate Matter (PM(_{2.5}))</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criteria Pollutant | State Designation | Federal Designation
--- | --- | ---
Nitrogen Dioxide (N0x) | Attainment | Attainment
Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) | Attainment | Attainment
Lead | Attainment | Attainment

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 3-5 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.

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*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 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$_{10}$ 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.
Table 4. South Coast Air Quality Management District Air Quality Regional Significance Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Emissions (Construction) (pounds/day)</th>
<th>Emissions (Operational) (pounds/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOx</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District CEQA Air Quality Significance Thresholds (2009)

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). Construction activities within the Project site will consist of demolishing portions of the existing flood control channel, site preparation, on-site grading, building, paving, and architectural coating. The Project is expected to export approximately 3,000 cubic yards of soil during the flood control channel excavation. The estimated maximum daily construction emissions are summarized in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Maximum Daily Construction Emissions (lbs/day)

<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>Summer</td>
<td>30.07</td>
<td>57.78</td>
<td>34.65</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>30.06</td>
<td>57.82</td>
<td>34.55</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</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>

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

As shown in Table 5, 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 6 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>Summer</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.05</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>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the analysis above, regional air quality impacts for construction 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 (NO\textsubscript{X}), carbon
monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM\textsubscript{10} and PM\textsubscript{2.5}) 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>NO\textsubscript{X}</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{10}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Emissions</td>
<td>57.82</td>
<td>34.65</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>6.63</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>

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

As shown in Table 7, 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 exceed even if standards are not exceeded on a regional level. On-
site area and energy sources were evaluated. As shown in Table 8, 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>NO\textsubscript{X}</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{10}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Emissions</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.16</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>

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

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: 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: 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.

The Project is being conditioned by the Planning Department as part of the entitlement process to require the installation of MERV 13 Filters for each residential dwelling unit and is considered a Project Design Feature. This Project Design Feature will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance.

PDF 3.3-1 As required by the Project’s Conditions of Approval, residential dwelling units within 500 feet of the SR-60 Freeway shall be required to install high efficiency Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) filters of MERV 13 or better as indicated by the American Society of Heating Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers ASHRAE) Standard 52.2, in the intake of ventilation systems. Heating, air conditioning and ventilation (HVAC) systems shall be installed with a fan unit power designed to force air through the MERV 13 filter.

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 adjacent to the Project site.

Localized Impacts

As shown on Table 8 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)

In regards to air quality hazards, 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.

IMPORTANT NOTE #1: 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 is not generally required to analyze 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 the hazards and the proposed project’s effect in terms of increasing the risks related to those hazards. The following analysis is consistent with the CBIA case.
Existing Conditions

The Project site is currently exposed to toxic air contaminant emissions from diesel truck emissions from SR-60 Freeway diesel particulate matter (DPM) sources. The existing conditions on the Project site only include vacant land that does not contain any operational land uses that emit toxic air contaminants.

The Project’s Contribution to Existing Conditions

Construction Impacts: During construction diesel particulate matter emissions would be emitted from heavy equipment use and heavy-duty trucks and would temporarily add to the health risk from diesel particulate matter in the project area that is primarily a result from heavy-duty trucks operating on State Route 60, adjacent to the Project site. Heavy-duty construction equipment is subject to a California Air Resources Board Airborne Toxics Control Measure for in-use diesel construction equipment to reduce diesel particulate emissions. As described above for the LST analysis, PM$_{10}$ (representative of diesel particulate matter, 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 15 feet from the proposed construction boundary. According to Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), 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.

Construction emissions are estimated based on model Year 2019 and beyond. It was assumed that construction would begin in the Year 2019 and would last approximately 18 months. Due to the relatively temporary nature of construction (that would only occur over approximately 18 months) exposure at any individual sensitive receptor and minimal particulate emissions generated on-site, TACs generated during construction would not be expected to result in concentrations causing significant health risks.

Operational Impacts: The Project is a residential development and will not be a source of toxic air contaminants. 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 exacerbate pre-existing health risk hazards from the SR-60 Freeway. Impacts are less than significant in this regard.

In summary, the proposed Project would not result in a potentially significant contribution to regional concentrations of TAC’s and would not result in a significant contribution to the adverse health impacts associated with those pollutants. Impacts would be less than significant.

IMPORTANT NOTE #2: As noted above, the CBIA case 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 only requires an analysis of the hazards and the proposed project’s effect in terms of increasing the risks related to those hazards. Notwithstanding this legal requirement, because the Project is locating sensitive receptors in proximity to freeway-related DPM sources, a Health Risk Assessment was conducted at the request of the City of Jurupa Valley for informational and disclosure purposes only.

Health Risk Assessment
According to the building setback line (BSL) on the tentative tract map (TTM), the closest any new single family dwelling could be to potential SR-60 Freeway diesel particulate matter (DPM) sources would be approximately 129 feet from the westbound SR-60 Freeway lanes of travel.

According to SCAQMD methodology, health effects from carcinogenic air toxics are usually described in terms of individual cancer risk. “Individual Cancer Risk” is the likelihood that a person exposed to concentrations of toxic air contaminants over a 30-year lifetime will contract cancer, based on the use of revised Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) risk-assessment methodology.

The SCAQMD has established the following health risk thresholds.

- Maximum Incremental Cancer Risk: 10 in 1 million at the nearest sensitive receptor or off-site worker; and
- Hazard Index (project increment) 1.0 or greater.

Cancer Risk

The proposed single-family detached residential dwelling units within 500 feet of the SR-60 Freeway would experience the highest levels of freeway-related DPM emissions, resulting in a cumulative cancer risk of up to 42.85 per million people (up to 31.73 per million for infants 0-2 years of age).

While cancer risk at the Project site due to TACs may be higher than other areas in Riverside County that are located further from the SR-60 Freeway, the risk on the Project site will be less than the majority of Riverside County and much less than the average in the South Coast Air Basin. Because the Project is not exacerbating the existing TAC exposure as discussed above, mitigation measures to reduce impacts are not required under CEQA.

The Health Risk Assessment prepared for the Project (Appendix B), identified that proposed dwelling units interior cancer risk can be mitigated down to less than 10 in a million using MERV 13 filtration systems. The requirement for the installation of MERV 13 filter systems for each home can be imposed as a Condition of Approval for the Project as part of the entitlement process.

Non-Cancer Related Impacts

The operational health risk impacts for non-cancer related impacts are less than 1.0; therefore, they are considered to be less significant.

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

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 Reports (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.

Sensitive Plant Species

According to the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) and California Native Plant Society (CNPS) special-status plant species have not been documented on the Project site (CDFW 2016b). However, several special-status plant species have been documented within the vicinity of the Project site. Although many of the species have been identified near the Project site, all of the plant species are presumed absent due to the lack of suitable habitat and the project site’s lengthy history of being heavily disturbed and frequently disced. In addition, the Project site is located within the MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area (NEPSSA), but the habitat (fallow agriculture) identified on the project site, and the recent discing/plowing of the Project site, made it unsuitable for the narrow endemic plant species, including San Diego ambrosia (*Ambrosia pumila*), Brand’s phacelia (*Phacelia stellaris*), and San Miguel savory (*Satureja chandleri*).

Sensitive Wildlife Species

According to the records searches, no special-status wildlife species have been documented on the Project site (CDFW 2016b). However, several special-status wildlife species have been documented within the vicinity of the Project site. A total of six species were found to varying levels of potential to occur on the Project site. None of the species were determined to have a high potential for occurrence on the Project site, but three species were determined to have a moderate potential to occur, including silvery legless lizard (*Anniella pulchra*), red diamond rattlesnake (*Crotalus ruber*), and yellow-breasted chat (*Icteria virens*). Additionally, three species were determined to have a low potential to occur, including western spadefoot toad (*Spea hammondii*), loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*), and American Badger (*Taxidea taxus*).

Suitable burrowing owl habitat was identified throughout the entire site; however, only Parcel 1 contained suitable burrows. No suitable burrows were identified on Parcel 2, the area between the two parcels where the proposed reinforced concrete box will be built, or the storm drain alignment. A total of 21 burrows that were of appropriate size and shape for burrowing owl use were identified during the focused burrow survey/first burrowing owl survey but burrowing owls and burrowing owl sign were neither observed nor detected. California ground squirrels, a species that burrowing owls can depend on for burrow construction, were associated with the burrows on site.
Burrowing owls and their sign were not observed or detected during any of the focused surveys. However, because burrowing owl habitat exists on the site, the following mitigation measure is required:

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

**MM-BIO-1: 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.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, 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.

[It should be noted that the site does contain trees with the potential for providing habitat for nesting birds. Nesting birds are discussed under Issue 3.4(d) below].

**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: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: Biological Reports (Appendix C), DBESP (Appendix D).*

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

The Western Riverside County MSHCP defines Riparian/Riverine Areas as, “...lands which contain Habitat dominated by trees, shrubs, persistent emergents, or emergent mosses and lichens, which occur close to or which depend upon soil moisture from a nearby fresh water source; or areas with fresh water flow during all or a portion of the year.”

The initial site assessment conducted in 2016 identified the Sunnyslope Channel, which includes two branches that run along the east border of the Parcel 1 and along the south border of Parcel 2 before the two branches connect and continue south, as a potential riverine area. Further evaluation in 2018 confirmed that the Sunnyslope Channel was jurisdictional to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and CDFW and was considered a riverine resource as defined by the MSHCP, due to its supporting fresh water flow during all or a portion of the year.

The Sunnyslope Channel is a cement-lined trapezoidal channel that includes two branches. The two branches of the Sunnyslope Channel adjacent to the Project site accounted for a total of 0.64 acre of riverine resources. Most of the Sunnyslope Channel will be avoided by construction, but based on the current design plans, the Project proposes to impact 0.14 acre of the Sunnyslope Channel during the construction of the reinforced concrete box culvert and associated transition walls.

Riparian/Riverine features on the Project site are of minimal value to riparian/riverine wildlife due to the lack of riparian vegetation within the channel and the surrounding areas. The only areas with any plant material within the channel were found at the north end of the Project site near Canal Street, where some algae and surface water were present. The functions associated with the channel are primarily as a local source of water for wildlife and as a conduit to feed downstream areas with fresh water. Sunnyslope Channel is connected hydrologically with the Santa Ana River and the Prado Basin, through a series of flood control channels.

Wildlife use of the riparian/riverine area on site is limited because of the lack of habitat present and lack of features necessary to support targeted MSHCP Riparian/Riverine species. It is also not part of a natural wildlife corridor or planned linkage under the MSHCP. Within the site, species observed included rock pigeon (Columbia livia), mourning dove (Zenaida macroura), and Anna’s hummingbird (Calypte anna) and other typically urban/suburban species. The channel area likely provides a water source for vertebrate and invertebrate species in the local area, but does not contain nesting habitat for bird species or permanent habitat for most other species.

Downstream of the Project site, the channel continues through several communities in either a concrete lined channel or an earthen bottom channel. Riparian habitat downstream does not become evident until the channel enters the Santa Ana River floodplain, approximately two miles downstream. This portion of the Santa Ana River is known to support a wide variety of riparian bird species including the least Bell’s vireo and southwestern willow flycatcher. Farther downstream, over five miles away in the Prado Basin, there is a known population of the yellow-billed cuckoo.

Riparian/Riverine features on the Project site do not function as a traditional riparian system, but rather as a part of the local flood control system. They provide low value for traditional riparian system functions as hydrologic regime, flood storage and flood flow modification, and sediment
trapping and transport. This is largely due to the lack of habitat, its landscape position, and the relatively small drainage area that it serves. However, the water flows across the site are considered important as a source of water and sediment transport for downstream populations of MSHCP target riparian/riverine species. Areas downstream could be affected by changes in water quality within Sunnyslope Channel. Because the Project will maintain the channel flows and existing water quality post-construction, no long-term modifications of riparian/riverine functions and values downstream are anticipated due to the Project.

The temporary impact to 0.14 acre of Sunnyslope Channel is not considered to be a significant loss because the area would be restored to approximate its current condition after the project is built. The 0.14 acre of riverine habitat is completely concrete, is completely devoid of riparian habitat, and is only considered a riverine resource because it conveys storm water flows downstream. Once the construction of the reinforced concrete box is complete, the channel will be returned to its original concrete form. Therefore, no restoration for temporary impacts to riparian/riverine resources shall be required and there will be no temporal loss of riparian habitat. The Project will result in no change to water quality levels in downstream waters and no riparian habitat will be lost due to the Project.

### 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.

**Sources:** Biological Reports (Appendix C), DBESP (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.*

Because Sunnyslope Channel is a manufactured channel, it is defined by the limits of its cement lining and normal capacity for flooding. The channel enters the site from Canal Road as a box channel, approximately eight feet in depth and 13 feet wide, and transitions to a trapezoidal channel that then flows directly south. The channel is 24 feet in width, with a bottom that is five feet wide and trapezoidal sides of 19 feet. During the survey, water originating from urban runoff was observed within the channel. A small area of algae was observed at the northern end of Sunnyslope Channel. At the southern end of Sunnyslope Channel, it confluences with an eastern branch (also named Sunnyslope Channel) and then flows through a triple box culvert underneath State Route 60. Then the channel continues as an open concrete channel southward for another 2.5 miles, joined by other concrete channels along the way, until it empties into the Santa Ana River. The ordinary high-water mark (OHWM) was demarcated by the upper limits of the concrete sideslopes of the channel. Sunnyslope Channel was determined to be jurisdictional based on the
observance of surface water within the channel. No soils were present within the channel and the only vegetation present were clumps of algae located at the upper end of the channel.

Most of the Sunnyslope Channel will be avoided by construction, however, based on the current design plans, the Project anticipates approximately 0.14 acre of impacts to the Sunnyslope Channel during the construction of the reinforced concrete box culvert and associated transition walls. As such, the following mitigation measures are required:

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

**MM BIO-2. Coordination With USACE, CDFW, and RWQCB.** 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 to positively determine whether or not either agency wishes to exert jurisdiction of the onsite drainage feature. If either agency decides to exert jurisdiction, Mitigation Measures BIO-3 and BIO-4 shall be implemented.

**BIO-3. CDFW Jurisdiction.** If state jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-2, 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 at a ratio of not less than 1:1 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. The above described ratios may be increase by the CDFW as part of the permit process.

**BIO-4. Federal Jurisdiction.** If federal jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-2, 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 more than 0.1 acre of wetlands and 1,278 linear feet of streambed channel, 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. The above described ratios may be increase by the USACOE or the RWQCB as part of the permit process.

With implementation of Mitigations BIO-2 through BIO-4, 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 With Mitigation Incorporated.
*Source: Biological Reports (Appendix C).*

**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.

Although no wildlife corridors are identified in Project area, the Project site contains some vegetation that may contain suitable nesting and foraging habitat for a number of common trees and ground-nesting avian species which are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. As such, development of the Project site may result in potential impacts to nesting birds if construction activities commence during the avian breeding season of February 1 through October 1. Therefore, the following mitigation measure is required:

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

**Mitigation Measure BIO-5- Nesting Bird Survey.** As a condition of approval for all grading permits, vegetation clearing and ground disturbance shall be prohibited during the migratory bird nesting season (February 1 through October 1), unless a migratory bird nesting survey is completed in accordance with the following requirements:

a. A migratory nesting bird survey of the Project’s impact footprint shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three business (3) days prior to initiating vegetation clearing or ground disturbance.

b. A copy of the migratory nesting bird survey results report shall be provided to the City of Jurupa Planning Department. If the survey identifies the presence of active nests, then the qualified biologist shall provide the Planning Department with a copy of maps showing the location of all nests and an appropriate buffer zone around each nest sufficient to protect the nest from direct and indirect impact. The size and location of all buffer zones, if required, shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Department and shall be no less than a 300-foot radius around the nest for non-raptors and a 500-foot radius around the nest for raptors. The nests and buffer zones shall be field checked weekly by a qualified biological monitor. The approved buffer zone shall be marked in the field with construction fencing, within which no vegetation clearing or ground disturbance shall commence until the qualified biologist and Planning Department verify that the nests are no longer occupied and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-5, impacts would be less than significant.
Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.


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.

To date, the City has not adopted a tree preservation ordinance. However, guidance on the preservation of trees is found in the following General Plan policies:

- **COS 1.2 - Protection of Significant Trees.** Protect and preserve significant trees, as determined by the City Council upon the recommendation of the Planning Commission. Significant trees are those trees that make substantial contributions to natural habitat or to the urban landscape due to their species, size, or rarity. In particular, California native trees should be protected.

- **COS 1.3 - Other Significant Vegetation.** Maintain and conserve superior examples of vegetation, including: agricultural wind screen plantings, street trees, stands of mature native and non-native trees, and other features of ecological, aesthetic, and conservation value.

According to Tree Survey (Appendix E) there are ten (10) trees that will be impacted by the Project. Nine (9) of the trees are locate within the right-of-way of Canal Street and Opal Street. One (1) tree is located on a proposed lot. All of the trees are proposed to be removed. The trees species are: Eucalyptus, Australian Whistling Pine, and Peruvian Pepper Tree. Per General Plan policy COS 1.3, nine (9) of the trees are considered “street trees” and afforded protection. Therefore, the following mitigation measure is required:

Mitigation Measures (MM)

**Mitigation Measure BIO-6-Tree Preservation and Replacement.** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, 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 permits:

“Prior to the removal of any trees, the issuance of a grading permit, or approval of a Site Development Permit, whichever comes first, a Tree Removal and Planting and Monitoring Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department that demonstrates that the following will be implemented:

1) The trees along Opal Street and Canal Street, identified in the Tree Survey prepared by BrightView Design Group, April 24, (Appendix D of the Initial Study Checklist for MA 17009) shall be replaced at a 3:1 ratio with an approved species as determined by the City’s Planning Department. Tree selection
must be at least 15-gallon purchased from quality nursery stock. This number of trees is above the number identified in the Project’s Landscape Plan"

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-5, impacts would be less than significant.

### 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.**

*Source: Source: Biological Reports (Appendix C), DBESP (Appendix D).*

**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 Biological Reports prepared for the Project and the Riverside Conservation Authority website:

- The Project site is not in an MSHCP survey area for riparian/riverine areas or vernal pools.
- The Project site is not in an MSHCP survey area 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-1 (30-day Pre-Construction Survey) is required:
With implementation of PPP 3.4-1 and Mitigation Measure BIO-1, 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 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></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 Study (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.*

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.

The Cultural Resources Study prepared for the Project (Appendix F) indicates that no cultural resources that are eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

A review of historic-period aerial photographs revealed that the Sunnyslope Channel includes a mix of both modern (less than 50 years old) and historic-age (more than 50 years old) branches. The modern branch of the Sunnyslope Channel was constructed in 1980 and runs north-south between eastern and western portions of the Project site. The modern portion of the Sunnyslope Channel is not a Historical Resource as defined by CEQA.

The installation of a box culvert and removal and replacement of 125 feet of channel bottom would require excavation into the historic-age portion of the Sunnyslope Channel. This historic-age segment of the Sunnyslope Channel was evaluated as not eligible for listing in the CRHR under any criteria and is not a Historical Resource for the purposes of CEQA.

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 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.*

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.
As noted under Issue 3.5 (b) above, the cultural resource records search identified no previously recorded cultural resources on the Project site and no resources were identified as a result of the pedestrian survey or through documentary research. The potential for buried deposits may be considered low based upon the lack of identified resources and previous impacts to the property. However, if intact buried cultural materials are encountered during construction, work in that area must halt until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the find. As such, the following mitigation measure is required:

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

**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.

**3.5(c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

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

**Source:** Riverside County Geographic information System.

**Impact Analysis**

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

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs 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.

According to the Riverside County Geographic Information System, the Project site is located in an area with “high potential” for paleontological resources. Therefore, the following mitigation measures are required.

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

**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 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.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Would the Project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
---|---|---|---|---|

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

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.

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

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?

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

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?

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: Updated Geotechnical Evaluation and Infiltration Study (Appendix G), Riverside County GIS.
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: Updated Geotechnical Evaluation and Infiltration Study (Appendix G), Riverside County GIS.

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: Updated Geotechnical Evaluation and Infiltration Study (Appendix G), Riverside County GIS.

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:
  
  o Intense seismic shaking;

  o Presence of loose granular soils prone to liquefaction; and

  o Saturation of soils due to shallow groundwater.

Historic groundwater exceeds 50 feet below ground surface (bgs) in the area. In addition, the Project site is identified by the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan (Figure 8-5-Liquefaction Susceptibility) as being in an area with a “moderate” susceptibility of liquefaction. However, the Geotechnical Evaluation conducted for the Project identified there in no potential for liquefaction to exist on the Project site based on the depth of the groundwater (in excess of 50 feet).

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: Updated Geotechnical Evaluation and Infiltration Study (Appendix G).*

**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: Updated Geotechnical Evaluation and Infiltration Study (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 Geographic Information System, 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 50-feet.
Collapse

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 50-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: Updated Geotechnical Evaluation and Infiltration Study (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 “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>(\square)</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>(\square)</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 and Greenhouse Gas Impact Study (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 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Source</th>
<th>GHG Emissions (metric tons per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Construction Emissions</td>
<td>21.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(amortized over 30 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>12.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>220.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>732.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>28.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Usage</td>
<td>24.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CO2E (All Sources)</td>
<td>1,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance Threshold</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Study (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>□</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>□</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>□</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>□</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>□</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>□</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>□</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>□</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.
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.

Historic Agricultural Use

In order to address the potential concern regarding historic agricultural use, soil samples from the Project site for chemical analysis were obtained. Ten (10) soil samples were obtained from selected areas of the Project site and submitted to a state certified laboratory for analysis of organochlorinated pesticides (OCP). Soil samples were obtained from a depth of up to approximately six (6) inches below the existing ground surface. Analysis of the soil samples detected measurable quantities of the OCP constituents 4, 4'-DDE, endrin ketone, and methoxychlor from the soil sample collected from near proposed lot 23. The detected OCP constituents were in concentrations below the maximum allowable concentration level for residential soil, as determined by the California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSLs) and Environmental Protection Agency Regional Screening Levels (RSLs). Based on the results above, additional investigation is not necessary at the site with respect to this issue.

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 located within ¼ mile of Mission Middle School. 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 1.4 miles northwest of the Flabob Airport. According to Map FL-1, Flabob Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Project site is not located within 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 Canal Street, Opal Street, and Pacific Avenue which are paved roadways 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 Canal Street, Opal Street, and Pacific Avenue 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.

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.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*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. Therefore development of the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires and no impact would occur.
### 3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<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. 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: Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulic Study (Appendix H).*

**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 site-specific storm drain system to prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials, or other elements that might degrade or harm biological resources or ecosystem processes. This will be accomplished by constructing two (2) detention basins with a design capture volume (DCV) sufficient 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.

Onsite runoff will be conveyed in the street and collected at catch basins provided at critical points to avoid gutter flow depths exceeding top of curb for 10-year flows or right-of-way for 100-year flows. Offsite flows from the northwest end of the project will be intercepted and conveyed with a proposed Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District Master Drainage Plan storm drain pipe to the existing Sunnyslope Channel. Existing runoff on the westerly side of Opal Street will continue to be conveyed by the street towards an existing drainage swale that runs adjacent to Project site and the State Route 60 Freeway. From there the runoff will be collected by the existing drainage inlet and outlets to the Sunnyslope Channel. Treatment of first flush waters from the development will be accomplished by routing them through the proposed on-site water quality basins.
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.**

*Source: Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulic Study (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.

Water service would 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 historical groundwater data (California Department of Water Resources and California State Water Resources Control Board groundwater well data [http://wdl.water.ca.gov and http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov]), depth to groundwater is greater than 50 feet bgs in the general site area, with a flow direction to the south-southwest. As such, the Project will not impact groundwater.

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.**

*Source: Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulic Study (Appendix H).*

**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.

Development of the Project would increase impervious surface coverage on the site and increase surface runoff. Onsite runoff will be conveyed in the street and collected at catch basins provided at critical points to avoid gutter flow depths exceeding top of curb for 10-year flows or right-of-way for 100-year flows. Offsite flows from the northwest end of the project will be intercepted and conveyed with a proposed Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District *Master Drainage Plan* storm drain pipe to the existing Sunnyslope Channel. Existing runoff on the westerly side of Opal Street will continue to be conveyed by the street towards an existing drainage swale that runs adjacent to Project site and the State Route 60 Freeway. From there the runoff will be collected by the existing drainage inlet and outlets to the Sunnyslope Channel. Treatment of first flush waters from the development will be accomplished by routing them through the proposed onsite water quality basins.

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.**
Source: Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulic Study (Appendix H).

**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: 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.

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: Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM).

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, 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.

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: 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.

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 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**

*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.*

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. The site is bounded by Canal Street, followed by vacant land, followed by a railroad easement or residential development to the north; a flood control channel, followed by residential development or Pacific Avenue, followed by vacant land to the east; State Highway 60 or a flood control channel to the south; and scattered residences 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.

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 Reports (Appendix C), DBESP (Appendix D).

**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 Biological Reports prepared for the Project and the Riverside Conservation Authority website:

- The Project site is not in an MSHCP survey area for riparian/riverine areas or vernal pools.
- The Project site is not in an MSHCP survey area 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-1 (30-day Pre-Construction Survey) is required:

With implementation of PPP 3.4-1 and Mitigation Measure BIO-1, 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 Impact 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.*
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.” 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 Impact Analysis (Appendix K).*

**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

The main noise sources surrounding the Project site include the SR-60 Freeway, located approximately 100 feet south of the Project's southern property line, and the Union Pacific Railroad, located approximately 100 feet north of the project's northern property line.

Construction Noise

The most significant source of short-term noise impact is related to noise generated during construction activities on the Project site which would result in potential noise impacts to nearby sensitive receptors (i.e. residential homes) located near the Project site. Construction is performed in discrete steps, each of which has its own mix of equipment and consequently its own noise characteristics. Thus noise levels will fluctuate depending upon construction phase, equipment type, duration of equipment use, distance between the noise source and receptor, and the presence or absence of noise attenuation structures. As shown on Table 10 below, noise levels generated by heavy construction equipment can range from approximately 75 dBA to 99 dBA when measured at 50 feet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Equipment</th>
<th>Range of Sound Levels Measured (dBA at 50 feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pile Drivers</td>
<td>81 to 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Drills</td>
<td>83 to 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Hammers</td>
<td>75 to 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
<td>78 to 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumps</td>
<td>68 to 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozers</td>
<td>85 to 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractors</td>
<td>77 to 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-End Loaders</td>
<td>86 to 90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Type of Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Equipment</th>
<th>Range of Sound Levels Measured (dBA at 50 feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graders</td>
<td>79 to 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Compressors</td>
<td>76 to 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks</td>
<td>81 to 87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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 75 dBA to 99 dBA when measured at 50 feet. The following mitigation measure is required to reduce construction noise impacts to the maximum extent feasible:

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

**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.”
Operational Noise

The Project is proposed to consist of 48 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 456 average daily vehicle trips (36 trips in the AM Peak hours and 48 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. Based on Project trip generation and distribution information provided by the Traffic Impact Study prepared for the Project (Appendix L), 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.

Traffic Source Noise

The City of Jurupa Valley follows the State of California’s noise compatibility guidelines. Residential land uses are categorized based on the following community noise exposure levels (CNEL) are shown on Table 11 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Community Noise Exposure Level (dB CNEL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normally Acceptable</td>
<td>60 and below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditionally Acceptable</td>
<td>55-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normally Acceptable</td>
<td>70-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly Unacceptable</td>
<td>75 and above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic noise along the SR-60 Freeway will be the main source of noise impacting the Project site and the surrounding area. For purposes of CEQA, exterior noise levels are calculated for habitable backyard and sideyard areas only. Unmitigated exterior backyard/sideyard exterior noise levels will range from 75.1 dBA CNEL to 69.5 dBA CNEL. It is anticipated that the first row of residential units facing the freeway will experience the highest noise levels on the site. On-site unmitigated exterior noise levels fall within the conditionally acceptable to clearly unacceptable community noise exposure limits. Therefore, Mitigation Measure NOI-2 is required.

Mitigation Measures (MM)

Mitigation Measure NOI-2. Sound Walls: Prior to issuance of building permits, a final noise study based on final precise grading plan elevations shall be prepared by a qualified acoustician and approved by the City to validate appropriate noise barrier heights, locations, and construction materials. a) Sound walls are required around all habitable exterior backyard and sideyard areas for all lots (See Exhibit C of Noise Impact Analysis, Appendix K of this Initial Study Checklist) for specific wall heights and locations. All required noise barriers shall be designed to reduce noise levels to below 65 dBA CNEL within private exterior areas (i.e., backyards) of residential lots. The noise barriers may consist of any material (block, tempered glass, earthen berm, etc.) or combination of materials that achieves the required noise attenuation and shall have no decorative cutouts or other line-of-sight openings between shielded areas and the noise source (adjacent roadway). Prior to
issuance of building permits, the City of Jurupa Valley shall review and approve the noise barrier design, placement, and materials to ensure that the required level of sound attenuation will be achieved.

**Future Interior Noise**

The future interior noise level was calculated for the sensitive receptor locations using a typical “windows open” and “windows closed” condition. A “windows open” condition assumes 12 dBA of noise attenuation from the exterior noise level. A “windows closed” condition assumes 20 dBA of noise attenuation from the exterior noise level.

The Noise Impact Analysis prepared for the Project (Appendix K) indicates that the first floor interior noise levels for all units on the Project site will range from 65.4 to 52.0 dBA CNEL with the windows open and 57.4 to 44.0 dBA CNEL with the windows closed.

The Noise Impact Analysis prepared for the Project (Appendix K) also indicates that the second floor interior noise levels for units facing the adjacent SR-60 Freeway will range from 69.3 to 64.0 dBA CNEL with the windows open and 61.3 to 56.0 dBA CNEL with the windows closed.

To meet the City’s interior 45 dBA CNEL standard, the following noise mitigation measure is required to comply with the City of Jurupa Valley and State of California noise standards.

**Mitigations Measures (MM)**

**Mitigation Measure NOI-3 Interior Noise Analysis:** Prior to issuance of any residential building permit, an interior noise analysis shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department demonstrating that proposed building materials will achieve interior noise levels less than 45 dBA CNEL. Measures that would facilitate compliance with the 45dBA CNEL interior noise standard include, but are not limited to:

- **a)** A “windows closed” condition is required to meet interior noise standards for all homes.

- **b)** Upgraded windows and sliding glass doors are required on all homes. See Tables 5 and 6 of Noise Impact Analysis, Appendix K of this Initial Study Checklist for specific STC requirements.

- **c)** Attic and roof vents that directly face the SR-60, if applicable, shall include an acoustical baffle to prevent vehicle noise intrusion. See Exhibits D and E of Noise Impact Analysis, Appendix K of this Initial Study Checklist for examples acoustical baffles. The contractor may install similar measures to provide noise reduction.

- **d)** For proper acoustical performance, all exterior windows, doors, and sliding glass doors must have a positive seal and leaks/cracks must be kept to a minimum.

**Rail Line Source Noise**

The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) U.S. DOT Crossing Inventory Form is used to obtain operational data along the adjacent railroad segment. According to the FRA online railroad portal, the railroad crossing nearest the project site is 810990D, SR-60 Freeway. The railroad source noise analysis uses a version of Wyle Labs WCR73_5, together with several key site parameters, to
estimate noise impacts of railroad operations to the Project site. Key inputs include train category identification, number of daily train operations, length of train, speed of train, and distance to receiver. Similar performance equations, including relative source-barrier-receiver horizontal separations, relative source-barrier receiver vertical separations, typical noise source spectra, and barrier transmission loss from the railroad noise model, were utilized to complete the stationary source model.

Railroad noise from the tracks north of the Project site will be an infrequent source of noise impacting the Project site and the surrounding area. Noise calculations assume a 6-foot block wall along the northern property line which will shield habitable exterior areas from railroad noise. It is anticipated that the first row residential units facing the subject rail line will experience an exterior noise level of 52.8 dBA CNEL at 110 feet from the railroad tracks and noise levels will be below the applicable standard. This impact is considered less than significant.

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

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Sources: Noise Impact Analysis (Appendix K).*

**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.

**Train Vibration**

The vibration impact will vary depending on the speed of the train and the respective distance to the sensitive receiver location. Train speed is based on the U.S. DOT Crossing inventory form for 810990D and indicates typical speed range is 5-10 mph. The vibration impact will be approximately 64 VdB at 100 feet from centerline of track. The vibration standard set by the FTA for infrequent events in a residential land use is 80 VdB. According to the FTA Manual, up to 30 events could occur per day without exceeding the vibration threshold. The impact is considered less than significant.

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.**

*Source: Noise Impact Analysis (Appendix K).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*Refer to PPP 3.12-1 and PPP 3.12-2 under Issue 3.12(a) above.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*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 through NOI-3, 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 Impact Analysis (Appendix K).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*Refer to PPP 3.12-1 and PPP 3.12-2 under Issue 3.12(a) above.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*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.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*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 forty-eight (48) 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 161 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 Canal Street, Opal, Street and Pacific Avenue.

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>1) Fire protection?</td>
<td>2) Police protection?</td>
<td>3) Schools?</td>
<td>4) Parks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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 Glen Avon Fire Station No. 18, an existing station located at an existing station located approximately 1.4 miles northeast of the Project site at 7545 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.
The Project proposes forty-eight (48) 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.

**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, the Project proposes forty-eight (48) 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 161 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 forty-eight (48) 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 161 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: Project Application Materials.*
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*

For purposes of determining the significance of traffic impacts, the City relies upon the *County of Riverside Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines* which contains the following significance criteria:

1) When existing traffic conditions exceed the General Plan target Level of Service (LOS).

2) When project traffic, when added to existing traffic will deteriorate the LOS to below the target LOS, and impacts cannot be mitigated through project conditions of approval.

3) When cumulative traffic exceeds the target LOS, and impacts cannot be mitigated through the TUMF network (or other funding mechanism), project conditions of approval, or other implementation mechanisms.

Table 12 below shows the Level of Service (LOS) Thresholds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service (LOS)</th>
<th>Signalized Intersection</th>
<th>Unsignalized Intersection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>≤10 seconds</td>
<td>≤10 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10–20 seconds</td>
<td>10–15 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20–35 seconds</td>
<td>15–25 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35–55 seconds</td>
<td>25–35 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>55–80 seconds</td>
<td>35–50 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;80 seconds</td>
<td>&gt;50 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *County of Riverside Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines*
Study Area Intersections

The following study intersections were included in the analysis as shown on Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection ID #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Opal Street (NS) at Canal Street (EW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pacific Avenue (NS) at Canal Street (EW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pacific Avenue (NS) at Mission Boulevard (EW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Project Access Street B (NS) at Canal Street (EW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pacific Avenue (NS) at Project Access Street A (EW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Traffic Impact Study (Appendix L)

Traffic Scenarios Analyzed

The Traffic Impact Study prepared for the Project examined the following scenarios:

1) Existing Conditions.
2) Project Opening Year (2019).
3) Project Opening Year (2019) with Cumulative Conditions.

Trip Generation

The proposed Project is projected to generate approximately 457 trip-ends per day with 36 total vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 48 total vehicles per hour during the PM peak hour

Scenario #1: Existing Traffic Conditions

Under existing conditions, all study intersections are operating at satisfactory Levels of Service C or better.

Scenario #2: Project Opening Year (2019)

For Project Opening Year traffic conditions, the study area intersections are projected to operate within acceptable Levels of Service C or better during the peak hours.

Scenario #3: Project Opening Year (2019) with Cumulative Conditions

For Opening Year With Cumulative Developments traffic conditions, the study area intersections are projected to operate within acceptable Levels of Service D or better during the peak hours.

Summary

The study area intersections are projected to operate within acceptable Levels of Service consistent with City standards as shown in Table 14 below
Table 14. Summary of Intersection Level of Service (LOS) and Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1: Opal Street (NS) at Canal Street (EW)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Pacific Avenue (NS) at Canal Street (EW)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Pacific Avenue (NS) at Mission Boulevard (EW)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Project Access Street B (NS) at Canal Street (EW)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Avenue (NS) at Project Access Street A (EW)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Traffic Impact Study (Appendix L)

As shown in Table 14, the study intersections are currently operating at an acceptable Level of Service (LOS D or better) for Existing Conditions and are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable Level of Service for the future analysis scenarios. Based on City of Jurupa Valley established thresholds of significance, the proposed Project is forecast to not result in a significant traffic impact at the study intersections for any of the evaluated analysis scenarios. As such, no mitigation measures are required for the proposed Project.

**Pacific Avenue Roadway Segment Level of Service Analysis**

A roadway segment analysis has been prepared for Pacific Avenue between Mission Boulevard and Canal Street. Based on the Traffic Impact Study prepared for the Project, for all three scenarios analyzed (Existing Conditions, Project Opening Year (2019), and Project Opening Year (2019) with Cumulative Conditions) the roadway segment is forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS (LOS A) for all scenarios analyzed.

**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 Opal Street,
Canal Street, and Pacific Avenue. 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: Traffic Impact Study (Appendix L).

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.

There are no roadways affected by the Project that are identified as part of the Riverside CMP System according to Exhibit 2-1 of the 2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program, December 14, 2011. As such, Project traffic will not result in significant direct and cumulatively considerable impacts to the 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.*

The following will be included as part of the conditions of approval for this Project:

- The intersection of Pacific Avenue (NS) and C Street (EW) shall be modified to provide curb returns in ultimate location to provide northbound left turn lane and the following geometries:
  
  a) Northbound: One left turn lane, one through lane.
  b) Southbound: One shared through/right lane.
  c) Eastbound: One shared left/right turn lane.
  d) Westbound: N/A.

- The intersection of A Street (NS) and C Street (EW) shall be modified to provide a yield sign controlled intersection on A Street and the following:
  
  a) Northbound: N/A
  b) Southbound: One shared left/right turn lane.
  c) Eastbound: One shared through/right lane.
  d) Westbound: One shared through/right lane.
- The intersection of B Street (NS) and Canal Street (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on B Street and the following:
  
a) Northbound: One shared left/right turn lane.
b) Southbound: N/A.
c) Eastbound: One shared through/right lane.
d) Westbound: One shared left/through lane.

- The intersection of B Street (NS) and C Street (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on B Street and the following:
  
a) Northbound: N/A.
b) Southbound: One shared left/right lane.
c) Eastbound: One shared left/through lane.
d) Westbound: One shared through/right lane.

These improvements are standard requirements and not mitigation measures. These improvements will be constructed to meet City standards. In addition, the Project is located in a residential area. 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 forty-eight (48) 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 Opal Street, Canal Street, and Pacific 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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:</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 Study (Appendix F), 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.

The Cultural Resources Study prepared for the Project (Appendix F) indicates that no cultural resources that are eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

A review of historic-period aerial photographs revealed that the Sunnyslope Channel includes a mix of both modern (less than 50 years old) and historic-age (more than 50 years old) branches. The modern branch of the Sunnyslope Channel was constructed in 1980 and runs north-south between eastern and western portions of the Project site. The modern portion of the Sunnyslope Channel is not a Historical Resource as defined by CEQA.
The installation of a box culvert and removal and replacement of 125 feet of channel bottom would require excavation into the historic-age portion of the Sunnyslope Channel. This historic-age segment of the Sunnyslope Channel was evaluated as not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources under any criteria and is not a Historical Resource for the purposes of CEQA.

Based on the above, there are no resources 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). As such, there is no impact and no mitigation measures are required. (Also refer to analysis under Cultural Resources, Issue 3.5(a).

### 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: AB 52 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 – Kizh Nation
- Soboba Band Luiseño Indians
- Torres Martinez Band of Cahuilla Indians.

The Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation and the Soboba Band Luiseño Indians requested consultation and indicated that tribal cultural resources could be present on the site. As a result the AB52 consultation process, the following mitigation measure is required:

**Mitigation Measure (MM)**

**MM- TCR-1: Native American Monitoring, Treatment of Discoveries, and Disposition of Discoveries.**

**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.

**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 City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department, the Eastern Information Center, and the appropriate Native American Tribe.

**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:

a) 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.

b) 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.

c) 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.

d) 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.
### 3.17 UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<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 Canal Street, Opal Street and Pacific Avenue. 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 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.*

Onsite runoff will be conveyed in the street and collected at catch basins provided at critical points to avoid gutter flow depths exceeding top of curb for 10-year flows or right-of-way for 100-year flows. Offsite flows from the northwest end of the project will be intercepted and conveyed with a proposed Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District *Master Drainage Plan* storm drain pipe to the existing Sunnyslope Channel. Existing runoff on the westerly side of Opal Street will continue to be conveyed by the street towards an existing drainage swale that runs adjacent to Project site and the State Route 60 Freeway. From there the runoff will be collected by the existing drainage inlet and outlets to the Sunnyslope Channel. Treatment of first flush waters from the development will be accomplished by routing them through the proposed on-site water quality basins.

Proposed “C” Street will be constructed across the Sunnyslope Channel. Improvements include constructing a box culvert that would entail removing a section of the flood control side walls and installing cast in place walls and top. Along with the box culvert, some remedial grading will be done to regrade portions of the access roads that exist on each side of the channel. Concurrent with the storm drain construction, sewer and water facilities will be installed under the box culvert. The reinforced concrete box culvert and associated transition walls are within the existing Sunnyslope channel. Construction of the box culvert and associated transitions walls will include the removal of approximately 7,000 square feet of the existing channel. This will also include the removal and replacement of approximately 250 feet of the existing Sunnyslope channel bottom. Additionally, the Sunnyslope Channel concrete junction structure would be reconstructed as an underground concrete junction structure. Sequanota, RCFCD and the City will also construct a 36” storm drain line (with accompanying inlet structures) at total of 1150 linear feet from the intersection of Canal Street and Opal Street, south approximately 500 feet within the Opal Street ROW, then east in the Street “C” ROW approximately 650 feet to connect to the reinforced concrete box culvert.

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.

Water service would 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 161 residents. Based on the 208 gpcd, the Project would result in an estimated water demand of 9,984 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.

The District issued a “Will Serve” letter dated March 13, 2018. The Will Serve letter does not guarantee that the District will provide water to serve the Project, but rather is an indicator that the District has the potential to provide water provided that fees are paid and water improvements are constructed per the District’s standards.

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.

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.

Sanitary sewer service to the Project site would be provided by the Rubidoux Community Services District (“District”). The District purchases treatment capacity at the Riverside Water Quality Control Plant (RWQCP), which is located on Acorn 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 AF/yr in 2040.

Based on a wastewater generation factor of 96.6 gallons per day per capita obtained from the Riverside Wastewater Collection and Treatment Facilities Integrated Mater Plan (Table 3.4), the Project is estimated to generate a wastewater treatment demand of 4,637 gallons per day (161 residents x 96.6 gallons per day per capita = 4,637 gallons per day) or 3.65 acre feet per year. This represents 0.15 percent of anticipated wastewater treatment volumes in 2020.
The District issued a “Will Serve” letter dated March 13, 2018. The Will Serve letter does not guarantee that the District will provide sewer service for the Project, but rather is an indicator that the District has the potential to provide sewer service provided that fees are paid and sewer improvements are constructed per the District’s standards.

Based on the above analysis, impacts are 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.**

*Sources: Riverside County Waste Management, Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details,.*

**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 56.1 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 28.08 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 14.02 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-6, 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-6, CR-1 through CR-4, NOI- through NOI-3, 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 through and NOI-3 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: Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, Change of Zone No. 17003 (MA 17009)

DATE: June 27 2018

PROJECT MANAGER: Rocio Lopez, Senior Planner

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The Project is a proposed subdivision proposed subdivision of a combined 10.4-acre property for future residential development, which will include the subdivision of the project area into 48 residential lots, 2 lettered lots for drainage facilities, and the construction of associated on-site and off-site infrastructure. Lot sizes range from 6,000 square feet to 11,734 square feet. A Change of Zone to the City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) is also proposed.

PROJECT LOCATION: The Project is located on the southeast corner of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60 Freeway and east of Pacific Avenue. The Project site is identified by Assessor Parcel Numbers: 177-130-007 and 177-142-018.

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.
### Mitigation Measure (MM) Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) Project Design Features (PDF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Time Frame/Milestone</th>
<th>Verified By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.1-1</td>
<td>As required by Municipal Code Section 9.199.040.C, one (1) family residences shall not exceed forty (40) feet in height. No other building or structure shall exceed fifty (50) feet in height, unless a greater height is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.370. In no event, however, shall a building or structure exceed seventy-five (75) feet in height, unless a variance is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.270.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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. | Planning Department | Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit and during project operation. |

| Air Quality | 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: 1. “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;” 2. “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 | Engineering Department | During grading |

M-2
<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the day.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.3-2</strong> 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.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.3-3</strong> 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:</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department Engineering Department Planning Department</td>
<td>During construction and on-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“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).”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.3-4</strong> 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.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.3-5</strong> 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.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF 3.3-1 As required by the Project’s Conditions of Approval, residential dwelling units within 500 feet of the SR-60 Freeway shall be required to install high</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mitigation Measure (MM) Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) Project Design Features (PDF)

| Efficiency Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) filters of MERV 13 or better as indicated by the American Society of Heating Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) Standard 52.2, in the intake of ventilation systems. Heating, air conditioning and ventilation (HVAC) systems shall be installed with a fan unit power designed to force air through the MERV 13 filter. | Planning Department |  | 
|---|---|---|---|

### Biological Resources

**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.

**MM-BIO-1: 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 methods may be selected. Prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities on the property, planning department review of this plan is required.

<p>| Planning Department | Prior to the issuance of a grading permit |
|---|---|---|---|</p>
<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>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-2. Coordination With USACE, CDFW, and RWQCB. 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 to positively determine whether or not either agency wishes to exert jurisdiction of the onsite drainage feature. If either agency decides to exert jurisdiction, Mitigation Measures BIO-3 and BIO-4 shall be implemented.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-3. CDFW Jurisdiction. If state jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-2, 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. 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 at a ratio of not less than 1:1 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.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-4. Federal Jurisdiction. If federal jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-2, the following shall be implemented: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall obtain a Clean Water Act Section 404 Nationwide Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and compensate for the loss of more than 0.1 acre of wetlands and 1,278 lineal feet of streambed channel, and a Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification from the Los Angeles Regional Water</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality Control Board. 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.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-5- Nesting Bird Survey.** As a condition of approval for all grading permits, vegetation clearing and ground disturbance shall be prohibited during the migratory bird nesting season (February 1 through October 1), unless a migratory bird nesting survey is completed in accordance with the following requirements:

a. A migratory nesting bird survey of the Project’s impact footprint shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three business (3) days prior to initiating vegetation clearing or ground disturbance.

b. A copy of the migratory nesting bird survey results report shall be provided to the City of Jurupa Planning Department. If the survey identifies the presence of active nests, then the qualified biologist shall provide the Planning Department with a copy of maps showing the location of all nests and an appropriate buffer zone around each nest sufficient to protect the nest from direct and indirect impact. The size and location of all buffer zones, if required, shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Department and shall be no less than a 300-foot radius around the nest for non-raptors and a 500-foot radius around the nest for raptors. The nests and buffer zones shall be field checked weekly by a qualified biological monitor. The approved buffer zone shall be marked in the field with construction fencing, within which no vegetation clearing or ground disturbance shall commence until the qualified biologist and Planning Department verify that the nests are no longer occupied and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-6-Tree Preservation and Replacement.** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, 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 permits:

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control Board. 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.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure BIO-5- Nesting Bird Survey.</strong> As a condition of approval for all grading permits, vegetation clearing and ground disturbance shall be prohibited during the migratory bird nesting season (February 1 through October 1), unless a migratory bird nesting survey is completed in accordance with the following requirements:</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the recordation of the Final Map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Prior to the removal of any trees, the issuance of a grading permit, or approval of a Site Development Permit, whichever comes first, a Tree Removal and Planting and Monitoring Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department that demonstrates that the following will be implemented:

1. The trees along Opal Street and Canal Street, identified in the Tree Survey prepared by BrightView Design Group, April 24, (Appendix D of the Initial Study Checklist for MA 17009) shall be replaced at a 3:1 ratio with an approved species as determined by the City’s Planning Department. Tree selection must be at least 15-gallon purchased from quality nursery stock. This number of trees is above the number identified in the Project’s Landscape Plan.”

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

#### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>During grading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM-CR-3: Paleontological Monitoring.</strong> 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.</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>During grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM-CR-4: Paleontological Treatment Plan.</strong> 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.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit or as otherwise determined by the Planning Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.5-1</strong> 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>Planning Department</td>
<td>During grading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GEOLOGY AND SOILS**
<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>
<tbody>
<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 California Building Code 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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP’s 3.91-1 through PPP 3.9-4 in Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality shall apply.</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and during operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></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 California Green Building Standards.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PPP 3.9-1 As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, *Storm Water/Uran 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.

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.9-1</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PPP 3.9-2 As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, *Storm Water/Uran 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 3.9-2 | Engineering Department | Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during construction | |

PPP 3.9-3 As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, *Storm Water/Uran 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

| PPP 3.9-3 | Engineering Department | Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during operation | |
(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

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>During operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</td>
<td>VERIFIED BY:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promulgated thereto, and any related administrative orders or permits issued in connection therewith.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOISE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a building permit</td>
<td></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>
<td>During operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure NOI-1-Construction Noise Mitigation Plan.</strong> 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.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.”

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure NOI-2, Sound Walls: Prior to issuance of building permits, a final noise study based on final precise grading plan elevations shall be prepared by a qualified acoustician and approved by the City to validate appropriate noise barrier heights, locations, and construction materials. Sound walls are required around all habitable exterior backyard and sideyard areas for all lots (See Exhibit C of Noise Impact Analysis, Appendix K of this Initial Study Checklist) for specific wall heights and locations. All required noise barriers shall be designed to reduce noise levels to below 65 dBA CNEL within private exterior areas (i.e., backyards) of residential lots. The noise barriers may consist of any material (block, tempered glass, earthen berm, etc.) or combination of materials that achieves the required noise attenuation and shall have no decorative cutouts or other line-of-sight openings between shielded areas and the noise source (adjacent roadway). Prior to issuance of building permits, the City of Jurupa Valley shall review and approve the noise barrier design, placement, and materials to ensure that the required level of sound attenuation will be achieved.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure NOI-3 Interior Noise Analysis: Prior to issuance of any residential building permit, an interior noise analysis shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department demonstrating that proposed building materials will achieve interior noise levels less than 45 dBA CNEL. Measures that would facilitate compliance with the 45dBA CNEL interior noise standard include, but are not limited to:</td>
<td>Planning Department Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of any residential building permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Upgraded windows and sliding glass doors are required on all homes. See Tables 5 and 6 of Noise Impact Analysis, Appendix K of this Initial Study Checklist for specific STC requirements.

c) Attic and roof vents that directly face the SR-60, if applicable, shall include an acoustical baffle to prevent vehicle noise intrusion. See Exhibits D and E of Noise Impact Analysis, Appendix K of this Initial Study Checklist for examples acoustical baffles. The contractor may install similar measures to provide noise reduction.

d) For proper acoustical performance, all exterior windows, doors, and sliding glass doors must have a positive seal and leaks/cracks must be kept to a minimum.

PUBLIC SERVICES

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a building permit or occupancy permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Per Municipal Code Chapter 3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PPP 3.14-4** 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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).</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</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>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM- TCR-1: Native American Monitoring, Treatment of Discoveries, and Disposition of Discoveries.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONITORING:</strong></td>
<td>Planning Department Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and during grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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><strong>TREATMENT OF DISCOVERIES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

**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:

- a) 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.

b) 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.

c) 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.

d) 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>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>
<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>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M-17
ATTACHMENT NO. 2

Ordinance No. 2019-01
ORDINANCE NO. 2019-01

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY OFFICIAL ZONING MAP CHANGING THE ZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) FROM ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (R-4) ZONE, AND MAKING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Project Procedural Findings. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that:

(a) Sequanata Partners, LP (the “Applicant”) has applied for Change of Zone No. 17003, Exception to Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and a Development Plan (collectively, Master Application No. 17099 or MA No. 17099) to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) in the One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone and designated Medium Density Residential (MDR).

(b) All of the components of Master Application No. 17099 shall collectively be known as the “Project.” Change of Zone Application No. 17003 is the subject of this Ordinance.

(c) The Applicant is seeking approval of Change of Zone No. 17003 to rezone 10.4 combined gross acres located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) Zone.

(d) 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.

(e) 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.
(f) 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.

(g) 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.

(h) 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.

(i) Section 9.285.040.(4)(a) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that upon receipt of a recommendation for approval by the Planning Commission, the City Clerk shall set the matter for public hearing before the City Council at the earliest convenient day, and 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.

(j) Section 9.285.040.(5) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after closing the public hearing the City Council must render its decision within a reasonable time and may approve, modify, or disapprove the recommendation of the Planning Commission; provided, however, that any proposed modification of the Planning Commission's recommendation not previously considered by the Planning Commission must first be referred back to the Planning Commission for a report and recommendation.

(k) The Project was processed including, but not limited to a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

(l) On October 24, 2018, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 17099, 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. At the conclusion of the Planning Commission hearing and after due consideration of the testimony, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01, recommending that the City Council adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approve Change of Zone No. 17003 to change the zoning classification of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres of real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) Zone. Additionally, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution
No. 2018-10-24-02, approving an exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and Tentative Tract Map No. 37211.

(m) On October 26, 2018, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 with the City Clerk and a copy of the notice was mailed to the Applicant, the Applicant’s authorized agent, and all interested parties requesting a copy.

(n) On November 15, 2018, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 with the City Council, which notice was placed on the City Council’s regular meeting agenda on that date.

(o) On November 15, 2018, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the proposed Change of Zone No. 17003, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing.

(p) All legal preconditions to the adoption of this Ordinance have occurred.

Section 2. California Environmental Quality Act Findings. The City Council hereby makes 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. 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 July 5, 2018, and expired on August 3, 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) On October 24, 2018, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Project and the MND, reviewed the staff report, accepted and considered public testimony. After due consideration, the Planning Commission found that agencies and interested members of the public were afforded ample notice and opportunity to comment on the MND and the Project and approved Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01 recommending that City Council adopt the MND, adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and approve the proposed Change of Zone No. 17003.

(d) On January 17, 2019, the City Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Project and the MND, reviewed the staff report, accepted and considered public testimony. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing, including the staff report
and oral testimony, the City Council, by separate Resolution No. 2019-02 adopted the MND and a MMRP for the Project as set forth in Exhibit “A” to City Council Resolution No. 2019-02.

(e) All actions taken by City have been duly taken in accordance with all applicable legal requirements, including the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code, § 21000 et seq.) (“CEQA”), and all other requirements for notice, public hearings, findings, votes and other procedural matters.

(f) The custodian of records for the MND, MMRP, and all other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City Council’s decision was based, including, without limitation, the staff reports for Master Application No. 17099, all of the materials that comprise and support the MND and all of the materials that support the staff reports for Master Application No. 17099, is the Planning Department of the City of Jurupa Valley. Those documents are available for public examination during normal business hours at the City of Jurupa Valley, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509.

Section 3. Findings for Approval of Change of Zone. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby finds and determines that Change of Zone No. 17003 should be adopted because the proposed change of zoning classification from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and the requirements of the General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) in that the proposed Project, which proposes a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre, complies with the maximum five (5) dwelling unit per acre requirement for premises designated MDR.

Section 4. Approval of Zone Change. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby rezones the approximately 10.4 combined gross acres of real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) Zone, and directs the City Manager to revise the official City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map to designate the property as being in this new zone.

Section 5. Severability. If any sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions of this Ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this Ordinance and each sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or otherwise invalid.

Section 6. Effect of Ordinance. This Ordinance is intended to supersede any ordinance or resolution of the County of Riverside incorporated by the City of Jurupa Valley that may in conflict with the terms of this Ordinance.

Section 7. Certification. The City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley shall certify to the passage and adoption of this Ordinance and shall cause the same to be published or posted in the manner required by law.

Section 8. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall take effect on the date provided in Government Code Section 36937.
PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 7th day of February, 2019.

______________________________
Brian Berkson
Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA                   )
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE                  ) ss.
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY                )

I, Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance No. 2019-01 was regularly introduced at a regular meeting of the City Council held on the 17th day of January, 2019 and thereafter at a regular meeting held on the 7th day of February 2019 it was duly passed and adopted by the following vote of the City Council:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, this 7th day of February, 2019

______________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
EXHIBIT A OF ATTACHMENT 2

Change of Zone Exhibit
EXHIBIT “A”
ATTACHMENT NO. 3
Resolution No. 2019-03
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-03


THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Project. Sequanata Partners, LP (the “Applicant”) has applied for Change of Zone No. 17003, Exception to Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and a Development Plan (collectively, Master Application No. 17099 or MA No. 17099) to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) in the One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone and designated Medium Density Residential (MDR) (the “Project”). The Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and the Development Plan are the subject of this Resolution.

Section 2. Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(a) Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code states: “Lots less than two (2) acres in gross area shall not have double street frontage except that in hillside areas where the topography requires, lots may abut two (2) or more streets provided that the frontage and vehicular access is from only one (1) such street.”
The Applicant is seeking approval of an exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code to permit double street frontage for Lots 3-7 on Opal Street and proposed “A” Street.

Section 7.10.010.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that exceptions from the requirements of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code relating to the design or improvement of land divisions may 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 3. Tentative Tract Map.

The Applicant is seeking approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018).

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.

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.

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.

(g) Section 7.15.150 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that, upon the filing of the appeal, the City Clerk must set the matter for public hearing on a date within thirty (30) days after the date of the filing of the appeal and must give notice of the public hearing in the same manner as was given for the original hearing. The City Council must render its decision on the appeal within ten (10) days of the closing of the hearing.

Section 4. Development Plan.

(a) Section 9.100.050 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that before any structure is erected or use established in the R-4 Zone, there shall be a subdivision map recorded and a development plan approved as set forth in Section 9.100.060 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.
The Applicant is seeking approval of a Development Plan for a proposed Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018).

Section 9.100.060.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that a development plan conforming to the requirements of Chapter 9.100 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and containing the minimum information set forth in Section 9.100.060.B.(1)-(4) may be approved by the Planning Commission.

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

(a) The application for MA No. 17099 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 October 24, 2018, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 17099, 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. At the conclusion of the Planning Commission hearing and after due consideration of the testimony, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01, recommending that the City Council adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approve Change of Zone No. 17003 to change the zoning classification of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres of real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) Zone. Additionally, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02, adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approving an exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and a Development Plan to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres of real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots.

(c) On October 26, 2018, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 with the City Clerk and a copy of the notice was mailed to the Applicant, the Applicant’s authorized agent, and all interested parties requesting a copy.

(d) On November 15, 2018, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 with the City Council, which notice was placed on the City Council’s regular meeting agenda on that date.

(e) On November 15, 2018, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the proposed Change of Zone No. 17003, at which time all persons interested
in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing and voted to deny the proposed Change of Zone No. 17003.

(f) On November 20, 2018, Mayor Goodland filed a timely appeal of the Planning Commission’s approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, which includes an appeal of the Planning Commission’s approval of the exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and the Development Plan (the “Appeal”). The Appeal set aside the Planning Commission’s action and made the Council the approving body.

(g) On December 6, 2018, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley adopted a motion to reconsider the introduction of Ordinance No. 2018-13, which has been re-numbered to Ordinance No. 2019-01 (which would, if adopted, approved Change of Zone No. 17003), and then set the public hearing on the introduction of Ordinance No. 2019-01 and the Appeal for the City Council’s regular meeting on January 17, 2019.

(h) On January 17, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the introduction of Ordinance No. 2019-01 and the Appeal, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing.

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

Section 6. California Environmental Quality Act Findings for Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration. The City Council 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 July 5, 2018, and expired on August 3, 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) On October 24, 2018, the Planning Commission reviewed the MND and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”) and found 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. Based on
those findings, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02, adopting the MND and MMRP for the Project, and approving the Exception to Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and the Development Plan.

(d) Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing, including the staff report and oral testimony, the City Council hereby sustains the Planning Commission’s adoption of the MND and MMRP for the Project, attached as Exhibit “B” to Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02.

Section 7. Findings for Approval of Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the Planning Commission’s approval of an exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, should be sustained because:

(a) There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property, including, but not limited to, size, shape, or topographical conditions, or existing road alignment and width, in that Lots 3-7 have only one vehicular access from the interior street of the proposed subdivision by design (as illustrated on Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, the Development Plan and the Conceptual Landscape Plan, which includes the Wall Plan);

(b) The granting of the modification will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare in that a community perimeter wall is proposed to be located on the rear lot lines of interior lots, thereby preventing multiple vehicular access points onto the Lots 3-7 and creating a lot design and layout similar to the proposed interior lots; and

(c) The granting of the modification will not be damaging to other property in the vicinity in that the proposed Development Plan and Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 create a unified and cohesive community and the proposed Conceptual Landscape Plan creates a desirable streetscape along Opal Street.

Section 8. Findings for Approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37211. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the Planning Commission’s approval of proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 should be sustained because:

(a) The proposed land division is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan. The proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 is consistent with the requirements of the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation, which permits up to five (5) dwelling units per acre. The proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 will facilitate the construction of forty-eight (48) single family homes at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre, which is below the maximum allowable density for the MDR land use designation;

(b) The design or improvement of the proposed land division is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan in that the proposed layout of the forty-eight (48) parcels is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan;
(c) The site of the proposed land division is physically suitable for the type of development in that it is a relatively flat, undeveloped, vacant lot located adjacent to other single-family residential land uses, with adequate water and sewer connections and public services are available to the site;

(d) The site of the proposed land division is physically suitable for the proposed density of the development in that it proposes forty-eight (48) single-family residential dwelling units at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre, which is below the maximum allowable density under the MDR land use designation;

(e) The design of the proposed land division or proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat in that the subject site is highly disturbed and occupied by ruderal flora and bare ground. Because of the existing degraded site condition, the absence of special-status plant communities, and overall low potential for most special-status species to utilize or reside on-site, the design of the proposed land division and the proposed improvements are not expected to directly impact federal or state-listed threatened or endangered species;

(f) The design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements are not likely to cause serious public health problems. An Initial Study was prepared that evaluated potential effects with respect to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry 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 MND 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 mitigation measures have been required or revisions in the Project have been made or agreed to by the Applicant. Furthermore a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) report prepared for the proposed Project did not reveal evidence of a recognized environmental condition in connection with the subject site. The Initial Study determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the proposed Project may have a significant effect on the environment. As such, the proposed Project will not cause serious public health problems; and

(g) The design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed land division in that there are no on-site easements within the subject site, the proposed Project will connect to existing water and sewer lines located on Canal Street, Opal Street, and Pacific Avenue, and all proposed utilities are required to be underground.

Section 9. Findings for Approval of Development Plan. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the Planning Commission’s approval of the proposed Development Plan should be sustained because:
The proposed Development Plan conforms to and satisfies all the requirements of Chapter 9.100 of Jurupa General Municipal Code, including Section 9.100.060 (Conditions of Development) of Chapter 9.100.

The proposed Development Plan identifies the location of each existing and each proposed structure in the development area and the uses or uses to be contained therein by depicting the locations of the building footprints, including setbacks and layout, which future residential units must comply with.

The proposed Development Plan identifies the location of all pedestrian walks, malls, recreation, and other open spaces for the use of the occupants and members of the public by depicting private open space, public sidewalks, and landscaped parkways throughout the proposed development.

The proposed Development Plan identifies the location and height of all walls, fences, and screen planting, including a plan for the landscaping of the development, types of surfacing, such as paving, turfing, or other landscaping to be used at various locations in that the proposed Landscape Plan included within the proposed Development Plan includes a Wall/Fence Plan that identifies landscaping, paving, monument walls, and interior and perimeter walls throughout the proposed development; and

The proposed plans and elevations of typical structures indicate the architectural type and construction standards in that the proposed Development Plan workbook depicts six (6) different plans for the single-family residential structures with three (3) varying exterior elevations (Tuscan, Spanish, Traditional, and Craftsman architectural styles) and a different floor plan per each of the six (6) plans.

Section 10. Approval of Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and Development Plan with Conditions. Based on the foregoing, the City Council hereby sustains the Planning Commission’s approval of an Exception to Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and a Development Plan to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue, subject to the recommended conditions of approval attached hereto as Exhibit “A”, and denies the Appeal of the Appellant. The Planning Commission’s approval of the Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and the Development Plan is conditioned upon the City Council’s adoption of an ordinance approving Change of Zone No. 17033, and the Commission’s approval shall not take effect until the effective date of the ordinance adopting Change of Zone No. 17003.

Section 11. Certification. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 17th day of January, 2019.
Brian Berkson
Mayor

ATTEST:

Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  )
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  ) ss.
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY  )

I, Victoria Wasko, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-03 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 17th day of January, 2019 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, on the 17th day of January, 2019

________________________________
Victoria Wasko, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
EXHIBIT A OF ATTACHMENT 3

Recommended Conditions of Approval
EXHIBIT “A”

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR MA17099 (TTM37211 & CZ17003)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. PROJECT PERMITTED. Master Application (MA) No. 17099: Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211, Change of Zone (CZ) No. 17003 and Exception to Section 7.10.080 (G) is for the approval to subdivide a combined 10.4 property into 48 single-family residential lots with two (2) water quality basin lots (Lot A & B) and three (3) lettered street lots (A-C). An exception to Section 7.10.080 (G) of Title 7 (Subdivisions) for double frontage lots on Lots 3-7 is also included. The property is located at the SEC of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60 Fwy and east of Pacific Avenue, APNS: 177-130-007 & 177-142-018.

2. 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 “Indemnites”) 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, and any finding or determination made and any other action taken by any of the Indemnites 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. CONSENT TO CONDITIONS. Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to the required conditions of approval to the Planning Director or designee.

4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM. Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to having received a copy of the “Applicant’s Acknowledgement of Comments and Code Information from...
Internal/External Agencies”. The receipt form shall be given to the Planning Director or designee.

5. **MITIGATION MEASURES.** This project shall be subject to the mitigation measures adopted with the Mitigated NegativeDeclaration (MND) prepared for the project and included with these conditions of approval.

6. **FEES.** The approval of MA17099 (TTM37211 & CZ17003) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

7. **CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA).** This project is approved subject to the provisions of a Mitigated Negative Declaration. Within forty-eight (48) hours of final approval for this project, the owner or designee shall deliver to the Planning Department a check payable to the Riverside County Clerk in the amount of $2,330.75 (includes $50.00 County Clerk Processing Fee) or the fees that are currently in effect at the time. This will enable the City to file the Notice of Determination.

8. **COPIED 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.

9. **APPROVAL PERIOD – TENTATIVE TRACT MAP.** An approved or conditionally approved tentative tract 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 (Subdivisions). If the tentative map expires before the recordation of the final map, or any phase thereof, no recordation of the final map, or any phase thereof, shall be permitted. The variance conditionally approved in connection with this 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.

10. **CONFORMANCE TO APPROVED EXHIBITS.** The project shall be in conformance to the approved plans (listed below) with any changes in accordance to these conditions of approval:

   a. Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 (Sheets 1 and 2): prepared by Proactive Engineering Consultants West, Inc. dated 9/14/16 (Revised 3/2018) and signed by George A. Lenfestey, R.C.E.

   b. Architectural Set of Plans consisting of:

      i. Plan 1.2319:
         1. Elevations (A-Spanish, B-Traditional, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans

      ii. Plan 2.2401:
         1. Elevations (A-Spanish, B-Traditional, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans

      iii. Plan 3.2611:
         1. Elevations (A-Spanish, B-Traditional, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans

      iv. Plan 4.2806:
1. Elevations (A-Spanish, B-Traditional, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans

v. Plan 5.3042:
   1. Elevations (A-Spanish, C-Craftsman, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans

vi. Plan 6.3124:
   1. Elevations (A-Spanish, C-Craftsman, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans

c. Conceptual Landscape Plans (Wall/Fence and Maintenance Plan included) dated April 2017 (Revised March 2018)

d. Development Plan workbook (dated 5-24-18)

11. ON-SITE LANDSCAPING. Prior to the issuance of any Building permit, the applicant shall submit a “Professional Services (PROS)” application (with current fees) and the following items for Planning Director review and approval:

a. The total cost estimate of landscaping, irrigation, and one-year of maintenance.

b. Completed City Faithful Performance Bond for Landscape Improvements form with original signatures after the City provides the applicant with the required amount of bond.

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

d. Final landscape, maintenance, planting, and irrigation plans and digital copies (CD format). The plans shall include the following:
   i. Compliance with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Biological Resources Mitigation Measure BIO-6-Tree Preservation and Replacement.
   ii. Compliance with approved Development Plan.
   iii. Compliance with Title 9 (Planning and Zoning) landscaping requirements.

e. STREET TREES. Street trees and related security and agreements are required pursuant to Chapter 7.55 of Title 7 (Subdivisions). Tree size, specimen and installation shall be under the direction of the Engineering Department if they are within the public right-of-way.

Prior to the final inspection of any Building permit, the Landscape Architect of Record shall conduct an inspection and submit a letter to the City of Jurupa Valley once s/he has deemed the installation is in conformance to the approved plans. Following the inspection of the Landscape Architect of Record, the applicant shall schedule a City inspection with the City's landscape architect.

12. MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF SOLID FENCING AND WALLS WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK. No solid fencing or wall shall exceed 42 inches in height within the front setback. For Lots 2, 19 and 22, no SOLID walls EXCEEDING 42-INCHES IN HEIGHT shall be placed within 30 feet of the front yard area.
13. **BLOCK WALL FOR INTERIOR AND SIDE LOT LINES.** Block walls shall be used for interior side lot lines. Decorative wrought iron gates shall be used on all side gates at individual parcels.

**Prior to the issuance of a building permit,** the applicant shall submit a Wall and Fence plan that is consistent with this condition to the Planning Department for review and approval.

14. **GRAFFITI PROTECTION FOR WALLS.** **Prior to the issuance of any building permit,** the applicant shall submit a wall plan that includes anti-graffiti coating or protection for the exterior side of all perimeter walls for City review and approval. The applicant shall remove any graffiti on the property as soon as possible. In addition, if the applicant was notified by the City, the applicant shall remove the graffiti within seven (7) days of the City’s notice.

15. **TWO-CAR GARAGE PER DWELLING UNIT.** All residential units shall have a minimum two-car garage with automatic sectional roll-up doors. No garage conversions are permitted and units must maintain two-car covered spaces at all times.

16. **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.

17. **MULTIPLE SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN MITIGATION FEE (ORD. NO. 810).** The applicant shall pay any owed fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 810. In order for the agency to determine that the project qualifies for any exemptions for any of the subject fees, the applicant needs to submit sufficient evidence to the City to demonstrate that it qualifies for the exemption.

18. **SALE OF INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS.** No structure constructed on Project site may be sold until the subject Project on which the structure is located is divided and a final map recorded in accordance with the City’s subdivision regulations such that the structure is located on a separate legally divided parcel.

19. **PROVIDE SOUND WALL ALONG THE SR-60 FREEWAY.**
   a. Applicant shall construct an approximate thirteen (13) foot high sound wall along the State Route 60 Freeway within the Caltrans right-of-way, for the length of the freeway fronting the project site, subject to procedure described below:
      i. Concurrent with City Council public hearing for the project entitlement, the Applicant shall petition the City to enter into an agreement with Caltrans for construction of the sound wall at the sole expense of the Applicant.
      ii. Upon City Council approval of above item (i), Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the City providing for (1) the payment by the Applicant to the City of all costs and expenses related to the sound wall expected to be incurred by the City, including, but not limited to, the price of third party consultants and attorney fees and (2) security for the design and construction of the sound wall by Applicant based on cost estimate for
design and construction of the sound wall reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.

iii. **Prior to Final Map**, the Applicant shall submit improvement plans for the construction of the sound wall to the City Engineer for approval and to Caltrans for the Caltrans permit.

iv. In the event that (1) the agreements and improvement plans described in subsections i), ii) or iii) are not approved and executed by the required times, or (2) the City Manager otherwise determines, in his sole discretion, that construction of the sound wall is infeasible, Applicant shall instead construct sound walls around all habitable back yard and side yard areas for all lots in accordance with the specifications provided in Exhibit C and Table 2 of the “TTM 37211 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL IMPACT STUDY” dated September 11, 2018.

b. **PRIOR TO FINAL OCCUPANCY OF LOTS 1-4, 17-24 AND 38-48**, the Caltrans permit for the sound wall shall have been issued or the City Manager must determine that construction of the sound wall is infeasible pursuant to subsection iii).

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

1. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (ENGINEERING)

1.1. The use hereby conditioned is for a Schedule "A" subdivision, Tentative Tract No. 37211; being a subdivision of Lot 5, Block A, Map Book 9, Page 34, of Maps on file in SB West Riverside & Lot 3, Map Book 9, Page 34, of Maps on file in SB West Riverside; more particularly Assessor's Parcels Number APN 177-130-007 & 177-142-018; containing 10.4 acres gross, Lots "A" and "B" will be dedicated to the City of Jurupa Valley, Streets A, B and C will be dedicated to the City of Jurupa Valley for public road and utility purposes. Exhibit titled Tentative Tract No. 37211, prepared by Proactive Engineering Consultants West, INC., 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 Project proponent 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 Project proponent may be required to amend or revise the permit application.

1.4. Opal Street is a Local Road with a right-of-way width of 60 feet. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on
Opal Street along the project's frontage. The improvements include, but are not limited to, curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaped parkway and signing and striping. The Project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.5. Canal Street is considered a Frontage Road with a right-of-way width of 52 feet. Right-of-way dedication to provide 30 feet half ultimate-width from centerline to the property line is required. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on Canal Street along the project's frontage. The improvements include, but are not limited to, curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway and signing and striping. Improvements shall be constructed per modified Riverside County Road Standard No. 107 and per section shown on the approved Tentative Tract Map, or as approved by the Public Works Director. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.6. Pacific Avenue shall be dedicated as public road and improved as Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 36-foot paved road on a 56-foot right-of-way; curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.7. Street "A" and Street "B" shall be dedicated as public road and improved as Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 36-foot paved road on a 56-foot right-of-way; curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.8. Street "C" shall be dedicated as a public road and improved as a modified Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105 and the approved Tentative Tract Map, or as approved by the Public Works Director. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 33-foot paved road on a 48-foot right-of-way, curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscape parkway, boundary wall, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.9. New street lights are required on Opal Street, Pacific Avenue, Canal Street, Street "A", Street "B", and Street "C". The project proponent shall cause streetlight plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer. Streetlights' maintenance will be through Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) and per the agency requirements.

1.10. 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.

1.11. 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.

1.12. Owner will be required to form a Community Facilities District (CFD) for landscape maintenance.

1.13. 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 Parcel Map.

2. PRIOR TO GRADING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

Grading and Drainage

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 Project Proponent 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 located as shown on the referenced exhibit(s) or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer. The 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 existing, and landscape and irrigation improvements/modifications shall be shown on the street improvement plans.

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 Project Proponent shall prepare a geotechnical/soils report for the proposed grading, infrastructure improvements and post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs) for review and approval of the City Engineer. All recommendations of that report shall be incorporated in the grading plan. The title and date of the geotechnical/soils report and the name and contact information of the Project Geotechnical/Soils Engineer shall be included on the face of the grading plan. The geotechnical/soils engineer must sign the grading plan.

2.4. Prior to approval of grading plans, the Project Proponent 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.

2.5. 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.

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

2.7. Where grading involves import or export the Project Proponent 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 Project Proponent shall provide evidence that the jurisdictional agency has provided all necessary separate approvals for import/export to/from the site.

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

2.9. Prior to approval of the grading plan the Project Proponent shall prepare a final
Drainage Study, corresponding with the proposed improvements, for approval of the City Engineer. The drainage study and the grading plan shall be signed by a California licensed civil engineer.

2.9.1. All drainage and storm drain improvements shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District's standards. Drainage shall be designed to accommodate 100-year storm flows. Minimum drainage grade shall be 1% except on Portland Cement Concrete where 0.5% shall be the minimum.

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

2.10. Prior to approval of the grading plan, Landowner shall prepare, or cause to be prepared, a final WQMP in conformance with the requirements of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCD) requirements for processing with and approval of the City Engineer.

2.10.1. The water quality management features and facilities to be constructed shall be shown on the project's site grading plans or separate post-construction BMP improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer.

2.10.2. The property owner shall enter into a Water Quality Management Plan and Stormwater BMP Operation and Maintenance Agreement with the City. The agreement shall be recorded and a certified copy shall be provided to the City Engineer.

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

2.12. The Project Proponent shall prepare separate street improvement and street lighting plans for review and approval by the City Engineer.

2.13. 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.

2.14. 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.

2.15. The Developer shall initiate formation of, or annexation to if one already exists, a Community Facilities District (CFD) for operation and maintenance of post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs).

2.16. Prior to approval of the grading plan for disturbance of one 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.

3. PRIOR TO MAP RECORDATION

3.1. No final Map shall be recorded until all related cases are approved and are in effect unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

3.2. No final Map shall be recorded until the formation process for the Community Facilities District (CFD) associated with this project is finalized.

3.2.1. Project Proponent shall prepare Landscape and Irrigation plans for CFD. Plans shall be prepared per Riverside County Ordinance 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:
   a) Water Quality Basins;
   b) 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;
   c) Landscape maintenance;
   d) Entry monuments.

3.2.3. The CFD will not maintain the parkway area in front of homeowner's lots. Property owners will be responsible of the maintenance of the landscape 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.

3.3. The Project Proponent 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. Final Map shall show abutter's rights along Opal Street. Lots 1 and 3 through 8 (inclusive) shall have access restriction to Opal Street.

3.6. The Project Proponent shall prepare bridge design plans per Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District's (RCFC&WCD) requirements and
for the City's review, for the crossing of proposed Street "C" over RCFC&WCD’s channel.

3.6.1. Applicant shall be responsible for cooperative agreement coordination and any fees involved in the development of the cooperative agreement between the Developer, City of Jurupa Valley, and RCFC&WCD for maintenance responsibilities of improvements.

3.6.2. Agreement shall be executed and recorded prior to final map recording.

3.6.3. Bridge design shall allow for the following:
   a) Concrete barrier with chainlink railing on both sides of the bridge;
   b) Curb and gutter on both sides;
   c) 5-ft sidewalk along the north side.

3.6.4. The Project Proponent is responsible for obtaining all appropriate permits for RCB construction.

3.7. Applicant shall show dedication for Public Utilities purposes on proposed Street C to accommodate final location of RCB.

3.8. The Project Proponent shall prepare improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer:

3.8.1. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Opal 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) 28-ft paved section on 60-ft right-of-way, with 30-ft from centerline of road to the easterly right-of-way line;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape, 5-ft sidewalk, and 2-ft landscape adjacent to property line, within a 12-foot parkway along the east side of Opal Street.
   e) Intersection improvements at Opal Street and Canal Street.

3.8.2. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Canal Street 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) 34-ft paved section on 52-ft right-of-way, with 30-ft from centerline of road to the southerly right-of-way line;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 4-ft curb adjacent landscape and 6-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway along the south side of Canal Street.
3.8.3. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Pacific 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) 52-ft paved section on 100-ft right-of-way, with 50-ft from centerline of road to the westerly right-of-way line;
c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
d) 9-ft curb adjacent landscape, 5-ft sidewalk, and 4-ft landscape adjacent to property line, within an 18-foot parkway along the west side of Pacific.

e) Improvements shall be installed along the project frontage with the following exception: Curb, gutter, and sidewalk installation along the west side of Pacific Avenue shall extend beyond the project frontage to the north to Patricia Drive, and to the south to CalTrans R/W (SR60 crossing). Fair share contributioin would be required in the event of improvement installation by others occurring prior to this development. Fair share contribution shall be for the Pacific Avenue improvements and in the amount of $39,992.

3.8.4. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on proposed Street "A" and Street "B" 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) 36-ft paved section on 56-ft right-of-way;
c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
d) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway on both sides of the street.

3.8.5. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on proposed Street "C" 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) 33-ft paved section on 48-ft right-of-way, with 27-ft from centerline of road to the northerly right-of-way line;
c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
d) 4-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 9-foot parkway along the north side of Street "C";
e) Curb adjacent landscaping and tract boundary wall along the south side of Street "C".

3.9. The following intersection improvements shall be included in the plans and
3.9.1. The intersection of Pacific Avenue (NS) and Street "C" (EW) shall be modified to provide curb returns in ultimate location to provide northbound left turn lane and the following geometries:
   a) Northbound: One left turn lane, one through lane;
   b) Southbound: One shared through/right lane;
   c) Eastbound: One shared left/right turn lane;
   d) Westbound: N/A

3.9.2. The intersection of Street "A" (NS) and Street "C" (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on Street "A" and the following:
   a) Northbound: N/A;
   b) Southbound: One shared left/right turn lane;
   c) Eastbound: One shared through/right turn lane;
   d) Westbound: One shared through/right turn lane.

3.9.3. The intersection of Street "B" (NS) and Canada Street (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on Street "B" and the following:
   a) Northbound: One shared left/right lane;
   b) Southbound: N/A;
   c) Eastbound: One shared through/right turn lane;
   d) Westbound: One shared left/through lane.

3.9.4. The intersection of Street "B" (NS) and Street "C" (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on Street "B" and the following:
   a) Northbound: N/A;
   b) Southbound: One shared left/right turn lane;
   c) Eastbound: One shared left/through lane;
   d) Westbound: One shared through/right turn lane.

3.10. The Project Proponent shall prepare Storm Drain Line 'C' plans and submit to RCFC&WCD for review. Storm drain line shall be per RCFC&WCD's requirements.

3.11. The Developer shall be responsible for any match up asphalt concrete (AC) paving, and reconstruction or resurfacing of existing paving as determined by the City Engineer.

3.11.1. Storm drain line shall be per RCFC&WCD's requirements.

3.11.2. City will approve final plans as reviewed and approved by RCFC&WCD to verify compliance with City regulations.

3.11.3. Storm drain line shall convey runoff from Opal Street to the Channel.
3.12. Should this project be within any assessment/benefit district, the Project Proponent shall make application for and pay any reappraisal of the assessment or pay the unit fees in the assessment/benefit district.

3.13. Project proponent 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.

3.14. Project proponent shall provide supporting documentation for district formation with Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) for the maintenance of the streetlights proposed with this project.

3.15. 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 Project Proponent 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.

3.16. Project proponent 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.

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 Project Proponent 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. Grading agreement and securities shall be in place prior to the commencement of grading.

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.
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.

4.6. The bridge design plans must be approved and signed by the City Engineer.

5. PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION (ENGINEERING)

5.1. The Project Proponent 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 Appendix J.

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 Project Civil Engineer shall provide Record ("As-built") Drawings of grading and all infrastructure improvements.

5.5. The Project Proponent 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 underground as herein before required, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer in writing. Utility extensions from the mainline or other points of connection within the public right-of-way require that the Project Proponent 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.

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

5.7. The Project proponent 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).

Conditions of Approval for MA17099 (TTM37211 & CZ17003)
Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01 & Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02
5.8. The Project Proponent shall complete the formation of, or if one already exists initiate annexation to, a Community Facilities District (CFD) in order to provide funding for City Public Safety Services for each existing and/or new parcel in the proposed development.

6. PRIOR TO CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY (ENGINEERING)

6.1. Street ‘C’ bridge improvements shall be installed and accepted to the City Engineer’s discretion prior to certificate of occupancy for lots requiring secondary access to Pacific Avenue through Street ‘C’, per the City’s Municipal Code and Ordinance 460.

6.2. Improvements on Pacific Avenue shall be installed and accepted to the City Engineer’s discretion prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy for lots on Street ‘C’ east of the Channel.

{| Geometric Modification | Description |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERSECTIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-Specific Intersection Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Pacific Avenue (NS) and C Street (EW)</td>
<td>Modify geometries to provide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NB: one LT lane, one TH lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SB: one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EB: one shared LT/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WB: N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Provide curb returns in ultimate location to provide NB LT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of “A” Street (NS) and “C” Street (EW)</td>
<td>Modify geometries to provide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NB: N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SB: one shared LT/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EB: one shared TH/TH lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WB: one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Intersection to be controlled by Yield sign on “A” Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of “B” Street (NS) and Canal Street (EW)</td>
<td>Install geometries to provide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NB: one shared LT/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SB: N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EB: one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WB: one shared LT/TH lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Intersection to be controlled by Stop sign on “B” Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intersection of “B” Street (NS) and “C” Street (EW)

Install geometries to provide:

- **NB**: N/A.
- **SB**: one shared LT/RT lane.
- **EB**: one shared LT/TH lane.
- **WB**: one shared TH/RT lane.

Note: Intersection to be controlled by Stop sign on “B” Street.

---

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: ________________
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MASTER APPLICATION 17099 SUMMARY

**Change of Zone 17003:** Amend the City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential).

**Tentative Tract Map 37211:** Subdivision of the 10.4-acre property for future residential development, which will include the subdivision of the project area into 48 residential lots, 2 lettered lots for drainage facilities, and the construction of associated infrastructure. Lot sizes range from 6,000 square feet to 11,734 square feet.
1.0. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of an Initial Study Checklist

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 Checklist 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 Checklist 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 Checklist 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 Checklist/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 Checklist/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 Checklist/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 Checklist/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 Checklist/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 Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Notice of Determination will be filed with the Riverside County Clerk.

1.5 Initial Study Checklist/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 Initial Study Checklist determined that implementation of the proposed Project would result in no impacts or less than significant impacts with implementation of Plans, Policies, Programs, or Project Design Features to the environment under the following issue areas:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
The Initial Study Checklist determined that the proposed Project would result in potentially significant impacts to the following issue areas, but the Project will incorporate mitigation measures that would avoid or mitigate effects to a point where clearly no significant environmental impacts on the environment would occur:

- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Noise
- Tribal Cultural Resources

The Initial Study Checklist 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 southeast corner of Canal and Opal Streets, north of the State Route 60 freeway and east of Pacific Avenue (Refer to Exhibit 1).

The Project site is identified by the following Assessor Parcel Numbers:

- 177-130-007 and 177-142-018.

2.2 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 in September 2017.

The Project site consists of vacant land and has an elevation range of approximately 870 feet above mean sea level with a slight downward slope from north to south. Natural drainage at the site is generally interpreted to be toward the south-southwest, conforming to the natural topography in the area. The Project site has been heavily disturbed and shows evidence of recent discing, which was likely performed as part of the general site maintenance for weed abatement and fire hazard reduction purposes. Dominant plant species on the Project site include Russian thistle, black mustard (Brassica nigra), dove weed (Croton setigerus), ripgut grass (Bromus diandrus), and Menzie’s fiddleneck (Amsinckia menziesii).

Access to the Project site is provided by Canal Street (a paved roadway with no curb, gutter, or sidewalk) which abuts the northern boundary of the site; Opal Street (a paved roadway with no curb, gutter, or sidewalk) which abuts the eastern boundary of the site; and by Pacific Avenue (a paved roadway with a rolled curb and no sidewalk).
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>Canal Street with vacant land and railroad tracks further to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>State Route 60 Freeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Opal Street with single-family residential further to the east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Concrete lined flood control channel with single-family residential to the west; and Pacific Avenue with vacant land further to the west.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Inspection, September 2017*

2.3 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>State Route 60 Freeway</td>
<td>State Route 60 Freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac and Highest Density Residential (HHDR)</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

2.4 Project Description

The Project Applicant, Sequanota Partners, LP, submitted the following applications to the City of Jurupa Valley, which comprise the proposed Project: Change of Zone (CZ) No. 17003 and Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211. The City of Jurupa Valley also refers to these applications as Master Application (MA) No. 17099. 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 17003**: Amend the City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential).

B. **Tentative Tract Map No. 37211**

The Project is a proposed subdivision of the 10.4-acre property for future residential development, which will include the subdivision of the Project site into 48 lots, 2 lots (“A” and “B”) for water quality basins, and the construction of associated infrastructure. Residential lot sizes range from 6,000 square feet to 11,734 square feet.

**Street Improvements**

The Project proposes the following street improvements:

- Canal Street along the Project boundary will have 2 travel lanes, curb, gutter, sidewalk, and parkway landscaping within a 52-foot right-of-way.

- Pacific Avenue between Canal Street and SR-60 will have two through lanes plus median turn lane (3 lanes total), curb, gutter, sidewalk, and parkway landscaping within a 100-foot right-of-way.

- Opal Street will be improved adjacent to the Project site with 18-feet of pavement, curb, gutter, and sidewalk within a half-width right-of-way of 30-feet.

- The intersection of Pacific Avenue (NS) and proposed “C” Street (EW) will be modified to provide curb returns in ultimate location to provide northbound left turn lane and the following geometries:
  - Northbound: One left turn lane, one through lane.
  - Southbound: One shared through/right lane.
  - Eastbound: One shared left/right turn lane.

- The intersection of proposed “B” Street (NS) and Canal Street (EW) will be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on proposed “B” Street and the following:
  - Northbound: One shared left/right turn lane.
  - Eastbound: One shared through/right lane.
  - Westbound: One shared left/through lane.

- Internal streets are proposed within 48-foot and 56-foot right-of-ways and will include curb, gutter, sidewalk, and parkway landscaping.

**Drainage Infrastructure**

Onsite runoff will be conveyed in the street and collected at catch basins provided at critical points to avoid gutter flow depths exceeding top of curb for 10-year flows or right-of-way for 100-year flows. Offsite flows from the northwest end of the project will be intercepted and conveyed with a proposed Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District Master Drainage Plan.
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storm drain pipe to the existing Sunnyslope Channel. Existing runoff on the westerly side of Opal
Street will continue to be conveyed by the street towards an existing drainage swale that runs
adjacent to Project site and the State Route 60 Freeway. From there the runoff will be collected by
the existing drainage inlet and outlets to the Sunnyslope Channel. Treatment of first flush waters
from the development will be accomplished by routing them through the proposed on-site water
quality basins.

Sewer and Water Infrastructure

New water and sewer lines will connect to the existing facilities in Canal Street, Opal, Street and
Pacific Avenue.

B. Extension of Infrastructure

Proposed “C” Street will be constructed across the Sunnyslope Channel. Improvements include
constructing a box culvert that would entail removing a section of the flood control side walls and
installing cast in place walls and top. Along with the box culvert, some remedial grading will be
done to regrade portions of the access roads that exist on each side of the channel. Concurrent with
the storm drain construction, sewer and water facilities will be installed under the box culvert. The
reinforced concrete box culvert and associated transition walls are within the existing Sunnyslope
channel. Construction of the box culvert and associated transitions walls will include the removal of
approximately 7,000 square feet of the existing channel. This will also include the removal and
replacement of approximately 250 feet of the existing Sunnyslope channel bottom. Additionally, the
Sunnyslope Channel concrete junction structure would be reconstructed as an underground
concrete junction structure. Sequanota, RCFCD and the City will also construct a 36” storm drain
line (with accompanying inlet structures) at total of 1150 linear feet from the intersection of Canal
Street and Opal Street, south approximately 500 feet within the Opal Street ROW, then east in the
Street “C” ROW approximately 650 feet to connect to the reinforced concrete box culvert.
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.

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use / Planning
- Population / Housing
- Transportation/Traffic
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Geology /Soils
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Utilities/Service Systems
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.

Signed: Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director

City of Jurupa Valley

Printed Name/Title: Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director

Date: June 27, 2018
Appendices (Under Separate Cover or on Compact Disk)


Appendix I.  *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment*, Geotek, July 14, 2016.

Appendix J.  *Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment*, Geotek, August 11, 2016.


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 9.199.040.C, one (1) family residences shall not exceed forty (40) feet in height. No other building or structure shall exceed fifty (50) feet in height, unless a greater height is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.370. In no event, however, shall a building or structure exceed seventy-five (75) feet in height, unless a variance is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.270.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

The Project site is approximately 10.4 gross acres in size and is located in an area largely characterized by residential development and vacant land. The site is bounded by Canal Street, followed by vacant land, followed by a railroad easement or residential development to the north; a flood control channel, followed by residential development or Pacific Avenue, followed by vacant land to the east; State Highway 60 or a flood control channel, followed by State Route 60, to the south; and scattered residences 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 5,000 feet to the northwest of the Project site and the Rattlesnake Mountains located approximately 2,000 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 40 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 48 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. The site is bounded by Canal Street, followed by vacant land, followed by a railroad easement or residential development to the north; a flood control channel, followed by residential development or Pacific Avenue, followed by vacant land to the east; State Route 60 or a flood control channel to the south; and scattered residences to the west. In addition, the Project site is planned for low density residential uses by the General Plan and this type of development has been anticipated for the subject site.

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:

- 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?
- Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- 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))?
- Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
- 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</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 has a zoning classification of R-1 (One Family Dwellings) which allows single-family detached housing at a density of 2-5 dwelling units per acre. The Project is proposing a zone change from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential). Neither the R-1 Zone or the R-4 Zone is considered a primary agricultural zone. As such, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use.

**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 site has a zoning classification R-1 (One Family Dwellings). The Project is proposing a zone change from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential). 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.

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 the eastern portion of the Project site as “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. According to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the Project (Appendix G), the site has not been used for agricultural purposes since 1985. One (1) vegetation community/land cover type was mapped within the Project site, agriculture land (fallow agriculture). 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. Fallow agriculture was the only land cover type found throughout the Project site. Non-native plant species, including Russian thistle (Salsola tragus) and brome grasses (Bromus spp.), were present in the fallow agricultural areas on site. As such, it is not currently providing active agricultural land of use to the local economy.

In addition, the Project site is approximately 10.4 gross acres in size and is located in an area largely characterized by residential development and vacant land. The site is bounded by Canal Street, followed by vacant land, followed by a railroad easement or residential development to the north; a flood control channel, followed by residential development or Pacific Avenue, followed by vacant land to the east; State Highway 60 or a flood control channel to the south; and scattered residences to the west. In addition, the Project site is planned for low density 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>Determination</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. 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 Study (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 (PM₁₀)
Fine Particulate Matter (PM₂.₅)
Carbon Monoxide (CO)
Nitrogen Dioxide (NOₓ)
Sulphur Dioxide (SO₂), 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 (PM₁₀)
- Fine Particulate Matter (PM₂.₅)
- Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NOₓ)
- Sulphur Dioxide (SO₂), 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 3. 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 (PM₁₀)</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Particulate Matter (PM₂.₅)</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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 3-5 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.

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

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.  
*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 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). Construction activities within the Project site will consist of demolishing portions of the existing flood control channel, site preparation, on-site grading, building, paving, and architectural coating. The Project is expected to export approximately 3,000 cubic yards of soil during the flood control channel excavation. The estimated maximum daily construction emissions are summarized in Table 5 below.

**Table 5. Maximum Daily Construction Emissions (lbs/day)**

<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>Summer</td>
<td>30.07</td>
<td>57.78</td>
<td>34.65</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>30.06</td>
<td>57.82</td>
<td>34.55</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threshold</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>550</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant?</strong></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 5, 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 6 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>NO\textsubscript{x}</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO\textsubscript{x}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{10}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.05</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>

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

Based on the analysis above, regional air quality impacts for construction 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 (NO\textsubscript{x}), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter less than 10 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM\textsubscript{10}) and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM\textsubscript{2.5}). 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 (NO\textsubscript{x}), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM\textsubscript{10} and PM\textsubscript{2.5}) 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 7.
**Construction Localized Significance Threshold Analysis (lbs/day)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>NO\textsubscript{x}</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{10}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Emissions</td>
<td>57.82</td>
<td>34.65</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>6.63</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>

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

As shown in Table 7, 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 exceed even if standards are not exceeded on a regional level. On-site area and energy sources were evaluated. As shown in Table 8, emissions resulting from the Project operations would not exceed LST numerical thresholds established by the SCAQMD and no mitigation is required.

### Table 8.
**Operational Localized Significance Threshold Analysis (lbs/day).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>NO\textsubscript{x}</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{10}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Emissions</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.16</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>

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

**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)*

**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.

The Project is being conditioned by the Planning Department as part of the entitlement process to require the installation of MERV 13 Filters for each residential dwelling unit and is considered a Project Design Feature. This Project Design Feature will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance.

PDF 3.3-1 As required by the Project’s Conditions of Approval, residential dwelling units within 500 feet of the SR-60 Freeway shall be required to install high efficiency Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) filters of MERV 13 or better as indicated by the American Society of Heating Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) Standard 52.2, in the intake of ventilation systems. Heating, air conditioning and ventilation (HVAC) systems shall be installed with a fan unit power designed to force air through the MERV 13 filter.

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 adjacent to the Project site.

Localized Impacts

As shown on Table 8 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)

In regards to air quality hazards, 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.

IMPORTANT NOTE #1: 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 is not generally required to analyze 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 the hazards and the proposed project’s effect in terms of increasing the risks related to those hazards. The following analysis is consistent with the CBIA case.
Existing Conditions

The Project site is currently exposed to toxic air contaminant emissions from diesel truck emissions from SR-60 Freeway diesel particulate matter (DPM) sources. The existing conditions on the Project site only include vacant land that does not contain any operational land uses that emit toxic air contaminants.

The Projects' Contribution to Existing Conditions

Construction Impacts: During construction diesel particulate matter emissions would be emitted from heavy equipment use and heavy-duty trucks and would temporarily add to the health risk from diesel particular matter in the project area that is primarily a result from heavy-duty trucks operating on State Route 60, adjacent to the Project site. Heavy-duty construction equipment is subject to a California Air Resources Board Airborne Toxics Control Measure for in-use diesel construction equipment to reduce diesel particulate emissions. As described above for the LST analysis, PM\textsubscript{10} (representative of diesel particulate matter, 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 15 feet from the proposed construction boundary. According to Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), 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.

Construction emissions are estimated based on model Year 2019 and beyond. It was assumed that construction would begin in the Year 2019 and would last approximately 18 months. Due to the relatively temporary nature of construction (that would only occur over approximately 18 months) exposure at any individual sensitive receptor and minimal particulate emissions generated on-site, TACs generated during construction would not be expected to result in concentrations causing significant health risks.

Operational Impacts: The Project is a residential development and will not be a source of toxic air contaminants. 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 exacerbate pre-existing health risk hazards from the SR-60 Freeway. Impacts are less than significant in this regard.

In summary, the proposed Project would not result in a potentially significant contribution to regional concentrations of TAC's and would not result in a significant contribution to the adverse health impacts associated with those pollutants. Impacts would be less than significant.

IMPORTANT NOTE #2: As noted above, the CBIA case 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 only requires an analysis of the hazards and the proposed project’s effect in terms of increasing the risks related to those hazards. Notwithstanding this legal requirement, because the Project is locating sensitive receptors in proximity to freeway-related DPM sources, a Health Risk Assessment was conducted at the request of the City of Jurupa Valley for informational and disclosure purposes only.

Health Risk Assessment
According to the building setback line (BSL) on the tentative tract map (TTM), the closest any new single family dwelling could be to potential SR-60 Freeway diesel particulate matter (DPM) sources would be approximately 129 feet from the westbound SR-60 Freeway lanes of travel.

According to SCAQMD methodology, health effects from carcinogenic air toxics are usually described in terms of individual cancer risk. “Individual Cancer Risk” is the likelihood that a person exposed to concentrations of toxic air contaminants over a 30-year lifetime will contract cancer, based on the use of revised Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) risk-assessment methodology.

The SCAQMD has established the following health risk thresholds.

- Maximum Incremental Cancer Risk: 10 in 1 million at the nearest sensitive receptor or off-site worker; and
- Hazard Index (project increment) 1.0 or greater.

Cancer Risk

The proposed single-family detached residential dwelling units within 500 feet of the SR-60 Freeway would experience the highest levels of freeway-related DPM emissions, resulting in a cumulative cancer risk of up to 42.85 per million people (up to 31.73 per million for infants 0-2 years of age).

While cancer risk at the Project site due to TACs may be higher than other areas in Riverside County that are located further from the SR-60 Freeway, the risk on the Project site will be less than the majority of Riverside County and much less than the average in the South Coast Air Basin. Because the Project is not exacerbating the existing TAC exposure as discussed above, mitigation measures to reduce impacts are not required under CEQA.

The Health Risk Assessment prepared for the Project (Appendix B), identified that proposed dwelling units interior cancer risk can be mitigated down to less than 10 in a million using MERV 13 filtration systems. The requirement for the installation of MERV 13 filter systems for each home can be imposed as a Condition of Approval for the Project as part of the entitlement process.

Non-Cancer Related Impacts

The operational health risk impacts for non-cancer related impacts are less than 1.0; therefore, they are considered to be less significant.

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.


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 Reports (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.

Sensitive Plant Species

According to the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) and California Native Plant Society (CNPS) special-status plant species have not been documented on the Project site (CDFW 2016b). However, several special-status plant species have been documented within the vicinity of the Project site. Although many of the species have been identified near the Project site, all of the plant species are presumed absent due to the lack of suitable habitat and the project site’s lengthy history of being heavily disturbed and frequently disced. In addition, the Project site is located within the MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area (NEPSSA), but the habitat (fallow agriculture) identified on the project site, and the recent discing/plowing of the Project site, made it unsuitable for the narrow endemic plant species, including San Diego ambrosia (Ambrosia pumila), Brand’s phacelia (Phacelia stellaris), and San Miguel savory (Satureja chandleri).

Sensitive Wildlife Species

According to the records searches, no special-status wildlife species have been documented on the Project site (CDFW 2016b). However, several special-status wildlife species have been documented within the vicinity of the Project site. A total of six species were found to varying levels of potential to occur on the Project site. None of the species were determined to have a high potential for occurrence on the Project site, but three species were determined to have a moderate potential to occur, including silvery legless lizard (Anniella pulchra), red diamond rattlesnake (Crotalus ruber), and yellow-breasted chat (Icteria virens). Additionally, three species were determined to have a low potential to occur, including western spadefoot toad (Spea hammondii), loggerhead shrike (Lanius ludovicianus), and American Badger (Taxidea taxus).

Suitable burrowing owl habitat was identified throughout the entire site; however, only Parcel 1 contained suitable burrows. No suitable burrows were identified on Parcel 2, the area between the two parcels where the proposed reinforced concrete box will be built, or the storm drain alignment. A total of 21 burrows that were of appropriate size and shape for burrowing owl use were identified during the focused burrow survey/first burrowing owl survey but burrowing owls and burrowing owl sign were neither observed nor detected. California ground squirrels, a species that burrowing owls can depend on for burrow construction, were associated with the burrows on site.
Burrowing owls and their sign were not observed or detected during any of the focused surveys. However, because burrowing owl habitat exists on the site, the following mitigation measure is required:

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

**MM-BIO-1: 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.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, 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.

[It should be noted that the site does contain trees with the potential for providing habitat for nesting birds. Nesting birds are discussed under Issue 3.4(d) below].
Project Design Features (PDF)

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

The Western Riverside County MSHCP defines Riparian/Riverine Areas as, “...lands which contain Habitat dominated by trees, shrubs, persistent emergents, or emergent mosses and lichens, which occur close to or which depend upon soil moisture from a nearby fresh water source; or areas with fresh water flow during all or a portion of the year.”

The initial site assessment conducted in 2016 identified the Sunnyslope Channel, which includes two branches that run along the east border of the Parcel 1 and along the south border of Parcel 2 before the two branches connect and continue south, as a potential riverine area. Further evaluation in 2018 confirmed that the Sunnyslope Channel was jurisdictional to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and CDFW and was considered a riverine resource as defined by the MSHCP, due to its supporting fresh water flow during all or a portion of the year.

The Sunnyslope Channel is a cement-lined trapezoidal channel that includes two branches. The two branches of the Sunnyslope Channel adjacent to the Project site accounted for a total of 0.64 acre of riverine resources. Most of the Sunnyslope Channel will be avoided by construction, but based on the current design plans, the Project proposes to impact 0.14 acre of the Sunnyslope Channel during the construction of the reinforced concrete box culvert and associated transition walls.

Riparian/Riverine features on the Project site are of minimal value to riparian/riverine wildlife due to the lack of riparian vegetation within the channel and the surrounding areas. The only areas with any plant material within the channel were found at the north end of the Project site near Canal Street, where some algae and surface water were present. The functions associated with the channel are primarily as a local source of water for wildlife and as a conduit to feed downstream areas with fresh water. Sunnyslope Channel is connected hydrologically with the Santa Ana River and the Prado Basin, through a series of flood control channels.

Wildlife use of the riparian/riverine area on site is limited because of the lack of habitat present and lack of features necessary to support targeted MSHCP Riparian/Riverine species. It is also not part of a natural wildlife corridor or planned linkage under the MSHCP. Within the site, species observed included rock pigeon (Columbia livia), mourning dove (Zenaida macroura), and Anna’s hummingbird (Calypte anna) and other typically urban/suburban species. The channel area likely provides a water source for vertebrate and invertebrate species in the local area, but does not contain nesting habitat for bird species or permanent habitat for most other species.

Downstream of the Project site, the channel continues through several communities in either a concrete lined channel or an earthen bottom channel. Riparian habitat downstream does not become evident until the channel enters the Santa Ana River floodplain, approximately two miles downstream. This portion of the Santa Ana River is known to support a wide variety of riparian bird species including the least Bell’s vireo and southwestern willow flycatcher. Farther downstream, over five miles away in the Prado Basin, there is a known population of the yellow-billed cuckoo.

Riparian/Riverine features on the Project site do not function as a traditional riparian system, but rather as a part of the local flood control system. They provide low value for traditional riparian system functions as hydrologic regime, flood storage and flood flow modification, and sediment...
trapping and transport. This is largely due to the lack of habitat, its landscape position, and the relatively small drainage area that it serves. However, the water flows across the site are considered important as a source of water and sediment transport for downstream populations of MSHCP target riparian/riverine species. Areas downstream could be affected by changes in water quality within Sunnyslope Channel. Because the Project will maintain the channel flows and existing water quality post-construction, no long-term modifications of riparian/riverine functions and values downstream are anticipated due to the Project.

The temporary impact to 0.14 acre of Sunnyslope Channel is not considered to be a significant loss because the area would be restored to approximate its current condition after the project is built. The 0.14 acre of riverine habitat is completely concrete, is completely devoid of riparian habitat, and is only considered a riverine resource because it conveys storm water flows downstream. Once the construction of the reinforced concrete box is complete, the channel will be returned to its original concrete form. Therefore, no restoration for temporary impacts to riparian/riverine resources shall be required and there will be no temporal loss of riparian habitat. The Project will result in no change to water quality levels in downstream waters and no riparian habitat will be lost due to the Project.

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.
Sources: Biological Reports (Appendix C), DBESP (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.

Because Sunnyslope Channel is a manufactured channel, it is defined by the limits of its cement lining and normal capacity for flooding. The channel enters the site from Canal Road as a box channel, approximately eight feet in depth and 13 feet wide, and transitions to a trapezoidal channel that then flows directly south. The channel is 24 feet in width, with a bottom that is five feet wide and trapezoidal sides of 19 feet. During the survey, water originating from urban runoff was observed within the channel. A small area of algae was observed at the northern end of Sunnyslope Channel. At the southern end of Sunnyslope Channel, it confluences with an eastern branch (also named Sunnyslope Channel) and then flows through a triple box culvert underneath State Route 60. Then the channel continues as an open concrete channel southward for another 2.5 miles, joined by other concrete channels along the way, until it empties into the Santa Ana River. The ordinary high-water mark (OHWM) was demarcated by the upper limits of the concrete side-slopes of the channel. Sunnyslope Channel was determined to be jurisdictional based on the
observance of surface water within the channel. No soils were present within the channel and the only vegetation present were clumps of algae located at the upper end of the channel.

Most of the Sunnyslope Channel will be avoided by construction, however, based on the current design plans, the Project anticipates approximately 0.14 acre of impacts to the Sunnyslope Channel during the construction of the reinforced concrete box culvert and associated transition walls. As such, the following mitigation measures are required:

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

**MM BIO-2. Coordination With USACE, CDFW, and RWQCB.** 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 to positively determine whether or not either agency wishes to exert jurisdiction of the onsite drainage feature. If either agency decides to exert jurisdiction, Mitigation Measures BIO-3 and BIO-4 shall be implemented.

**BIO-3. CDFW Jurisdiction.** If state jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-2, 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 at a ratio of not less than 1:1 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. The above described ratios may be increase by the CDFW as part of the permit process.

**BIO-4. Federal Jurisdiction.** If federal jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-2, 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 more than 0.1 acre of wetlands and 1,278 lineal feet of streambed channel, 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. The above described ratios may be increase by the USACOE or the RWQCB as part of the permit process.

With implementation of Mitigations BIO-2 through BIO-4, 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 With Mitigation Incorporated.

*Source: Biological Reports (Appendix C).*

**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.

Although no wildlife corridors are identified in Project area, the Project site contains some vegetation that may contain suitable nesting and foraging habitat for a number of common trees and ground-nesting avian species which are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. As such, development of the Project site may result in potential impacts to nesting birds if construction activities commence during the avian breeding season of February 1 through October 1. Therefore, the following mitigation measure is required:

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

*Mitigation Measure BIO-5- Nesting Bird Survey.* As a condition of approval for all grading permits, vegetation clearing and ground disturbance shall be prohibited during the migratory bird nesting season (February 1 through October 1), unless a migratory bird nesting survey is completed in accordance with the following requirements:

a. A migratory nesting bird survey of the Project’s impact footprint shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three business (3) days prior to initiating vegetation clearing or ground disturbance.

b. A copy of the migratory nesting bird survey results report shall be provided to the City of Jurupa Planning Department. If the survey identifies the presence of active nests, then the qualified biologist shall provide the Planning Department with a copy of maps showing the location of all nests and an appropriate buffer zone around each nest sufficient to protect the nest from direct and indirect impact. The size and location of all buffer zones, if required, shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Department and shall be no less than a 300-foot radius around the nest for non-raptors and a 500-foot radius around the nest for raptors. The nests and buffer zones shall be field checked weekly by a qualified biological monitor. The approved buffer zone shall be marked in the field with construction fencing, within which no vegetation clearing or ground disturbance shall commence until the qualified biologist and Planning Department verify that the nests are no longer occupied and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-5, impacts would be less than significant.
3.4(e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

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.

To date, the City has not adopted a tree preservation ordinance. However, guidance on the preservation of trees is found in the following General Plan policies:

- **COS 1.2 - Protection of Significant Trees.** Protect and preserve significant trees, as determined by the City Council upon the recommendation of the Planning Commission. Significant trees are those trees that make substantial contributions to natural habitat or to the urban landscape due to their species, size, or rarity. In particular, California native trees should be protected.

- **COS 1.3 - Other Significant Vegetation.** Maintain and conserve superior examples of vegetation, including: agricultural wind screen plantings, street trees, stands of mature native and non-native trees, and other features of ecological, aesthetic, and conservation value.

According to Tree Survey (Appendix E) there are ten (10) trees that will be impacted by the Project. Nine (9) of the trees are located within the right-of-way of Canal Street and Opal Street. One (1) tree is located on a proposed lot. All of the trees are proposed to be removed. The trees species are: Eucalyptus, Australian Whistling Pine, and Peruvian Pepper Tree. Per General Plan policy COS 1.3, nine (9) of the trees are considered “street trees” and afforded protection. Therefore, the following mitigation measure is required:

Mitigation Measures (MM)

**Mitigation Measure BIO-6-Tree Preservation and Replacement.** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, 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 permits:

“Prior to the removal of any trees, the issuance of a grading permit, or approval of a Site Development Permit, whichever comes first, a Tree Removal and Planting and Monitoring Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department that demonstrates that the following will be implemented:

1. The trees along Opal Street and Canal Street, identified in the Tree Survey prepared by BrightView Design Group, April 24, (Appendix D of the Initial Study Checklist for MA 17009) shall be replaced at a 3:1 ratio with an approved species as determined by the City’s Planning Department. Tree selection
must be at least 15-gallon purchased from quality nursery stock. This number of trees is above the number identified in the Project's Landscape Plan”

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-5, impacts would be less than significant.

**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.**

*Source: Biological Reports (Appendix C), DBESP (Appendix D).*

**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 Biological Reports prepared for the Project and the Riverside Conservation Authority website:

- The Project site is not in an MSHCP survey area for riparian/riverine areas or vernal pools.
- The Project site is not in an MSHCP survey area 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-1 (30-day Pre-Construction Survey) is required:
With implementation of PPP 3.4-1 and Mitigation Measure BIO-1, 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></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 Study (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.

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.

The Cultural Resources Study prepared for the Project (Appendix F) indicates that no cultural resources that are eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

A review of historic-period aerial photographs revealed that the Sunnyslope Channel includes a mix of both modern (less than 50 years old) and historic-age (more than 50 years old) branches. The modern branch of the Sunnyslope Channel was constructed in 1980 and runs north-south between eastern and western portions of the Project site. The modern portion of the Sunnyslope Channel is not a Historical Resource as defined by CEQA.

The installation of a box culvert and removal and replacement of 125 feet of channel bottom would require excavation into the historic-age portion of the Sunnyslope Channel. This historic-age segment of the Sunnyslope Channel was evaluated as not eligible for listing in the CRHR under any criteria and is not a Historical Resource for the purposes of CEQA.

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 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.

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.
As noted under Issue 3.5 (b) above, the cultural resource records search identified no previously recorded cultural resources on the Project site and no resources were identified as a result of the pedestrian survey or through documentary research. The potential for buried deposits may be considered low based upon the lack of identified resources and previous impacts to the property. However, if intact buried cultural materials are encountered during construction, work in that area must halt until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the find. As such, the following mitigation measure is required:

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

**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.

**3.5(c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

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

*Source: Riverside County Geographic information System.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs 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.

According to the Riverside County Geographic Information System, the Project site is located in an area with “high potential” for paleontological resources. Therefore, the following mitigation measures are required.

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

**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.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*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: Updated Geotechnical Evaluation and Infiltration Study (Appendix G), Riverside County GIS.*
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: Updated Geotechnical Evaluation and Infiltration Study (Appendix G), Riverside County GIS.

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: Updated Geotechnical Evaluation and Infiltration Study (Appendix G), Riverside County GIS.***

**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.

Historic groundwater exceeds 50 feet below ground surface (bgs) in the area. In addition, the Project site is identified by the City of Jurupa Valley *General Plan* (Figure 8-5-Liquefaction Susceptibility) as being in an area with a “moderate” susceptibility of liquefaction. However, the *Geotechnical Evaluation* conducted for the Project identified there in no potential for liquefaction to exist on the Project site based on the depth of the groundwater (in excess of 50 feet).

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: Updated Geotechnical Evaluation and Infiltration Study (Appendix G).*

**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, hydroteeering.

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: Updated Geotechnical Evaluation and Infiltration Study (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 Geographic Information System, 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 50-feet.
Collapse

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 50-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: Updated Geotechnical Evaluation and Infiltration Study (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 “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?

Determinant: 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 and Greenhouse Gas Impact Study (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 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Source</th>
<th>GHG Emissions (metric tons per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Construction Emissions</td>
<td>21.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(amortized over 30 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>12.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>220.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>732.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>28.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Usage</td>
<td>24.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CO2É (All Sources)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,039</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 Study (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></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></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></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></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></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></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></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></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.
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.

Historic Agricultural Use

In order to address the potential concern regarding historic agricultural use, soil samples from the Project site for chemical analysis were obtained. Ten (10) soil samples were obtained from selected areas of the Project site and submitted to a state certified laboratory for analysis of organochlorinated pesticides (OCP). Soil samples were obtained from a depth of up to approximately six (6) inches below the existing ground surface. Analysis of the soil samples detected measurable quantities of the OCP constituents 4, 4'-DDE, endrin ketone, and methoxychlor from the soil sample collected from near proposed lot 23. The detected OCP constituents were in concentrations below the maximum allowable concentration level for residential soil, as determined by the California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSLs) and Environmental Protection Agency Regional Screening Levels (RSLs). Based on the results above, additional investigation is not necessary at the site with respect to this issue.

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 located within ¼ mile of Mission Middle School. 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 1.4 miles northwest of the Flabob Airport. According to Map FL-1, Flabob Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Project site is not located within 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 Canal Street, Opal Street, and Pacific Avenue which are paved roadways 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 Canal Street, Opal Street, and Pacific Avenue 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.*

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.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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. Therefore development of the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires and no impact would occur.
### 3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<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. 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: Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulic Study (Appendix H).*

**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 site-specific storm drain system to prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials, or other elements that might degrade or harm biological resources or ecosystem processes. This will be accomplished by constructing two (2) detention basins with a design capture volume (DCV) sufficient 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.

Onsite runoff will be conveyed in the street and collected at catch basins provided at critical points to avoid gutter flow depths exceeding top of curb for 10-year flows or right-of-way for 100-year flows. Offsite flows from the northwest end of the project will be intercepted and conveyed with a proposed Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District *Master Drainage Plan* storm drain pipe to the existing Sunnyslope Channel. Existing runoff on the westerly side of Opal Street will continue to be conveyed by the street towards an existing drainage swale that runs adjacent to Project site and the State Route 60 Freeway. From there the runoff will be collected by the existing drainage inlet and outlets to the Sunnyslope Channel. Treatment of first flush waters from the development will be accomplished by routing them through the proposed on-site water quality basins.
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.**

*Source: Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulic Study (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.

Water service would 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 historical groundwater data (California Department of Water Resources and California State Water Resources Control Board groundwater well data [http://wdl.water.ca.gov and http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov]), depth to groundwater is greater than 50 feet bgs in the general site area, with a flow direction to the south-southwest. As such, the Project will not impact groundwater.

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.
Source: Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulic Study (Appendix H).

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.

Development of the Project would increase impervious surface coverage on the site and increase surface runoff. Onsite runoff will be conveyed in the street and collected at catch basins provided at critical points to avoid gutter flow depths exceeding top of curb for 10-year flows or right-of-way for 100-year flows. Offsite flows from the northwest end of the project will be intercepted and conveyed with a proposed Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District Master Drainage Plan storm drain pipe to the existing Sunnyslope Channel. Existing runoff on the westerly side of Opal Street will continue to be conveyed by the street towards an existing drainage swale that runs adjacent to Project site and the State Route 60 Freeway. From there the runoff will be collected by the existing drainage inlet and outlets to the Sunnyslope Channel. Treatment of first flush waters from the development will be accomplished by routing them through the proposed onsite water quality basins.

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.**  
*Source: Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulic Study (Appendix H).*

**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: 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.

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: Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, 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.

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: 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.

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 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**

**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.*

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. The site is bounded by Canal Street, followed by vacant land, followed by a railroad easement or residential development to the north; a flood control channel, followed by residential development or Pacific Avenue, followed by vacant land to the east; State Highway 60 or a flood control channel to the south; and scattered residences 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.

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 Reports (Appendix C), DBESP (Appendix D).

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 Biological Reports prepared for the Project and the Riverside Conservation Authority website:

- The Project site is not in an MSHCP survey area for riparian/riverine areas or vernal pools.
- The Project site is not in an MSHCP survey area 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-1 (30-day Pre-Construction Survey) is required:

With implementation of PPP 3.4-1 and Mitigation Measure BIO-1, 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.
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.” 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 Impact Analysis (Appendix K).*

**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

The main noise sources surrounding the Project site include the SR-60 Freeway, located approximately 100 feet south of the Project's southern property line, and the Union Pacific Railroad, located approximately 100 feet north of the project's northern property line.

Construction Noise

The most significant source of short-term noise impact is related to noise generated during construction activities on the Project site which would result in potential noise impacts to nearby sensitive receptors (i.e. residential homes) located near the Project site. Construction is performed in discrete steps, each of which has its own mix of equipment and consequently its own noise characteristics. Thus noise levels will fluctuate depending upon construction phase, equipment type, duration of equipment use, distance between the noise source and receptor, and the presence or absence of noise attenuation structures. As shown on Table 10 below, noise levels generated by heavy construction equipment can range from approximately 75 dBA to 99 dBA when measured at 50 feet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Equipment</th>
<th>Range of Sound Levels Measured (dBA at 50 feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pile Drivers</td>
<td>81 to 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Drills</td>
<td>83 to 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Hammers</td>
<td>75 to 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
<td>78 to 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumps</td>
<td>68 to 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozers</td>
<td>85 to 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractors</td>
<td>77 to 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-End Loaders</td>
<td>86 to 90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Type of Equipment | Range of Sound Levels Measured (dBA at 50 feet)
---|---
Graders | 79 to 89
Air Compressors | 76 to 86
Trucks | 81 to 87


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 75 dBA to 99 dBA when measured at 50 feet. The following mitigation measure is required to reduce construction noise impacts to the maximum extent feasible:

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

**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.”
**Operational Noise**

The Project is proposed to consist of 48 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 456 average daily vehicle trips (36 trips in the AM Peak hours and 48 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. Based on Project trip generation and distribution information provided by the Traffic Impact Study prepared for the Project (Appendix L), 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.

**Traffic Source Noise**

The City of Jurupa Valley follows the State of California’s noise compatibility guidelines. Residential land uses are categorized based on the following community noise exposure levels (CNEL) are shown on Table 11 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Community Noise Exposure Level (dB CNEL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normally Acceptable</td>
<td>60 and below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditionally Acceptable</td>
<td>55-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normally Acceptable</td>
<td>70-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly Unacceptable</td>
<td>75 and above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Noise Impact Analysis (Appendix K).*

Traffic noise along the SR-60 Freeway will be the main source of noise impacting the Project site and the surrounding area. For purposes of CEQA, exterior noise levels are calculated for habitable backyard and sideyard areas only. Unmitigated exterior backyard/sideyard exterior noise levels will range from 75.1 dBA CNEL to 69.5 dBA CNEL. It is anticipated that the first row of residential units facing the freeway will experience the highest noise levels on the site. On-site unmitigated exterior noise levels fall within the conditionally acceptable to clearly unacceptable community noise exposure limits. Therefore, Mitigation Measure NOI-2 is required.

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

**Mitigation Measure NOI-2. Sound Walls:** Prior to issuance of building permits, a final noise study based on final precise grading plan elevations shall be prepared by a qualified acoustician and approved by the City to validate appropriate noise barrier heights, locations, and construction materials. a) Sound walls are required around all habitable exterior backyard and sideyard areas for all lots (See Exhibit C of Noise Impact Analysis, Appendix K of this Initial Study Checklist) for specific wall heights and locations. All required noise barriers shall be designed to reduce noise levels to below 65 dBA CNEL within private exterior areas (i.e., backyards) of residential lots. The noise barriers may consist of any material (block, tempered glass, earthen berm, etc.) or combination of materials that achieves the required noise attenuation and shall have no decorative cutouts or other line-of-sight openings between shielded areas and the noise source (adjacent roadway). Prior to
issuance of building permits, the City of Jurupa Valley shall review and approve the noise barrier design, placement, and materials to ensure that the required level of sound attenuation will be achieved.

**Future Interior Noise**

The future interior noise level was calculated for the sensitive receptor locations using a typical “windows open” and “windows closed” condition. A “windows open” condition assumes 12 dBA of noise attenuation from the exterior noise level. A “windows closed” condition assumes 20 dBA of noise attenuation from the exterior noise level.

The Noise Impact Analysis prepared for the Project (Appendix K) indicates that the first floor interior noise levels for all units on the Project site will range from 65.4 to 52.0 dBA CNEL with the windows open and 57.4 to 44.0 dBA CNEL with the windows closed.

The Noise Impact Analysis prepared for the Project (Appendix K) also indicates that the second floor interior noise levels for units facing the adjacent SR-60 Freeway will range from 69.3 to 64.0 dBA CNEL with the windows open and 61.3 to 56.0 dBA CNEL with the windows closed.

To meet the City’s interior 45 dBA CNEL standard, the following noise mitigation measure is required to comply with the City of Jurupa Valley and State of California noise standards.

**Mitigations Measures (MM)**

**Mitigation Measure NOI-3 Interior Noise Analysis:** Prior to issuance of any residential building permit, an interior noise analysis shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department demonstrating that proposed building materials will achieve interior noise levels less than 45 dBA CNEL. Measures that would facilitate compliance with the 45dBA CNEL interior noise standard include, but are not limited to:

a) A “windows closed” condition is required to meet interior noise standards for all homes.

b) Upgraded windows and sliding glass doors are required on all homes. See Tables 5 and 6 of Noise Impact Analysis, Appendix K of this Initial Study Checklist for specific STC requirements.

c) Attic and roof vents that directly face the SR-60, if applicable, shall include an acoustical baffle to prevent vehicle noise intrusion. See Exhibits D and E of Noise Impact Analysis, Appendix K of this Initial Study Checklist for examples acoustical baffles. The contractor may install similar measures to provide noise reduction.

d) For proper acoustical performance, all exterior windows, doors, and sliding glass doors must have a positive seal and leaks/cracks must be kept to a minimum.

**Rail Line Source Noise**

The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) U.S. DOT Crossing Inventory Form is used to obtain operational data along the adjacent railroad segment. According to the FRA online railroad portal, the railroad crossing nearest the project site is 810990D, SR-60 Freeway. The railroad source noise analysis uses a version of Wyle Labs WCR73_5, together with several key site parameters, to
estimate noise impacts of railroad operations to the Project site. Key inputs include train category identification, number of daily train operations, length of train, speed of train, and distance to receiver. Similar performance equations, including relative source-barrier-receiver horizontal separations, relative source-barrier receiver vertical separations, typical noise source spectra, and barrier transmission loss from the railroad noise model, were utilized to complete the stationary source model.

Railroad noise from the tracks north of the Project site will be an infrequent source of noise impacting the Project site and the surrounding area. Noise calculations assume a 6-foot block wall along the northern property line which will shield habitable exterior areas from railroad noise. It is anticipated that the first row residential units facing the subject rail line will experience an exterior noise level of 52.8 dBA CNEL at 110 feet from the railroad tracks and noise levels will be below the applicable standard. This impact is considered less than significant.

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: Noise Impact Analysis (Appendix K).

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.

**Train Vibration**

The vibration impact will vary depending on the speed of the train and the respective distance to the sensitive receiver location. Train speed is based on the U.S. DOT Crossing inventory form for 810990D and indicates typical speed range is 5-10 mph. The vibration impact will be approximately 64 VdB at 100 feet from centerline of track. The vibration standard set by the FTA for infrequent events in a residential land use is 80 VdB. According to the FTA Manual, up to 30 events could occur per day without exceeding the vibration threshold. The impact is considered less than significant.

### 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.

*Source: Noise Impact Analysis (Appendix K).*

**Impact Analysis**

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

Refer to PPP 3.12-1 and PPP 3.12-2 under Issue 3.12(a) above.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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 through NOI-3, 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 Impact Analysis (Appendix K).*

**Impact Analysis**

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

Refer to PPP 3.12-1 and PPP 3.12-2 under Issue 3.12(a) above.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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.*

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*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, 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 forty-eight (48) 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 161 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 Canal Street, Opal, Street and Pacific Avenue.

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 Glen Avon Fire Station No. 18, an existing station located at an existing station located approximately 1.4 miles northeast of the Project site at 7545 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, 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.
The Project proposes forty-eight (48) 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.

**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, the Project proposes forty-eight (48) 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 161 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 forty-eight (48) 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 161 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. Project Application Materials.*
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

For purposes of determining the significance of traffic impacts, the City relies upon the County of Riverside Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines which contains the following significance criteria:

1) When existing traffic conditions exceed the General Plan target Level of Service (LOS).

2) When project traffic, when added to existing traffic will deteriorate the LOS to below the target LOS, and impacts cannot be mitigated through project conditions of approval.

3) When cumulative traffic exceeds the target LOS, and impacts cannot be mitigated through the TUMF network (or other funding mechanism), project conditions of approval, or other implementation mechanisms.

Table 12 below shows the Level of Service (LOS) Thresholds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service (LOS)</th>
<th>Signalized Intersection</th>
<th>Unsignalized Intersection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>≤10 seconds</td>
<td>≤10 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10–20 seconds</td>
<td>10–15 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20–35 seconds</td>
<td>15–25 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35–55 seconds</td>
<td>25–35 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>55–80 seconds</td>
<td>35–50 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;80 seconds</td>
<td>&gt;50 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: County of Riverside Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines
Study Area Intersections

The following study intersections were included in the analysis as shown on Table 13.

Table 13. Study Area Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection ID #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Opal Street (NS) at Canal Street (EW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pacific Avenue (NS) at Canal Street (EW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pacific Avenue (NS) at Mission Boulevard (EW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Project Access Street B (NS) at Canal Street (EW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pacific Avenue (NS) at Project Access Street A (EW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Traffic Impact Study(Appendix L)

Traffic Scenarios Analyzed

The Traffic Impact Study prepared for the Project examined the following scenarios:

1) Existing Conditions.
2) Project Opening Year (2019).
3) Project Opening Year (2019) with Cumulative Conditions.

Trip Generation

The proposed Project is projected to generate approximately 457 trip-ends per day with 36 total vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 48 total vehicles per hour during the PM peak hour.

Scenario #1: Existing Traffic Conditions

Under existing conditions, all study intersections are operating at satisfactory Levels of Service C or better.

Scenario #2: Project Opening Year (2019)

For Project Opening Year traffic conditions, the study area intersections are projected to operate within acceptable Levels of Service C or better during the peak hours.

Scenario #3: Project Opening Year (2019) with Cumulative Conditions

For Opening Year With Cumulative Developments traffic conditions, the study area intersections are projected to operate within acceptable Levels of Service D or better during the peak hours.

Summary

The study area intersections are projected to operate within acceptable Levels of Service consistent with City standards as shown in Table 14 below.
Table 14. Summary of Intersection Level of Service (LOS) and Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Conditions</td>
<td>Project Opening Year (2019)</td>
<td>Project Opening Year (2019) with Cumulative Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection #</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1: Opal Street (NS) at Canal Street (EW)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Pacific Avenue (NS) at Canal Street (EW)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Pacific Avenue (NS) at Mission Boulevard (EW)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Project Access Street B (NS) at Canal Street (EW)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Avenue (NS) at Project Access Street A (EW)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Traffic Impact Study (Appendix L)

As shown in Table 14, the study intersections are currently operating at an acceptable Level of Service (LOS D or better) for Existing Conditions and are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable Level of Service for the future analysis scenarios. Based on City of Jurupa Valley established thresholds of significance, the proposed Project is forecast to not result in a significant traffic impact at the study intersections for any of the evaluated analysis scenarios. As such, no mitigation measures are required for the proposed Project.

Pacific Avenue Roadway Segment Level of Service Analysis

A roadway segment analysis has been prepared for Pacific Avenue between Mission Boulevard and Canal Street. Based on the Traffic Impact Study prepared for the Project, for all three scenarios analyzed (Existing Conditions, Project Opening Year (2019), and Project Opening Year (2019) with Cumulative Conditions) the roadway segment is forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS (LOS A) for all scenarios analyzed.

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 that 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 Opal Street,
Canal Street, and Pacific Avenue. 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: Traffic Impact Study (Appendix L).*

### 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.

There are no roadways affected by the Project that are identified as part of the Riverside CMP System according to Exhibit 2-1 of the *2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program, December 14, 2011*. As such, Project traffic will not result in significant direct and cumulatively considerable impacts to the 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.

The following will be included as part of the conditions of approval for this Project:

- The intersection of Pacific Avenue (NS) and C Street (EW) shall be modified to provide curb returns in ultimate location to provide northbound left turn lane and the following geometries:
  a) Northbound: One left turn lane, one through lane.
  b) Southbound: One shared through/right lane.
  c) Eastbound: One shared left/right turn lane.
  d) Westbound: N/A.

- The intersection of A Street (NS) and C Street (EW) shall be modified to provide a yield sign controlled intersection on A Street and the following:
  a) Northbound: N/A
  b) Southbound: One shared left/right turn lane.
  c) Eastbound: One shared through/right lane.
  d) Westbound: One shared through/right lane.
The intersection of B Street (NS) and Canal Street (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on B Street and the following:

a) Northbound: One shared left/right turn lane.
b) Southbound: N/A.
c) Eastbound: One shared through/right lane.
d) Westbound: One shared left/through lane.

The intersection of B Street (NS) and C Street (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on B Street and the following:

a) Northbound: N/A.
b) Southbound: One shared left/right lane.
c) Eastbound: One shared left/through lane.
d) Westbound: One shared through/right lane.

These improvements are standard requirements and not mitigation measures. These improvements will be constructed to meet City standards. In addition, the Project is located in a residential area. 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 forty-eight (48) 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 Opal Street, Canal Street, and Pacific 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></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>Yes</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 Study (Appendix F), 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.

The Cultural Resources Study prepared for the Project (Appendix F) indicates that no cultural resources that are eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

A review of historic-period aerial photographs revealed that the Sunnyslope Channel includes a mix of both modern (less than 50 years old) and historic-age (more than 50 years old) branches. The modern branch of the Sunnyslope Channel was constructed in 1980 and runs north-south between eastern and western portions of the Project site. The modern portion of the Sunnyslope Channel is not a Historical Resource as defined by CEQA.
The installation of a box culvert and removal and replacement of 125 feet of channel bottom would require excavation into the historic-age portion of the Sunnyslope Channel. This historic-age segment of the Sunnyslope Channel was evaluated as not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources under any criteria and is not a Historical Resource for the purposes of CEQA.

Based on the above, there are no resources 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). As such, there is no impact and no mitigation measures are required. (Also refer to analysis under Cultural Resources, Issue 3.5(a).

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: AB 52 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 – Kizh Nation
- Soboba Band Luiseño Indians
- Torres Martinez Band of Cahuilla Indians.

The Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation and the Soboba Band Luiseño Indians requested consultation and indicated that tribal cultural resources could be present on the site. As a result the AB52 consultation process, the following mitigation measure is required:

**Mitigation Measure (MM)**

**MM- TCR-1: Native American Monitoring, Treatment of Discoveries, and Disposition of Discoveries.**

**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.

**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 City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department, the Eastern Information Center, and the appropriate Native American Tribe.

**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:

a) 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.

b) 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.

c) 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.

d) 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.
### 3.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<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 Canal Street, Opal Street and Pacific Avenue. 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 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.*

Onsite runoff will be conveyed in the street and collected at catch basins provided at critical points to avoid gutter flow depths exceeding top of curb for 10-year flows or right-of-way for 100-year flows. Offsite flows from the northwest end of the project will be intercepted and conveyed with a proposed Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District *Master Drainage Plan* storm drain pipe to the existing Sunnyslope Channel. Existing runoff on the westerly side of Opal Street will continue to be conveyed by the street towards an existing drainage swale that runs adjacent to Project site and the State Route 60 Freeway. From there the runoff will be collected by the existing drainage inlet and outlets to the Sunnyslope Channel. Treatment of first flush waters from the development will be accomplished by routing them through the proposed on-site water quality basins.

Proposed “C” Street will be constructed across the Sunnyslope Channel. Improvements include constructing a box culvert that would entail removing a section of the flood control side walls and installing cast in place walls and top. Along with the box culvert, some remedial grading will be done to regrade portions of the access roads that exist on each side of the channel. Concurrent with the storm drain construction, sewer and water facilities will be installed under the box culvert. The reinforced concrete box culvert and associated transition walls are within the existing Sunnyslope channel. Construction of the box culvert and associated transitions walls will include the removal of approximately 7,000 square feet of the existing channel. This will also include the removal and replacement of approximately 250 feet of the existing Sunnyslope channel bottom. Additionally, the Sunnyslope Channel concrete junction structure would be reconstructed as an underground concrete junction structure. Sequanota, RCFCD and the City will also construct a 36” storm drain line (with accompanying inlet structures) at total of 1150 linear feet from the intersection of Canal Street and Opal Street, south approximately 500 feet within the Opal Street ROW, then east in the Street “C” ROW approximately 650 feet to connect to the reinforced concrete box culvert.

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.*

Water service would 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 161 residents. Based on the 208 gpcd, the Project would result in an estimated water demand of 9,984 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.

The District issued a “Will Serve” letter dated March 13, 2018. The Will Serve letter does not guarantee that the District will provide water to serve the Project, but rather is an indicator that the District has the potential to provide water provided that fees are paid and water improvements are constructed per the District’s standards.

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.*

**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.

Sanitary sewer service to the Project site would be provided by the Rubidoux Community Services District (“District”). The District purchases treatment capacity at the Riverside Water Quality Control Plant (RWQCP), which is located on Acorn 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.

Based on a wastewater generation factor of 96.6 gallons per day per capita obtained from the Riverside Wastewater Collection and Treatment Facilities Integrated Mater Plan (Table 3.4), the Project is estimated to generate a wastewater treatment demand of 4,637 gallons per day (161 residents x 96.6 gallons per day per capita = 4,637 gallons per day) or 3.65 acre feet per year. This represents 0.15 percent of anticipated wastewater treatment volumes in 2020.
The District issued a “Will Serve” letter dated March 13, 2018. The Will Serve letter does not guarantee that the District will provide sewer service for the Project, but rather is an indicator that the District has the potential to provide sewer service provided that fees are paid and sewer improvements are constructed per the District’s standards.

Based on the above analysis, impacts are 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.**

*Sources: Riverside County Waste Management, Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details,*

**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 56.1 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 28.08 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 14.02 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-6, 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-6, CR-1 through CR-4, NOI- through NOI-3, 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 through and NOI-3 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:  Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, Change of Zone No. 17003 (MA 17009)

DATE:  June 27 2018

PROJECT MANAGER:  Rocio Lopez, Senior Planner

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:  The Project is a proposed subdivision of a combined 10.4-acre property for future residential development, which will include the subdivision of the project area into 48 residential lots, 2 lettered lots for drainage facilities, and the construction of associated on-site and off-site infrastructure. Lot sizes range from 6,000 square feet to 11,734 square feet. A Change of Zone to the City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) is also proposed.

PROJECT LOCATION:  The Project is located on the southeast corner of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60 Freeway and east of Pacific Avenue. The Project site is identified by Assessor Parcel Numbers: 177-130-007 and 177-142-018.

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.
### MITIGATION MEASURE (MM)
### PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP)
### PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>AESTHETICS</strong></th>
<th><strong>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</strong></th>
<th><strong>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</strong></th>
<th><strong>VERIFIED BY:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.1-1</strong> As required by Municipal Code Section 9.199.040.C, one (1) family residences shall not exceed forty (40) feet in height. No other building or structure shall exceed fifty (50) feet in height, unless a greater height is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.370. In no event, however, shall a building or structure exceed seventy-five (75) feet in height, unless a variance is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.270.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>AIR QUALITY</strong></th>
<th><strong>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</strong></th>
<th><strong>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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 work is done for..." | Engineering Department | 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the day.”</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and Project site areas are reduced to 15 miles per hour or less.”</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.3-2</strong> 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.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>During construction and on-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.3-3</strong> 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:</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department Engineering Department Planning Department</td>
<td>During construction and on-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ”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).”</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.3-4</strong> 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.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.3-5</strong> 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.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PDF 3.3-1</strong> As required by the Project’s Conditions of Approval, residential dwelling units within 500 feet of the SR-60 Freeway shall be required to install high</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MITIGATION MEASURE (MM)
**PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP)**
**PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)**

| Efficiency | Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) filters of MERV 13 or better as indicated by the American Society of Heating Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers ASHRAE Standard 52.2, in the intake of ventilation systems. Heating, air conditioning and ventilation (HVAC) systems shall be installed with a fan unit power designed to force air through the MERV 13 filter. | Planning Department | | |

### BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

#### 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.

**MM-BIO-1: 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:

1. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies no burrowing owls in the impact area, a grading permit may be issued without restriction.
2. 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 will occur as follows:}

<p>| Planning Department | Prior to the issuance of a grading permit | Planning Department | Prior to the issuance of a grading permit |</p>
<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM BIO-2. Coordination With USACE, CDFW, and RWQCB.</strong> 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 to positively determine whether or not either agency wishes to exert jurisdiction of the onsite drainage feature. If either agency decides to exert jurisdiction, Mitigation Measures BIO-3 and BIO-4 shall be implemented.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-3. CDFW Jurisdiction.</strong> If state jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-2, 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. 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 at a ratio of not less than 1:1 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.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-4. Federal Jurisdiction.</strong> If federal jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-2, the following shall be implemented: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall obtain a Clean Water Act Section 404 Nationwide Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and compensate for the loss of more than 0.1 acre of wetlands and 1,278 lineal feet of streambed channel, and a Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification from the Los Angeles Regional Water</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality Control Board. 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.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Nesting Bird Survey.** As a condition of approval for all grading permits, vegetation clearing and ground disturbance shall be prohibited during the migratory bird nesting season (February 1 through October 1), unless a migratory bird nesting survey is completed in accordance with the following requirements:

- A migratory nesting bird survey of the Project’s impact footprint shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three business (3) days prior to initiating vegetation clearing or ground disturbance.

- A copy of the migratory nesting bird survey results report shall be provided to the City of Jurupa Planning Department. If the survey identifies the presence of active nests, then the qualified biologist shall provide the Planning Department with a copy of maps showing the location of all nests and an appropriate buffer zone around each nest sufficient to protect the nest from direct and indirect impact. The size and location of all buffer zones, if required, shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Department and shall be no less than a 300-foot radius around the nest for non-raptors and a 500-foot radius around the nest for raptors. The nests and buffer zones shall be field checked weekly by a qualified biological monitor. The approved buffer zone shall be marked in the field with construction fencing, within which no vegetation clearing or ground disturbance shall commence until the qualified biologist and Planning Department verify that the nests are no longer occupied and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests.

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control Board. 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.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Nesting Bird Survey.</strong> As a condition of approval for all grading permits, vegetation clearing and ground disturbance shall be prohibited during the migratory bird nesting season (February 1 through October 1), unless a migratory bird nesting survey is completed in accordance with the following requirements:</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to recordation of the Final Map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Prior to the removal of any trees, the issuance of a grading permit, or approval of a Site Development Permit, whichever comes first, a Tree Removal and Planting and Monitoring Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department that demonstrates that the following will be implemented:

1). The trees along Opal Street and Canal Street, identified in the Tree Survey prepared by BrightView Design Group, April 24, (Appendix D of the Initial Study Checklist for MA 17009) shall be replaced at a 3:1 ratio with an approved species as determined by the City’s Planning Department. Tree selection must be at least 15-gallon purchased from quality nursery stock. This number of trees is above the number identified in the Project’s Landscape Plan”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTURAL RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM- CR-1: Archaeological Monitoring.</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Department</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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 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 |
| **Engineering Department** | **During grading** |
## MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM-CR-3: Paleontological Monitoring</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>During grading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM-CR-4: Paleontological Treatment Plan</td>
<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 the find a local qualified repository, and preparation of a report summarizing the find.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit or as otherwise determined by the Planning Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.5-1</td>
<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>Planning Department</td>
<td>During grading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GEOLOGY AND SOILS
| 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. | Building & Safety Department | Prior to the issuance of building permits |
| PPP’s 3.91-1 through PPP 3.9-4 in Section 3.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality* shall apply. | Engineering Department | Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and during operation |

**GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

| 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. | Building & Safety Department | Prior to the issuance of building permits |
| 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. | Building & Safety Department | Prior to the issuance of building permits |
| 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*. | Building & Safety Department | Prior to the issuance of building permits |

**HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

| 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. | Fire Department | Prior to the issuance of building permits |

**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**
<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>
<tbody>
<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>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permits</td>
<td></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>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during construction</td>
<td></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: (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</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during operation</td>
<td></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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</th>
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<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>During operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
promulgated thereto, and any related administrative orders or permits issued in connection therewith.

<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>

**NOISE**

**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.

| Building & Safety Department | Prior to the issuance of a building permit |

**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.

| Building & Safety Department | During operation |

**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.”

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure NOI-2. Sound Walls:</strong> Prior to issuance of building permits, a final noise study based on final precise grading plan elevations shall be prepared by a qualified acoustician and approved by the City to validate appropriate noise barrier heights, locations, and construction materials. Sound walls are required around all habitable exterior backyard and sideyard areas for all lots (See Exhibit C of Noise Impact Analysis, Appendix K of this Initial Study Checklist) for specific wall heights and locations. All required noise barriers shall be designed to reduce noise levels to below 65 dBA CNEL within private exterior areas (i.e., backyards) of residential lots. The noise barriers may consist of any material (block, tempered glass, earthen berm, etc.) or combination of materials that achieves the required noise attenuation and shall have no decorative cutouts or other line-of-sight openings between shielded areas and the noise source (adjacent roadway). Prior to issuance of building permits, the City of Jurupa Valley shall review and approve the noise barrier design, placement, and materials to ensure that the required level of sound attenuation will be achieved.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Mitigation Measure NOI-3 Interior Noise Analysis:** Prior to issuance of any residential building permit, an interior noise analysis shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department demonstrating that proposed building materials will achieve interior noise levels less than 45 dBA CNEL. Measures that would facilitate compliance with the 45dBA CNEL interior noise standard include, but are not limited to:

a) A “windows closed” condition is required to meet interior noise standards for all homes. | Planning Department Building & Safety Department | Prior to issuance of any residential building permit | |
<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Upgraded windows and sliding glass doors are required on all homes. See Tables 5 and 6 of Noise Impact Analysis, Appendix K of this Initial Study Checklist for specific STC requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Attic and roof vents that directly face the SR-60, if applicable, shall include an acoustical baffle to prevent vehicle noise intrusion. See Exhibits D and E of Noise Impact Analysis, Appendix K of this Initial Study Checklist for examples acoustical baffles. The contractor may install similar measures to provide noise reduction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) For proper acoustical performance, all exterior windows, doors, and sliding glass doors must have a positive seal and leaks/cracks must be kept to a minimum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC SERVICES**

**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.  

Fire Department  

Prior to issuance of a building permit or occupancy permit

**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.

Building & Safety Department  

Per Municipal Code Chapter 3.75

**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.

Building & Safety Department  

Prior to the issuance of building permits

**PPP 3.14-4** 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.

Building & Safety Department  

Prior to the issuance of building permits
TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<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>
<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).</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></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>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM- TCR-1: Native American Monitoring, Treatment of Discoveries, and Disposition of Discoveries.</strong></td>
<td>Planning Department Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and during grading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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(s) 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.

**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.

**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:

a) 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
MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) 
PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) 
PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF) 
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</tr>
</thead>
</table>

been completed.

b) 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.

c) 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.

d) 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.

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

**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.

| Building & Safety Department | Prior to the issuance of building permits |
DATE: NOVEMBER 15, 2018

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

FROM: GARY THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER
BY: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 15.A

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER CHANGE OF ZONE (CZ) NO. 17003 FROM R-1 (ONE FAMILY DWELLINGS) TO R-4 (PLANNED RESIDENTIAL) AND NOTICE OF PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION TO APPROVE MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 17099 (TPM37211) A PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT FOR NOTICING THE ADVISORY AGENCY’S (PLANNING COMMISSION) DECISION OF APPROVING A SUBDIVISION OF A PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE SEC OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60 FWY AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE, APNS: 177-130-007 & 177-142-018 (APPLICANT: SEQUANATA PARTNERS, LP)

RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2018-74, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR A PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION (“SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS”) (48 UNITS) LOCATED ON 10.4 ACRES AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018)

2) That the City Council conduct a first reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2018-13, entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY OFFICIAL ZONING MAP CHANGING THE ZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007,
177-142-018) FROM ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (R-4) ZONE, AND MAKING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

3) That the City Council receive and file the Notice of Decision, initiating the commencement of a ten-day appeal period for Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211.

BACKGROUND

On October 24, 2018, the Planning Commission held a public hearing and, on a 5-0 vote, took the following actions:

(1) Adopted Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01, recommending that the City Council (1) adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and (2) approve Change of Zone No. 17003; and

(2) Adopted Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02, (1) adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, (2) approving an Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Title 7 (Subdivisions) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, (3) approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and (4) approving a Development Plan to permit a planned residential development consisting of a 48-lot subdivision on a combined 10.4 gross acre site.

LOCATION

As shown on Exhibit 1, the project site is located north of State Route (SR) 60, east of Pacific Avenue, and southeast of Canal and Opal Streets. The property is surrounded by single-family homes to the east and west, State Route (SR) 60 to the south and Union Pacific Railroad to the north. Beyond the railroad tracks are industrial land uses. Exhibit 1 provides an aerial view of the project site. Exhibit 2 provides the existing General Plan Land Use (GPLU) designations and zoning of the site and surrounding parcels.

EXHIBIT 1: SITE LOCATION MAP
PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS

The Applicant ("Applicant" or "Sequonota Partners, LP"), requests approval of Change of Zone No. 17003 to change the existing zoning from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) to allow the development of the combined 10.4 acre property into 48 single-family residential lots with minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet; two (2) water quality basin lots (Lot A & B) and three (3) lettered street lots (A-C). The existing General Plan land use designation of MDR (Medium Density Residential) will remain unchanged. The project’s community name is "Sequonota Heights".

As the property is currently zoned R-1 (One Family Dwellings), the minimum required lot size is 7,200 square feet, with a minimum average lot width of 60 feet and a minimum average lot depth of 100 feet. Since the project proposes lot sizes ranging from 6,000 to 11,734 square feet, with a few lots proposed with less than the average lot width and average lot depth, the project will require a Change of Zone from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) to accommodate the lots which do not meet the R-1 zone development standards.

A summary of the existing General Plan land use and existing zoning designations for the project site and surrounding properties is provided in Table 1 and maps are provided under Exhibit 2.

TABLE 1: EXISTING AND SURROUNDING GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>State Route 60 Freeway</td>
<td>State Route 60 Freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac and Highest Density Residential (HHDR)</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City of Jurupa Valley General Plan Land Use and Zoning Map
GENERAL PLAN

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MDR)

The MDR land use designation provides for the development of detached single-family dwellings on parcels typically ranging from 5,500 to 20,000 square feet. The density range is from 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre, with a minimum lot size of 5,500 square feet to encourage clustering.

The project is consistent with applicable policies of the MDR land use and density level, which permits 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre. Under the current land use designation, up to 52 dwelling units are permitted. The project proposes 48 residential lots at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density.

ZONING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

R-1 ZONE (ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS)

The subject property is located within the R-1 zone and is subject to Section 9.55.020 (Development Standards), which states that the lot area of any parcel/lot shall not be less than 7,200 square feet with a minimum average lot width of 60 feet and a minimum average lot depth of 100 feet.

The Applicant proposes to subdivide the 10.4-acre parcel into 48 lots as defined in Table 3.
TABLE 2: LOT SUMMARY TABLE (NET AREA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT NO.</th>
<th>AREA (SF)</th>
<th>AVG. WIDTH</th>
<th>AVG. DEPTH</th>
<th>LOT NO.</th>
<th>AREA (SF)</th>
<th>AVG. WIDTH</th>
<th>AVG. DEPTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>65'</td>
<td>103'</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,170</td>
<td>59'</td>
<td>108'</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,853</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>127'</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,623</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>123'</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,441</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>118'</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,001</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>108'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,127</td>
<td>73'</td>
<td>121'</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6,360</td>
<td>54'</td>
<td>111'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,909</td>
<td>63'</td>
<td>121'</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6,210</td>
<td>62'</td>
<td>102'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7,606</td>
<td>66'</td>
<td>113'</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6,970</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>120'</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11,226</td>
<td>52'</td>
<td>154'</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6,252</td>
<td>52'</td>
<td>111'</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6,520</td>
<td>61'</td>
<td>108'</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7,176</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>118'</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6,949</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>115'</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6,035</td>
<td>59'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7,183</td>
<td>58'</td>
<td>112'</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6,188</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>117'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6,419</td>
<td>54'</td>
<td>98'</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6,340</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>105'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6,035</td>
<td>54'</td>
<td>102'</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6,493</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>108'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6,069</td>
<td>59'</td>
<td>102'</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6,645</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>59'</td>
<td>109'</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6,225</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>113'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6,158</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>112'</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6,938</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>115'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6,849</td>
<td>54'</td>
<td>120'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the majority of the proposed lots are less than the minimum development standard requirements within the R-1 zone, the applicant is requesting a Change of Zone to change the existing zone classification to R-4 (Planned Residential).

**R-4 ZONE (PLANNED RESIDENTIAL)**

According to Section 9.100.030, the R-4 zone shall not be applied to any area containing less than nine (9) acres. The subject site contains a combined 10.4 acres and is therefore qualified to be rezoned to R-4 with an approved Development Plan.

Pursuant to Section 9.100.050 (Subdivision and development plan requirements), before any structure is erected or use established in the R-4 Zone, there shall be a subdivision map recorded and a development plan approved as set forth in Section 9.100.060. The Planning Commission approved Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 and the Development Plan via Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02. The applicant intends to record the map and sell the entitled project to a home builder for future development.
LAND USE COMPATIBILITY

The proposed R-4 (Planned Residential) zone will enable the subdivision of a combined 10.4 acre parcel into 48 single family residential lots ranging in size from 6,000 to 11,734 square feet. While adjacent property is zoned R-1 (One Family Dwellings) with single family residential development, the lots sizes of 7,200 square feet are compatible with the proposed R-4 (Planned Residential) zone minimum lot sizes.

The development of a 48-lot single family housing tract, with attractive architecture, landscaping and new public right-of-way improvements will serve to increase the overall property values in this neighborhood and create a cohesive and compatible land use and zoning environment.

Exhibit 3 depicts the existing and proposed zoning for the subject property:

**EXHIBIT 3: EXISTING AND PROPOSED ZONING**

![Existing Zoning Exhibit](image)

![Proposed Change of Zone Exhibit](image)

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

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. 5 requires all the mitigation measures of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to be as conditions.

The Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration dated June 27, 2018, Attachment 2 (b), contains an analysis of the traffic noise impacts from SR-60 on future residents of the project. Subsequent to the preparation and circulation of the Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration, staff inquired of the City Attorney if it was required to include such an analysis in the CEQA documentation in light of the CBIA v. Bay Area Air Quality Mgmt. Dist. 62 Cal. 4th 369 (2015). In that case, the California Supreme Court determined that with limited exceptions, CEQA requires only that the lead agency analyze the proposed project’s impacts on the environment – not the impacts of the existing environment on potential future users/residents of a proposed project.

As it applies to this project, for the purposes of CEQA, the analysis must focus on the noise added by the project to the noise levels at existing sensitive receptors in the area (e.g., nearby existing residences, schools, etc.). The analysis for CEQA purposes should not analyze the existing environmental noise (i.e. SR-60 Freeway) on the future residents of the project, unless there is substantial evidence that the project will have impacts that would actually exacerbate an existing condition. The analysis shows that the project will not exacerbate an existing condition (i.e. adding significant amounts of traffic to SR-60 Freeway thus increasing noise levels).

Therefore, the noise analysis with respect to the noise impacts form the SR-60 Freeway in the Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration is to be considered for informational purposes only under CEQA and Mitigation Measure NOI-2-Sound Walls and Mitigation Measure NOI-3 -Interior Noise Analysis do not apply to the project for CEQA purposes.

However, analyzing the noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway on the future residents of the project is necessary for the land use approvals required for the project. As such, the City is addressing the noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway to the future residents as part of the land use entitlement process and is conditioning the project to address noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway accordingly. Please refer to the Walls and Fencing section of the October 24, 2018 Planning Commission staff report.

Public Review Period
The public review period for the environmental document began on July 5, 2018 and ended on August 3, 2018. The City did not receive any comments.

CONCLUSION
The proposed Change of Zone No. 17003 is in conformance with the General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) and is compatible with the surrounding single family land use development within the R-1 (One Family Dwellings) zone. The project will not be a detriment to the public health, safety and welfare and is conditionally compatible with the present and future logical development of the area. Furthermore, the addition of 48 residential units complies with the City’s Housing Element Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) inventory.

The new single family residential development will serve to revitalize the underutilized parcel and visually improve the surrounding neighborhood, and provide much needed housing to the community as well as foster an increase in property values.

All required findings for approval have been affirmatively determined and staff therefore recommends that the City Council adopt Resolution 2018-74 and conduct a first reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2018-13.

Per the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Title 7 – Subdivisions, Section 7.15.230. -Expiration of Approved Tentative Maps and Vesting Tentative Maps—Extension of Time, the decision of the Planning Commission to extend a Tentative Tract Map shall be forwarded to the City Council as a consent calendar item. The decision of the Planning Commission shall be final unless the decision is appealed to the City Council. Such appeal must be filed with the City Clerk within 10 days of the date that the notice of decision appears on the City Council’s Agenda.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

There are no financial impacts associated with the notice of decision or the Change of Zone as the Applicant has covered all associated costs for processing.

ALTERNATIVES

1. That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2018-74 and conduct the first reading and introduce Ordinance no. 2018-13 to allow the Change of Zone (CZ No. 17003) from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) for property located at the SEC of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60 Freeway and east of Pacific Avenue, APNS: 177-130-007 & 177-142-018 (the recommended action)

2. That the City Council receive and file the notice of decision.

3. Provide alternative direction to staff.
Prepared by:

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director

Submitted by:

Gary Thompson
City Manager

Reviewed by:

Peter M. Thorson
City Attorney

Reviewed by:

George A. Wentz
Deputy City Manager

ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution No. 2018-74
   a) Exhibit A: Initial Study Checklist / Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
2. Ordinance No. 2018-13
   a) Exhibit A: Change of Zone Exhibit
   a) Exhibit A: Conditions of Approval (located at end of both PC Resos)
   b) Exhibit B: Initial Study Checklist / Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (same as Attachment No. 1a)
4. October 24, 2018 Planning Commission Staff Report (without exhibits)
5. Radius Map showing 1,000 foot radius from project boundaries
6. Development Plan workbook
7. Tentative Tract Map No. 32711 and Development Plan (Sheets 1-2)
8. Architectural Set of Plans
9. Conceptual Landscape Plans (Wall/Fence and Maintenance Plan included)
ATTACHMENT NO. 5
Excerpt of the November 15, 2018 City Council Minutes
EXCERPT OF THE NOVEMBER 15, 2018 MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE JURUPA VALLEY CITY COUNCIL

15. PUBLIC HEARING

A. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER CHANGE OF ZONE (CZ) NO. 17003 FROM R-1 (ONE FAMILY DWELLING) TO R-4 (PLANNED RESIDENTIAL) AND NOTICE OF PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION TO APPROVE MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 17099 (TPM 37211) A PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT FOR NOTICING THE ADVISORY AGENCY’S (PLANNING COMMISSION) DECISION OF APPROVING A SUBDIVISION OF A PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE SEC OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60 FWY AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE, APNS: 177-130-007 & 177-142-018 (APPLICANT: SEQUANATA PARTNERS, LP)

Rocio Lopez, Senior Planner, presented the staff report.

Thomas Merrell, Planning Director, provided additional information and responded to Council's questions.

Mayor Goodland opened the public hearing and called for any public comments.

Paul Onufer, representing Sequanota Partners, LP, (Applicant) spoke in support of the project and gave an overview of the project's density, landscaping, and planned improvements.

Further discussion followed.

Council Member Roughton thanked the developer for building such an attractive development and for adding a sufficient number of single-story homes.

Further discussion followed.

Mayor Pro Tem Berkson stated that he was concerned with three of the lots that have less than 15-foot rear yards.

Council Member Kelly voiced concern that from a few of the homes, there will be a view of a block wall looking south. He stated that he would have preferred that the development had fewer homes.

Mr. Onufer (Applicant) stated that the existing view is a view of the freeway. He noted that in designing the project, they went through various configurations and street designs and one of the reasons that Street C runs parallel to the freeway is to locate the homes further away from the freeway for sound attenuation. He stated that the block wall includes intensive landscaping that slopes up to the freeway which includes an additional sound wall.

Council Member Lauritzen noted that in a “perfect world” homeowners always have a perfect view; however, the reality is that this project is an infill project and the developer must work within existing constraints. He stated that the development will help revitalize the existing community and the developer is creating a project that will offer very nice amenities.
Mayor Pro Tem Berkson voiced concern that there are no parks for the residents. He suggested adding a walking path near one of the detention basins.

Further discussion followed.

Mayor Goodland voiced concern that this project will include some lots that are less than 7,000 square feet and it is too dense. He suggested that the developer possibly reduce the number of homes to allow for larger lots.

Mayor Pro Tem Berkson voiced concern that most of the lots are 6,000 square feet.

There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed.

A motion was made by Council Member Lauritzen, seconded by Council Member Roughton, to receive and file the Notice of Decision, initiating the commencement of a ten-day appeal period for Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211; adopt Resolution No. 2018-74 and introduce Ordinance No. 2018-13, entitled:

RESOLUTION NO. 2018-74 - A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR A PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION (“SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS”) (48 UNITS) LOCATED ON 10.4 ACRES AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018); AND

ORDINANCE NO. 2018-13 - AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY OFFICIAL ZONING MAP CHANGING THE ZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) FROM ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (R-4) ZONE, AND MAKING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

Ayes: Lauritzen, Roughton / Noes: Berkson, Goodland, Kelly / Absent: None

MOTION FAILED.
STAFF REPORT

DATE: DECEMBER 6, 2018
TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER
BY: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR
SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 8.A

SEQUANATA PARTNERS, LP PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60 FWY AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE ("PROPERTY")—REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCE NO. 2018-13, CHANGING THE ZONE OF THIS PROPERTY FROM ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (R-4) AND SET THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE RECONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE NO. 2018-13 AND THE APPEAL OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION’S DECISION TO APPROVE TENTATIVE TRACT MAP FOR TRACT 37211 FOR THIS PROPERTY (AT REQUEST OF MAYOR GOODLAND)

RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council discuss whether to reconsider the Council action of November 15, 2018 to not approve introduction of Ordinance No. 2018-13, changing the zone of the Property from one (1) family dwellings zone (R-1) to planned residential zone (R-4).

2) If the Council wishes to reconsider the introduction of Ordinance No. 2018-13, then Mayor Goodland, Mayor Pro Tem Berkson, or Council Member Kelley, as the Council Members on the prevailing side, should make the following motion: “I move to reconsider the introduction of Ordinance No. 2018-13 which was previously considered by the Council on November 15, 2018.”

3) If the motion to reconsider is adopted, any Council Member should make the following motion: “I move to set the public hearing on the introduction of proposed Ordinance No. 2018-13 and the appeal filed by Mayor Goodland of the Planning Commission’s approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 for the Property for January 17, 2019 during the regular Council Meeting.”
BACKGROUND

At the November 15, 2018 City Council meeting, MA17099, a rezone for a proposed residential subdivision and notice of Planning Commission approval of a tentative tract map, was denied by a 3-2 vote. Mayor Goodland, who voted with the prevailing side to deny the rezone, has requested an agenda item for the Council to reconsider the denial or the rezone. The November 15, 2018 staff report for this item is attached.

Given the Council’s concerns expressed on November 15th, The Mayor has also filed an appeal of the Tentative Map so that all approvals are before the Council and any changes agreed to by the Developer can be incorporated into the Tentative Map. Mayor Goodland can appeal given that he has requested reconsideration of the vote on the introduction of the Zone Change Ordinance.

Mayor Goodland’s appeal form is attached.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

There are no financial impacts associated with the Notice of Decision or the Change of Zone as the Applicant has covered all associated costs for processing.

ALTERNATIVES

1. That the City Council:
   a. Discuss whether to reconsider the Council action of November 15, 2018 to not approve introduction of Ordinance No. 2018-13, changing the zone of the Property from one (1) family dwellings zone (R-1) to planned residential zone (R-4).
   b. If the Council wishes to reconsider the introduction of Ordinance No. 2018-13, the Mayor Goodland, Mayor Pro Tem Berkson, or Council Member Kelley, as the Council Members on the prevailing side, should make the following motion: “I move to reconsider the introduction of Ordinance No. 2018-13 which was previously considered by the Council on November 15, 2018.”
   c. If the motion to reconsider is adopted, any Council Member should make the following motion: “I move to set the public hearing on the introduction of proposed Ordinance No. 2018-13 and the appeal by Mayor Goodland of the Planning Commission’s approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 for the Property for January 17, 2019 during the regular Council Meeting.

2. Provide alternative direction to staff.
Prepared by:

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director

Reviewed by:

[Signature]
Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Reviewed by:

[Signature]
George A. Wentz
Deputy City Manager

Submitted by:

[Signature]
Gary S. Thompson
City Manager

Reviewed by:

[Signature]
Peter M. Thorson
City Attorney

Attachments:

1. Appeal submitted by Mayor Goodland
2. Letter from Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
3. November 15, 2018 City Council staff report for MA17099
ATTACHMENT NO. 7

Excerpt of the Draft December 6, 2018 City Council Minutes
8. COUNCIL RECONSIDERATION

A. SEQUANATA PARTNERS, LP PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60 FWY AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (“PROPERTY”); REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCE NO. 2018-13, CHANGING THE ZONE OF THIS PROPERTY FROM ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (R4) AND SETTING THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE RECONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE NO. 2018-13 AND THE APPEAL OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION’S DECISION TO APPROVE TENTATIVE TRACT MAP FOR TRACT 37211 FOR THIS PROPERTY (AT REQUEST OF MAYOR GOODLAND)

City Attorney Peter Thorson presented the staff report.

A motion was made by Mayor Goodland, seconded by Council Member Kelly to reconsider the introduction of Ordinance No. 2018-13.

Ayes: Berkson, Goodland, Kelly, Lauritzen, Roughton / Noes: None / Absent: None

A motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Berkson, seconded by Council Member Roughton to set the public hearing on the introduction of proposed Ordinance No. 2018-13 and the appeal by Mayor Goodland of the Planning Commission’s approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 for the January 17, 2019 Council Meeting.

Ayes: Berkson, Goodland, Kelly, Lauritzen, Roughton / Noes: None / Absent: None
ATTACHMENT NO. 8

Planning Commission Resolution Nos.
2018-10-24-01 & 2018-10-24-02
RESOLUTION NO. 2018-10-24-01

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. 17003 TO CHANGE THE ZONING CLASSIFICATION OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) FROM ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (R-4) ZONE

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

Section 1. Project. Sequanata Partners, LP (the "Applicant") has applied for Change of Zone No. 17003, Exception to Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and a Development Plan (collectively, Master Application No. 17099 or MA No. 17099) to permit a Schedule "A" subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) in the One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone and designated Medium Density Residential (MDR) (the "Project"). Change of Zone No. 17003 is the subject is this Resolution.

Section 2. Change of Zone.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Change of Zone No. 17003 to rezone 10.4 combined gross acres located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) 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. 17099 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 October 24, 2018, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 17099, 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 July 5, 2018, and expired on August 3, 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 hereby recommends that the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley find and determine that Change of Zone No. 17003 should be adopted because the proposed change of zoning classification from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and the requirements of the General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) in that the proposed Project, which proposes a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre, complies with the maximum five (5) dwelling unit per acre requirement for premises designated MDR.

Section 6. **Recommendation of Approval of Change of Zone No. 17003.** Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley approve Change of Zone No. 17003 to rezone 10.4 combined gross acres located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) 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 24th day of October, 2018.
William Hofferber
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. 2018-10-24-01 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 24th day of October, 2018, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Hofferber, Ruiz, Moore, Pruitt, Silva

NOES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

THOMAS G. MERRELL
PLANNING DIRECTOR
EXHIBIT “A”

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR MA17099 (TTM37211 & CZ17003)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. **PROJECT PERMITTED.** Master Application (MA) No. 17099: Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211, Change of Zone (CZ) No. 17003 and Exception to Section 7.10.080 (G) is for the approval to subdivide a combined 10.4 property into 48 single-family residential lots with two (2) water quality basin lots (Lot A & B) and three (3) lettered street lots (A-C). An exception to Section 7.10.080 (G) of Title 7 (Subdivisions) for double frontage lots on Lots 3-7 is also included. The property is located at the SEC of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60 Fwy and east of Pacific Avenue, APNS: 177-130-007 & 177-142-018.

2. **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 “Indemnites”) 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, 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) any 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. 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. **CONSENT TO CONDITIONS.** Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to the required conditions of approval to the Planning Director or designee.

4. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM.** Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to having received a copy of the “Applicant’s Acknowledgement of Comments and Code Information from
Internal/External Agencies”. The receipt form shall be given to the Planning Director or designee.

5. **MITIGATION MEASURES.** This project shall be subject to the mitigation measures adopted with the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) prepared for the project and included with these conditions of approval.

6. **FEES.** The approval of MA17099 (TTM37211 & CZ17003) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

7. **CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA).** This project is approved subject to the provisions of a Mitigated Negative Declaration. Within forty-eight (48) hours of final approval for this project, the owner or designee shall deliver to the Planning Department a check payable to the Riverside County Clerk in the amount of $2,330.75 (includes $50.00 County Clerk Processing Fee) or the fees that are currently in effect at the time. This will enable the City to file the Notice of Determination.

8. **COPIED 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.

9. **APPROVAL PERIOD – TENTATIVE TRACT MAP.** An approved or conditionally approved tentative tract 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 (Subdivisions). If the tentative map expires before the recordation of the final map, or any phase thereof, no recordation of the final map, or any phase thereof, shall be permitted. The variance conditionally approved in connection with this 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.

10. **CONFORMANCE TO APPROVED EXHIBITS.** The project shall be in conformance to the approved plans (listed below) with any changes in accordance to these conditions of approval:

   a. Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 (Sheets 1 and 2): prepared by Proactive Engineering Consultants West, Inc. dated 9/14/16 (Revised 3/2018) and signed by George A. Lenfestey, R.C.E.

   b. Architectural Set of Plans consisting of:
      
      i. Plan 1.2319:
         1. Elevations (A-Spanish, B-Traditional, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans

      ii. Plan 2.2401:
         1. Elevations (A-Spanish, B-Traditional, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans

      iii. Plan 3.2611:
         1. Elevations (A-Spanish, B-Traditional, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans

      iv. Plan 4.2806:
1. Elevations (A-Spanish, B-Traditional, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans
v. Plan 5.3042:
   1. Elevations (A-Spanish, C-Craftsman, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans
vi. Plan 6.3124:
   1. Elevations (A-Spanish, C-Craftsman, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans
c. Conceptual Landscape Plans (Wall/Fence and Maintenance Plan included) dated April 2017 (Revised March 2018)
d. Development Plan workbook (dated 5-24-18)

11. **ON-SITE LANDSCAPING. Prior to the issuance of any Building permit**, the applicant shall submit a “Professional Services (PROS)” application (with current fees) and the following items for Planning Director review and approval:
   
   a. The total cost estimate of landscaping, irrigation, and one-year of maintenance.
   
   b. Completed City Faithful Performance Bond for Landscape Improvements form with original signatures after the City provides the applicant with the required amount of bond.
   
   c. Completed City Landscape Agreement with original signatures after the City has reviewed the submitted cost estimate.
   
   d. Final landscape, maintenance, planting, and irrigation plans and digital copies (CD format). The plans shall include the following:
      
      i. Compliance with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Biological Resources Mitigation Measure BIO-6-Tree Preservation and Replacement.
      
      ii. Compliance with approved Development Plan.
      
      iii. Compliance with Title 9 (Planning and Zoning) landscaping requirements.
   
   e. **STREET TREES.** Street trees and related security and agreements are required pursuant to Chapter 7.55 of Title 7 (Subdivisions). Tree size, specimen and installation shall be under the direction of the Engineering Department if they are within the public right-of-way.

   Prior to the final inspection of any Building permit, the Landscape Architect of Record shall conduct an inspection and submit a letter to the City of Jurupa Valley once s/he has deemed the installation is in conformance to the approved plans. Following the inspection of the Landscape Architect of Record, the applicant shall schedule a City inspection with the City's landscape architect.

12. **MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF SOLID FENCING AND WALLS WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK.** No solid fencing or wall shall exceed 42 inches in height within the front setback. For Lots 2, 19 and 22, no SOLID walls EXCEEDING 42-INCHES IN HEIGHT shall be placed within 30 feet of the front yard area.
13. **BLOCK WALL FOR INTERIOR AND SIDE LOT LINES.** Block walls shall be used for interior side lot lines. Decorative wrought iron gates shall be used on all side gates at individual parcels.

Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a Wall and Fence plan that is consistent with this condition to the Planning Department for review and approval.

14. **GRAFFITI PROTECTION FOR WALLS.** Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit a wall plan that includes anti-graffiti coating or protection for the exterior side of all perimeter walls for City review and approval. The applicant shall remove any graffiti on the property as soon as possible. In addition, if the applicant was notified by the City, the applicant shall remove the graffiti within seven (7) days of the City’s notice.

15. **TWO-CAR GARAGE PER DWELLING UNIT.** All residential units shall have a minimum two-car garage with automatic sectional roll-up doors. No garage conversions are permitted and units must maintain two-car covered spaces at all times.

16. **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.

17. **MULTIPLE SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN MITIGATION FEE (ORD. NO. 810).** The applicant shall pay any owed fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 810. In order for the agency to determine that the project qualifies for any exemptions for any of the subject fees, the applicant needs to submit sufficient evidence to the City to demonstrate that it qualifies for the exemption.

18. **SALE OF INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS.** No structure constructed on Project site may be sold until the subject Project on which the structure is located is divided and a final map recorded in accordance with the City’s subdivision regulations such that the structure is located on a separate legally divided parcel.

19. **PROVIDE SOUND WALL ALONG THE SR-60 FREEWAY.**

   a. Applicant shall construct an approximate thirteen (13) foot high sound wall along the State Route 60 Freeway within the Caltrans right-of-way, for the length of the freeway fronting the project site, subject to procedure described below:

   i. Concurrent with City Council public hearing for the project entitlement, the Applicant shall petition the City to enter into an agreement with Caltrans for construction of the sound wall at the sole expense of the Applicant.

   ii. Upon City Council approval of above item (i), Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the City providing for (1) the payment by the Applicant to the City of all costs and expenses related to the sound wall expected to be incurred by the City, including, but not limited to, the price of third party consultants and attorney fees and (2) security for the design and construction of the sound wall by Applicant based on cost estimate for
design and construction of the sound wall reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.

iii. **Prior to Final Map**, the Applicant shall submit improvement plans for the construction of the sound wall to the City Engineer for approval and to Caltrans for the Caltrans permit.

iv. In the event that (1) the agreements and improvement plans described in subsections i), ii) or iii) are not approved and executed by the required times, or (2) the City Manager otherwise determines, in his sole discretion, that construction of the sound wall is infeasible, Applicant shall instead construct sound walls around all habitable back yard and side yard areas for all lots in accordance with the specifications provided in Exhibit C and Table 2 of the “TTM 37211 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL IMPACT STUDY” dated September 11, 2018.

b. **PRIOR TO FINAL OCCUPANCY OF LOTS 1-4, 17-24 AND 38-48**, the Caltrans permit for the sound wall shall have been issued or the City Manager must determine that construction of the sound wall is infeasible pursuant to subsection iii).

**ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT**

1. **GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (ENGINEERING)**

1.1. The use hereby conditioned is for a Schedule "A" subdivision, Tentative Tract No. 37211; being a subdivision of Lot 5, Block A, Map Book 9, Page 34, of Maps on file in SB West Riverside & Lot 3, Map Book 9, Page 34, of Maps on file in SB West Riverside; more particularly Assessor's Parcels Number APN 177-130-007 & 177-142-018; containing 10.4 acres gross, Lots "A" and "B" will be dedicated to the City of Jurupa Valley, Streets A, B and C will be dedicated to the City of Jurupa Valley for public road and utility purposes. Exhibit titled Tentative Tract No. 37211, prepared by Proactive Engineering Consultants West, INC., 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 Project proponent 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 Project proponent may be required to amend or revise the permit application.

1.4. Opal Street is a Local Road with a right-of-way width of 60 feet. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on
Opal Street along the project's frontage. The improvements include, but are not limited to, curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaped parkway and signing and striping. The Project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.5. Canal Street is considered a Frontage Road with a right-of-way width of 52 feet. Right-of-way dedication to provide 30 feet half ultimate-width from centerline to the property line is required. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on Canal Street along the project's frontage. The improvements include, but are not limited to, curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway and signing and striping. Improvements shall be constructed per modified Riverside County Road Standard No. 107 and per section shown on the approved Tentative Tract Map, or as approved by the Public Works Director. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.6. Pacific Avenue shall be dedicated as public road and improved as Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 36-foot paved road on a 56-foot right-of-way; curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.7. Street "A" and Street "B" shall be dedicated as public road and improved as Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 36-foot paved road on a 56-foot right-of-way; curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.8. Street "C" shall be dedicated as a public road and improved as a modified Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105 and the approved Tentative Tract Map, or as approved by the Public Works Director. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 33-foot paved road on a 48-foot right-of-way, curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscape parkway, boundary wall, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.9. New street lights are required on Opal Street, Pacific Avenue, Canal Street, Street "A", Street "B", and Street "C". The project proponent shall cause streetlight plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer. Streetlights' maintenance will be through Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) and per the agency requirements.

1.10. 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.
Conditions of Approval for MA17099 (TTM37211 & CZ17003)
Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01 & Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02

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.

1.11. 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.

1.12. Owner will be required to form a Community Facilities District (CFD) for landscape maintenance.

1.13. 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 Parcel Map.

2. PRIOR TO GRADING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

Grading and Drainage

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 Project Proponent 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 located as shown on the referenced exhibit(s) or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer. The 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 existing, and landscape and irrigation improvements/modifications shall be shown on the street improvement plans.

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 Project Proponent shall prepare a geotechnical/soils report for the proposed grading, infrastructure improvements and post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs) for review and approval of the City Engineer. All recommendations of that report shall be incorporated in the grading plan. The title and date of the geotechnical/soils report and the name and contact information of the Project Geotechnical/Soils Engineer shall be included on the face of the grading plan. The geotechnical/soils engineer must sign the grading plan.

2.4. Prior to approval of grading plans, the Project Proponent 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.

2.5. 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.

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

2.7. Where grading involves import or export the Project Proponent 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 Project Proponent shall provide evidence that the jurisdictional agency has provided all necessary separate approvals for import/export to/from the site.

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

2.9. Prior to approval of the grading plan the Project Proponent shall prepare a final
Drainage Study, corresponding with the proposed improvements, for approval of the City Engineer. The drainage study and the grading plan shall be signed by a California licensed civil engineer.

2.9.1. All drainage and storm drain improvements shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District's standards. Drainage shall be designed to accommodate 100-year storm flows. Minimum drainage grade shall be 1% except on Portland Cement Concrete where 0.5% shall be the minimum.

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

2.10. Prior to approval of the grading plan, Landowner shall prepare, or cause to be prepared, a final WQMP in conformance with the requirements of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCD) requirements for processing with and approval of the City Engineer.

2.10.1. The water quality management features and facilities to be constructed shall be shown on the project's site grading plans or separate post-construction BMP improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer.

2.10.2. The property owner shall enter into a Water Quality Management Plan and Stormwater BMP Operation and Maintenance Agreement with the City. The agreement shall be recorded and a certified copy shall be provided to the City Engineer.

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

2.12. The Project Proponent shall prepare separate street improvement and street lighting plans for review and approval by the City Engineer.

2.13. 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.

2.14. 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.

2.15. The Developer shall initiate formation of, or annexation to if one already exists, a Community Facilities District (CFD) for operation and maintenance of post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs).

2.16. Prior to approval of the grading plan for disturbance of one 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.

3. PRIOR TO MAP RECORDATION

3.1. No final Map shall be recorded until all related cases are approved and are in effect unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

3.2. No final Map shall be recorded until the formation process for the Community Facilities District (CFD) associated with this project is finalized.

3.2.1. Project Proponent shall prepare Landscape and Irrigation plans for CFD. Plans shall be prepared per Riverside County Ordinance 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:
   a) Water Quality Basins;
   b) 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;
   c) Landscape maintenance;
   d) Entry monuments.

3.2.3. The CFD will not maintain the parkway area in front of homeowner's lots. Property owners will be responsible of the maintenance of the landscape 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.

3.3. The Project Proponent 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. Final Map shall show abutter's rights along Opal Street. Lots 1 and 3 through 8 (inclusive) shall have access restriction to Opal Street.

3.6. The Project Proponent shall prepare bridge design plans per Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District's (RCFC&WCD) requirements and
for the City's review, for the crossing of proposed Street "C" over RCFC&WCD's channel.

3.6.1. Applicant shall be responsible for cooperative agreement coordination and any fees involved in the development of the cooperative agreement between the Developer, City of Jurupa Valley, and RCFC&WCD for maintenance responsibilities of improvements.

3.6.2. Agreement shall be executed and recorded prior to final map recording.

3.6.3. Bridge design shall allow for the following:
   a) Concrete barrier with chainlink railing on both sides of the bridge;
   b) Curb and gutter on both sides;
   c) 5-ft sidewalk along the north side.

3.6.4. The Project Proponent is responsible for obtaining all appropriate permits for RCB construction.

3.7. Applicant shall show dedication for Public Utilities purposes on proposed Street C to accommodate final location of RCB.

3.8. The Project Proponent shall prepare improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer:

3.8.1. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Opal 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) 28-ft paved section on 60-ft right-of-way, with 30-ft from centerline of road to the easterly right-of-way line;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape, 5-ft sidewalk, and 2-ft landscape adjacent to property line, within a 12-foot parkway along the east side of Opal Street.
   e) Intersection improvements at Opal Street and Canal Street.

3.8.2. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Canal Street 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) 34-ft paved section on 52-ft right-of-way, with 30-ft from centerline of road to the southerly right-of-way line;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 4-ft curb adjacent landscape and 6-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway along the south side of Canal Street.
3.8.3. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Pacific 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) 52-ft paved section on 100-ft right-of-way, with 50-ft from centerline of road to the westerly right-of-way line;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 9-ft curb adjacent landscape, 5-ft sidewalk, and 4-ft landscape adjacent to property line, within an 18-foot parkway along the west side of Pacific.
   e) Improvements shall be installed along the project frontage with the following exception: Curb, gutter, and sidewalk installation along the west side of Pacific Avenue shall extend beyond the project frontage to the north to Patricia Drive, and to the south to CalTrans R/W (SR60 crossing). Fair share contribution would be required in the event of improvement installation by others occurring prior to this development. Fair share contribution shall be for the Pacific Avenue improvements and in the amount of $39,992.

3.8.4. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on proposed Street "A" and Street "B" 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) 36-ft paved section on 56-ft right-of-way;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway on both sides of the street.

3.8.5. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on proposed Street "C" 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) 33-ft paved section on 48-ft right-of-way, with 27-ft from centerline of road to the northerly right-of-way line;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 4-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 9-foot parkway along the north side of Street "C";
   e) Curb adjacent landscaping and tract boundary wall along the south side of Street "C".

3.9. The following intersection improvements shall be included in the plans and
3.9.1. The intersection of Pacific Avenue (NS) and Street "C" (EW) shall be modified to provide curb returns in ultimate location to provide northbound left turn lane and the following geometries:
   a) Northbound: One left turn lane, one through lane;
   b) Southbound: One shared through/right turn lane;
   c) Eastbound: One shared left/right turn lane;
   d) Westbound: N/A

3.9.2. The intersection of Street "A" (NS) and Street "C" (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on Street "A" and the following:
   a) Northbound: N/A;
   b) Southbound: One shared left/right turn lane;
   c) Eastbound: One shared through/right turn lane;
   d) Westbound: One shared through/right turn lane.

3.9.3. The intersection of Street "B" (NS) and Canada Street (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on Street "B" and the following:
   a) Northbound: One shared left/right lane;
   b) Southbound: N/A;
   c) Eastbound: One shared through/right turn lane;
   d) Westbound: One shared through/right turn lane.

3.9.4. The intersection of Street "B" (NS) and Street "C" (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on Street "B" and the following:
   a) Northbound: N/A;
   b) Southbound: One shared left/right turn lane;
   c) Eastbound: One shared left/through lane;
   d) Westbound: One shared through/right turn lane.

3.10. The Project Proponent shall prepare Storm Drain Line 'C' plans and submit to RCFC&WCD for review. Storm drain line shall be per RCFC&WCD's requirements.

3.11. The Developer shall be responsible for any match up asphalt concrete (AC) paving, and reconstruction or resurfacing of existing paving as determined by the City Engineer.

3.11.1. Storm drain line shall be per RCFC&WCD's requirements.

3.11.2. City will approve final plans as reviewed and approved by RCFC&WCD to verify compliance with City regulations.

3.11.3. Storm drain line shall convey runoff from Opal Street to the Channel.
3.12. Should this project be within any assessment/benefit district, the Project Proponent shall make application for and pay any reapportionment of the assessment or pay the unit fees in the assessment/benefit district.

3.13. Project proponent 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.

3.14. Project proponent shall provide supporting documentation for district formation with Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) for the maintenance of the streetlights proposed with this project.

3.15. 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 Project Proponent 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.

3.16. Project proponent 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.

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 Project Proponent 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. Grading agreement and securities shall be in place prior to the commencement of grading.

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.

4.6. The bridge design plans must be approved and signed by the City Engineer.

5. PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION (ENGINEERING)

5.1. The Project Proponent 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 Appendix J.

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 Project Civil Engineer shall provide Record ("As-built") Drawings of grading and all infrastructure improvements.

5.5. The Project Proponent 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 underground as herein before required, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer in writing. Utility extensions from the mainline or other points of connection within the public right-of-way require that the Project Proponent 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.

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

5.7. The Project proponent 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).
5.8. The Project Proponent shall complete the formation of, or if one already exists initiate annexation to, a Community Facilities District (CFD) in order to provide funding for City Public Safety Services for each existing and/or new parcel in the proposed development.

6. PRIOR TO CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY (ENGINEERING)

6.1. Street ‘C’ bridge improvements shall be installed and accepted to the City Engineer’s discretion prior to certificate of occupancy for lots requiring secondary access to Pacific Avenue through Street ‘C’, per the City’s Municipal Code and Ordinance 460.

6.2. Improvements on Pacific Avenue shall be installed and accepted to the City Engineer’s discretion prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy for lots on Street ‘C’ east of the Channel.

TABLE A
MA17099 -INTERSECTION AND ROADWAY SEGMENT IMPROVEMENT AND MITIGATION LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geometric Modification</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERSECTIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-Specific Intersection Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Pacific Avenue (NS) and C Street (EW)</td>
<td>Modify geometries to provide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NB: one LT lane, one TH lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SB: one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EB: one shared LT/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WB: N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Provide curb returns in ultimate location to provide NB LT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of “A” Street (NS) and “C” Street (EW)</td>
<td>Modify geometries to provide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NB: N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SB: one shared LT/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EB: one shared TH/TH lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WB: one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Intersection to be controlled by Yield sign on “A” Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of “B” Street (NS) and Canal Street (EW)</td>
<td>Install geometries to provide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB: one shared LT/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB: N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB: one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB: one shared LT/TH lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Intersection to be controlled by Stop sign on “B” Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of “B” Street (NS) and “C” Street (EW)</td>
<td>Install geometries to provide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB: N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB: one shared LT/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB: one shared LT/ TH lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB: one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Intersection to be controlled by Stop sign on “B” Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: ________________
RESOLUTION NO. 2018-10-24-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM, AND APPROVING AN EXCEPTION TO SUBSECTION G OF SECTION 7.10.080 OF CHAPTER 7.10 OF TITLE 7 OF THE JURUPA VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 37211, AND A DEVELOPMENT PLAN TO PERMIT A SCHEDULE “A” SUBDIVISION OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) INTO 48 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS

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

Section 1. Project. Sequana Partners, LP (the "Applicant") has applied for Change of Zone No. 17003, Exception to Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and a Development Plan (collectively, Master Application No. 17099 or MA No. 17099) to permit a Schedule "A" subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) in the One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone and designated Medium Density Residential (MDR) (the "Project"). The Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and the Development Plan are the subject of this Resolution.

Section 2. Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(a) Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code states: "Lots less than two (2) acres in gross area shall not have double street frontage except that in hillside areas where the topography requires, lots may abut two (2) or more streets provided that the frontage and vehicular access is from only one (1) such street."

(b) The Applicant is seeking approval of an exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code to permit double street frontage for Lots 3-7 on Opal Street and proposed "A" Street.

(c) Section 7.10.010.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that exceptions from the requirements of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code relating to the
design or improvement of land divisions may granted by the Planning Commission 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 3. Tentative Tract Map.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018).

(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.

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.

Section 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 4. Development Plan.

(a) Section 9.100.050 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that before any structure is erected or use established in the R-4 Zone, there shall be a subdivision map recorded and a development plan approved as set forth in Section 9.100.060 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(b) The Applicant is seeking approval of a Development Plan for a proposed Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018).

(c) Section 9.100.060.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that a development plan conforming to the requirements of Chapter 9.100 of the Jurupa Valley
Municipal Code and containing the minimum information set forth in Section 9.100.060.B.(1)-(4) may be approved by the Planning Commission.

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. 17099 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 October 24, 2018, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 17099, 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 July 5, 2018, and expired on August 3, 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 Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. 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.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, should be granted because:

(a) There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property, including, but not limited to, size, shape, or topographical conditions, or existing road alignment and width, in that Lots 3-7 have only one vehicular access from the interior street of the proposed subdivision by design (as illustrated on Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, the Development Plan and the Conceptual Landscape Plan, which includes the Wall Plan);

(b) The granting of the modification will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare in that a community perimeter wall is proposed to be located on the rear lot lines of interior lots, thereby preventing multiple vehicular access points onto the Lots 3-7 and creating a lot design and layout similar to the proposed interior lots; and

(c) The granting of the modification will not be damaging to other property in the vicinity in that the proposed Development Plan and Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 create a unified and cohesive community and the proposed Conceptual Landscape Plan creates a desirable streetscape along Opal Street.

Section 8. Findings for Approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37211. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 should be granted because:

(a) The proposed land division is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan. The proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 is consistent with the requirements of the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation, which permits up to five (5) dwelling units per acre. The proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 will facilitate the construction of forty-eight (48) single family homes at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre, which is below the maximum allowable density for the MDR land use designation;

(b) The design or improvement of the proposed land division is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan in that the proposed layout of the forty-eight (48) parcels is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan;

(c) The site of the proposed land division is physically suitable for the type of development in that it is a relatively flat, undeveloped, vacant lot located adjacent to other single-family residential land uses, with adequate water and sewer connections and public services are available to the site;
(d) The site of the proposed land division is physically suitable for the proposed density of the development in that it proposes forty-eight (48) single-family residential dwelling units at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre, which is below the maximum allowable density under the MDR land use designation;

(e) The design of the proposed land division or proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat in that the subject site is highly disturbed and occupied by ruderal flora and bare ground. Because of the existing degraded site condition, the absence of special-status plant communities, and overall low potential for most special-status species to utilize or reside on-site, the design of the proposed land division and the proposed improvements are not expected to directly impact federal or state-listed threatened or endangered species;

(f) The design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements are not likely to cause serious public health problems. An Initial Study was prepared that evaluated potential effects with respect to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry 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 MND 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 mitigation measures have been required or revisions in the Project have been made or agreed to by the Applicant. Furthermore a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) report prepared for the proposed Project did not reveal evidence of a recognized environmental condition in connection with the subject site. The Initial Study determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the proposed Project may have a significant effect on the environment. As such, the proposed Project will not cause serious public health problems; and

(g) The design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed land division in that there are no on-site easements within the subject site, the proposed Project will connect to existing water and sewer lines located on Canal Street, Opal Street, and Pacific Avenue, and all proposed utilities are required to be undergrounded.

Section 9. Findings for Approval of Development Plan. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby recommends that the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley find, determine, and declare that the proposed Development Plan should be approved because:

(a) The proposed Development Plan conforms to and satisfies all the requirements of Chapter 9.100 of Jurupa General Municipal Code, including Section 9.100.060 (Conditions of Development) of Chapter 9.100.
(b) The proposed Development Plan identifies the location of each existing and each proposed structure in the development area and the uses or uses to be contained therein by depicting the locations of the building footprints, including setbacks and layout, which future residential units must comply with.

(c) The proposed Development Plan identifies the location of all pedestrian walks, malls, recreation, and other open spaces for the use of the occupants and members of the public by depicting private open space, public sidewalks, and landscaped parkways throughout the proposed development.

(d) The proposed Development Plan identifies the location and height of all walls, fences, and screen planting, including a plan for the landscaping of the development, types of surfacing, such as paving, turfing, or other landscaping to be used at various locations in that the proposed Landscape Plan included within the proposed Development Plan includes a Wall/Fence Plan that identifies landscaping, paving, monument walls, and interior and perimeter walls throughout the proposed development; and

(e) The proposed plans and elevations of typical structures indicate the architectural type and construction standards in that the proposed Development Plan workbook depicts six (6) different plans for the single-family residential structures with three (3) varying exterior elevations (Tuscan, Spanish, Traditional, and Craftsman architectural styles) and a different floor plan per each of the six (6) plans.

Section 10. Approval of Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and Development Plan with Conditions.

Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission hereby approves an Exception to Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and a Development Plan to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue, subject to the recommended conditions of approval attached hereto as Exhibit “A.” The Planning Commission’s approval of the Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and the Development Plan is conditioned upon the City Council’s adoption of an ordinance approving Change of Zone No. 17033, and this approval shall not take effect until the effective date of the ordinance adopting Change of Zone No. 17003.

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 24th day of October, 2018.
William Hofferber
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 Merrell, Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 24th day of October, 2018, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Hofferber, Ruiz, Moore, Pruitt, Silva

NOES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

[Signature]

THOMAS G. MERRELL
PLANNING DIRECTOR
EXHIBIT “A”

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR MA17099 (TTM37211 & CZ17003)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. **PROJECT PERMITTED.** Master Application (MA) No. 17099: Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211, Change of Zone (CZ) No. 17003 and Exception to Section 7.10.080 (G) is for the approval to subdivide a combined 10.4 property into 48 single-family residential lots with two (2) water quality basin lots (Lot A & B) and three (3) lettered street lots (A-C). An exception to Section 7.10.080 (G) of Title 7 (Subdivisions) for double frontage lots on Lots 3-7 is also included. The property is located at the SEC of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60 Fwy and east of Pacific Avenue, APNS: 177-130-007 & 177-142-018.

2. **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, 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. **CONSENT TO CONDITIONS.** Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to the required conditions of approval to the Planning Director or designee.

4. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM.** Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to having received a copy of the “Applicant’s Acknowledgement of Comments and Code Information from
5. **MITIGATION MEASURES.** This project shall be subject to the mitigation measures adopted with the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) prepared for the project and included with these conditions of approval.

6. **FEES.** The approval of MA17099 (TTM37211 & CZ17003) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

7. **CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA).** This project is approved subject to the provisions of a Mitigated Negative Declaration. Within forty-eight (48) hours of final approval for this project, the owner or designee shall deliver to the Planning Department a check payable to the Riverside County Clerk in the amount of $2,330.75 (includes $50.00 County Clerk Processing Fee) or the fees that are currently in effect at the time. This will enable the City to file the Notice of Determination.

8. **COPIED 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.

9. **APPROVAL PERIOD – TENTATIVE TRACT MAP.** An approved or conditionally approved tentative tract 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 (Subdivisions). If the tentative map expires before the recordation of the final map, or any phase thereof, no recordation of the final map, or any phase thereof, shall be permitted. The variance conditionally approved in connection with this 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.

10. **CONFORMANCE TO APPROVED EXHIBITS.** The project shall be in conformance to the approved plans (listed below) with any changes in accordance to these conditions of approval:

    a. Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 (Sheets 1 and 2): prepared by Proactive Engineering Consultants West, Inc. dated 9/14/16 (Revised 3/2018) and signed by George A. Lenfestey, R.C.E.

    b. Architectural Set of Plans consisting of:

        i. Plan 1.2319:
           1. Elevations (A-Spanish, B-Traditional, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans
        ii. Plan 2.2401:
           1. Elevations (A-Spanish, B-Traditional, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans
        iii. Plan 3.2611:
           1. Elevations (A-Spanish, B-Traditional, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans
        iv. Plan 4.2806:
1. Elevations (A-Spanish, B-Traditional, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans

v. Plan 5.3042:
   1. Elevations (A-Spanish, C-Craftsman, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans

vi. Plan 6.3124:
   1. Elevations (A-Spanish, C-Craftsman, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans

c. Conceptual Landscape Plans (Wall/Fence and Maintenance Plan included) dated April 2017 (Revised March 2018)

d. Development Plan workbook (dated 5-24-18)

11. ON-SITE LANDSCAPING. Prior to the issuance of any Building permit, the applicant shall submit a “Professional Services (PROS)” application (with current fees) and the following items for Planning Director review and approval:

   a. The total cost estimate of landscaping, irrigation, and one-year of maintenance.

   b. Completed City Faithful Performance Bond for Landscape Improvements form with original signatures after the City provides the applicant with the required amount of bond.

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

   d. Final landscape, maintenance, planting, and irrigation plans and digital copies (CD format). The plans shall include the following:
       i. Compliance with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Biological Resources Mitigation Measure BIO-6-Tree Preservation and Replacement.
       ii. Compliance with approved Development Plan.
       iii. Compliance with Title 9 (Planning and Zoning) landscaping requirements.

   e. STREET TREES. Street trees and related security and agreements are required pursuant to Chapter 7.55 of Title 7 (Subdivisions). Tree size, specimen and installation shall be under the direction of the Engineering Department if they are within the public right-of-way.

   Prior to the final inspection of any Building permit, the Landscape Architect of Record shall conduct an inspection and submit a letter to the City of Jurupa Valley once s/he has deemed the installation is in conformance to the approved plans. Following the inspection of the Landscape Architect of Record, the applicant shall schedule a City inspection with the City's landscape architect.

12. MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF SOLID FENCING AND WALLS WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK. No solid fencing or wall shall exceed 42 inches in height within the front setback. For Lots 2, 19 and 22, no SOLID walls EXCEEDING 42-INCHES IN HEIGHT shall be placed within 30 feet of the front yard area.
13. **BLOCK WALL FOR INTERIOR AND SIDE LOT LINES.** Block walls shall be used for interior side lot lines. Decorative wrought iron gates shall be used on all side gates at individual parcels. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a Wall and Fence plan that is consistent with this condition to the Planning Department for review and approval.

14. **GRAFFITI PROTECTION FOR WALLS.** Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit a wall plan that includes anti-graffiti coating or protection for the exterior side of all perimeter walls for City review and approval. The applicant shall remove any graffiti on the property as soon as possible. In addition, if the applicant was notified by the City, the applicant shall remove the graffiti within seven (7) days of the City’s notice.

15. **TWO-CAR GARAGE PER DWELLING UNIT.** All residential units shall have a minimum two-car garage with automatic sectional roll-up doors. No garage conversions are permitted and units must maintain two-car covered spaces at all times.

16. **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.

17. **MULTIPLE SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN MITIGATION FEE (ORD. NO. 810).** The applicant shall pay any owed fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 810. In order for the agency to determine that the project qualifies for any exemptions for any of the subject fees, the applicant needs to submit sufficient evidence to the City to demonstrate that it qualifies for the exemption.

18. **SALE OF INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS.** No structure constructed on Project site may be sold until the subject Project on which the structure is located is divided and a final map recorded in accordance with the City’s subdivision regulations such that the structure is located on a separate legally divided parcel.

19. **PROVIDE SOUND WALL ALONG THE SR-60 FREEWAY.**
   a. Applicant shall construct an approximate thirteen (13) foot high sound wall along the State Route 60 Freeway within the Caltrans right-of-way, for the length of the freeway fronting the project site, subject to procedure described below:
      i. Concurrent with City Council public hearing for the project entitlement, the Applicant shall petition the City to enter into an agreement with Caltrans for construction of the sound wall at the sole expense of the Applicant.
      ii. Upon City Council approval of above item (i), Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the City providing for (1) the payment by the Applicant to the City of all costs and expenses related to the sound wall expected to be incurred by the City, including, but not limited to, the price of third party consultants and attorney fees and (2) security for the design and construction of the sound wall by Applicant based on cost estimate for
iii. **Prior to Final Map**, the Applicant shall submit improvement plans for the construction of the sound wall to the City Engineer for approval and to Caltrans for the Caltrans permit.

iv. In the event that (1) the agreements and improvement plans described in subsections i), ii) or iii) are not approved and executed by the required times, or (2) the City Manager otherwise determines, in his sole discretion, that construction of the sound wall is infeasible, Applicant shall instead construct sound walls around all habitable back yard and side yard areas for all lots in accordance with the specifications provided in Exhibit C and Table 2 of the “TTM 37211 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL IMPACT STUDY” dated September 11, 2018.

b. **PRIOR TO FINAL OCCUPANCY OF LOTS 1-4, 17-24 AND 38-48**, the Caltrans permit for the sound wall shall have been issued or the City Manager must determine that construction of the sound wall is infeasible pursuant to subsection iii).

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

1. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (ENGINEERING)

1.1. The use hereby conditioned is for a Schedule "A" subdivision, Tentative Tract No. 37211: being a subdivision of Lot 5, Block A, Map Book 9, Page 34, of Maps on file in SB West Riverside & Lot 3, Map Book 9, Page 34, of Maps on file in SB West Riverside; more particularly Assessor's Parcels Number APN 177-130-007 & 177-142-018; containing 10.4 acres gross, Lots "A" and "B" will be dedicated to the City of Jurupa Valley, Streets A, B and C will be dedicated to the City of Jurupa Valley for public road and utility purposes. Exhibit titled Tentative Tract No. 37211, prepared by Proactive Engineering Consultants West, INC., 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 Project proponent 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 Project proponent may be required to amend or revise the permit application.

1.4. Opal Street is a Local Road with a right-of-way width of 60 feet. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on
Opal Street along the project's frontage. The improvements include, but are not limited to, curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaped parkway and signing and striping. The Project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.5. Canal Street is considered a Frontage Road with a right-of-way width of 52 feet. Right-of-way dedication to provide 30 feet half ultimate-width from centerline to the property line is required. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on Canal Street along the project's frontage. The improvements include, but are not limited to, curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway and signing and striping. Improvements shall be constructed per modified Riverside County Road Standard No. 107 and per section shown on the approved Tentative Tract Map, or as approved by the Public Works Director. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.6. Pacific Avenue shall be dedicated as public road and improved as Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 36-foot paved road on a 56-foot right-of-way; curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.7. Street "A" and Street "B" shall be dedicated as public road and improved as Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 36-foot paved road on a 56-foot right-of-way; curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.8. Street "C" shall be dedicated as a public road and improved as a modified Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105 and the approved Tentative Tract Map, or as approved by the Public Works Director. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 33-foot paved road on a 48-foot right-of-way, curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscape parkway, boundary wall, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.9. New street lights are required on Opal Street, Pacific Avenue, Canal Street, Street "A", Street "B", and Street "C". The project proponent shall cause streetlight plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer. Streetlights' maintenance will be through Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) and per the agency requirements.

1.10. 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.

1.11. 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.

1.12. Owner will be required to form a Community Facilities District (CFD) for landscape maintenance.

1.13. 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 Parcel Map.

2. PRIOR TO GRADING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

Grading and Drainage

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 Project Proponent 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 Engine.

2.2.4. Driveway approaches shall be located as shown on the referenced exhibit(s) or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer. The 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 existing, and landscape and irrigation improvements/modifications shall be shown on the street improvement plans.

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 Project Proponent shall prepare a geotechnical/soils report for the proposed grading, infrastructure improvements and post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs) for review and approval of the City Engineer. All recommendations of that report shall be incorporated in the grading plan. The title and date of the geotechnical/soils report and the name and contact information of the Project Geotechnical/Soils Engineer shall be included on the face of the grading plan. The geotechnical/soils engineer must sign the grading plan.

2.4. Prior to approval of grading plans, the Project Proponent 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.

2.5. 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.

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

2.7. Where grading involves import or export the Project Proponent 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 Project Proponent shall provide evidence that the jurisdictional agency has provided all necessary separate approvals for import/export to/from the site.

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

2.9. Prior to approval of the grading plan the Project Proponent shall prepare a final
Drainage Study, corresponding with the proposed improvements, for approval of the City Engineer. The drainage study and the grading plan shall be signed by a California licensed civil engineer.

2.9.1. All drainage and storm drain improvements shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District's standards. Drainage shall be designed to accommodate 100-year storm flows. Minimum drainage grade shall be 1% except on Portland Cement Concrete where 0.5% shall be the minimum.

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

2.10. Prior to approval of the grading plan, Landowner shall prepare, or cause to be prepared, a final WQMP in conformance with the requirements of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCD) requirements for processing with and approval of the City Engineer.

2.10.1. The water quality management features and facilities to be constructed shall be shown on the project's site grading plans or separate post-construction BMP improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer.

2.10.2. The property owner shall enter into a Water Quality Management Plan and Stormwater BMP Operation and Maintenance Agreement with the City. The agreement shall be recorded and a certified copy shall be provided to the City Engineer.

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

2.12. The Project Proponent shall prepare separate street improvement and street lighting plans for review and approval by the City Engineer.

2.13. 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.

2.14. 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.

2.15. The Developer shall initiate formation of, or annexation to if one already exists, a Community Facilities District (CFD) for operation and maintenance of post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs).

2.16. Prior to approval of the grading plan for disturbance of one 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.

3. PRIOR TO MAP RECORDATION

3.1. No final Map shall be recorded until all related cases are approved and are in effect unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

3.2. No final Map shall be recorded until the formation process for the Community Facilities District (CFD) associated with this project is finalized.

3.2.1. Project Proponent shall prepare Landscape and Irrigation plans for CFD. Plans shall be prepared per Riverside County Ordinance 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:
   a) Water Quality Basins;
   b) 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;
   c) Landscape maintenance;
   d) Entry monuments.

3.2.3. The CFD will not maintain the parkway area in front of homeowner's lots. Property owners will be responsible of the maintenance of the landscape 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.

3.3. The Project Proponent 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. Final Map shall show abutter’s rights along Opal Street. Lots 1 and 3 through 8 (inclusive) shall have access restriction to Opal Street.

3.6. The Project Proponent shall prepare bridge design plans per Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District's (RCFC&WCD) requirements and
for the City's review, for the crossing of proposed Street "C" over RCFC&WCD's channel.

3.6.1. Applicant shall be responsible for cooperative agreement coordination and any fees involved in the development of the cooperative agreement between the Developer, City of Jurupa Valley, and RCFC&WCD for maintenance responsibilities of improvements.

3.6.2. Agreement shall be executed and recorded prior to final map recording.

3.6.3. Bridge design shall allow for the following:
   a) Concrete barrier with chainlink railing on both sides of the bridge;
   b) Curb and gutter on both sides;
   c) 5-ft sidewalk along the north side.

3.6.4. The Project Proponent is responsible for obtaining all appropriate permits for RCB construction.

3.7. Applicant shall show dedication for Public Utilities purposes on proposed Street C to accommodate final location of RCB.

3.8. The Project Proponent shall prepare improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer:

3.8.1. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Opal 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) 28-ft paved section on 60-ft right-of-way, with 30-ft from centerline of road to the easterly right-of-way line;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape, 5-ft sidewalk, and 2-ft landscape adjacent to property line, within a 12-foot parkway along the east side of Opal Street.
   e) Intersection improvements at Opal Street and Canal Street.

3.8.2. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Canal Street 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) 34-ft paved section on 52-ft right-of-way, with 30-ft from centerline of road to the southerly right-of-way line;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 4-ft curb adjacent landscape and 6-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway along the south side of Canal Street.
3.8.3. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Pacific 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)** 52-ft paved section on 100-ft right-of-way, with 50-ft from centerline of road to the westerly right-of-way line;
- **c)** Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
- **d)** 9-ft curb adjacent landscape, 5-ft sidewalk, and 4-ft landscape adjacent to property line, within an 18-foot parkway along the west side of Pacific.

- **e)** Improvements shall be installed along the project frontage with the following exception: Curb, gutter, and sidewalk installation along the west side of Pacific Avenue shall extend beyond the project frontage to the north to Patricia Drive, and to the south to CalTrans R/W (SR60 crossing). Fair share contribution would be required in the event of improvement installation by others occurring prior to this development. Fair share contribution shall be for the Pacific Avenue improvements and in the amount of $39,992.

3.8.4. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on proposed Street "A" and Street "B" 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)** 36-ft paved section on 56-ft right-of-way;
- **c)** Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
- **d)** 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway on both sides of the street.

3.8.5. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on proposed Street "C" 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)** 33-ft paved section on 48-ft right-of-way, with 27-ft from centerline of road to the northerly right-of-way line;
- **c)** Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
- **d)** 4-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 9-foot parkway along the north side of Street "C";
- **e)** Curb adjacent landscaping and tract boundary wall along the south side of Street "C".

3.9. The following intersection improvements shall be included in the plans and
Conditions of Approval for MA17099 (TTM37211 & CZ17003)

Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01 & Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02

installed upon approval:

3.9.1. The intersection of Pacific Avenue (NS) and Street "C" (EW) shall be modified to provide curb returns in ultimate location to provide northbound left turn lane and the following geometries:
   a) Northbound: One left turn lane, one through lane;
   b) Southbound: One shared through/right lane;
   c) Eastbound: One shared left/right turn lane;
   d) Westbound: N/A

3.9.2. The intersection of Street "A" (NS) and Street "C" (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on Street "A" and the following:
   a) Northbound: N/A;
   b) Southbound: One shared left/right turn lane;
   c) Eastbound: One shared through/right turn lane;
   d) Westbound: One shared through/right turn lane.

3.9.3. The intersection of Street "B" (NS) and Canada Street (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on Street "B" and the following:
   a) Northbound: One shared left/right lane;
   b) Southbound: N/A;
   c) Eastbound: One shared through/right turn lane;
   d) Westbound: One shared left/through lane.

3.9.4. The intersection of Street "B" (NS) and Street "C" (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on Street "B" and the following:
   a) Northbound: N/A;
   b) Southbound: One shared left/right turn lane;
   c) Eastbound: One shared left/through lane;
   d) Westbound: One shared through/right turn lane.

3.10. The Project Proponent shall prepare Storm Drain Line 'C' plans and submit to RCFC&WCD for review. Storm drain line shall be per RCFC&WCD's requirements.

3.11. The Developer shall be responsible for any match up asphalt concrete (AC) paving, and reconstruction or resurfacing of existing paving as determined by the City Engineer.

3.11.1. Storm drain line shall be per RCFC&WCD's requirements.

3.11.2. City will approve final plans as reviewed and approved by RCFC&WCD to verify compliance with City regulations.

3.11.3. Storm drain line shall convey runoff from Opal Street to the Channel.
3.12. Should this project be within any assessment/benefit district, the Project Proponent shall make application for and pay any reapportionment of the assessment or pay the unit fees in the assessment/benefit district.

3.13. Project proponent 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.

3.14. Project proponent shall provide supporting documentation for district formation with Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) for the maintenance of the streetlights proposed with this project.

3.15. 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 Project Proponent 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.

3.16. Project proponent 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.

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 Project Proponent 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. Grading agreement and securities shall be in place prior to the commencement of grading.

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.

4.6. The bridge design plans must be approved and signed by the City Engineer.

5. PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION (ENGINEERING)

5.1. The Project Proponent 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 Appendix J.

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 Project Civil Engineer shall provide Record ("As-built") Drawings of grading and all infrastructure improvements.

5.5. The Project Proponent 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 underground as herein before required, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer in writing. Utility extensions from the mainline or other points of connection within the public right-of-way require that the Project Proponent 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.

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

5.7. The Project proponent 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).
5.8. The Project Proponent shall complete the formation of, or if one already exists initiate annexation to, a Community Facilities District (CFD) in order to provide funding for City Public Safety Services for each existing and/or new parcel in the proposed development.

6. PRIOR TO CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY (ENGINEERING)

6.1. Street ‘C’ bridge improvements shall be installed and accepted to the City Engineer’s discretion prior to certificate of occupancy for lots requiring secondary access to Pacific Avenue through Street ‘C’, per the City’s Municipal Code and Ordinance 460.

6.2. Improvements on Pacific Avenue shall be installed and accepted to the City Engineer’s discretion prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy for lots on Street ‘C’ east of the Channel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA17099 - INTERSECTION AND ROADWAY SEGMENT IMPROVEMENT AND MITIGATION LIST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geometric Modification</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERSECTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-Specific Intersection Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Intersection of Pacific Avenue (NS) and C Street (EW) | Modify geometries to provide:  
  - **NB**: one LT lane, one TH lane.  
  - **SB**: one shared TH/RT lane.  
  - **EB**: one shared LT/RT lane.  
  - **WB**: N/A.  
  Note: Provide curb returns in ultimate location to provide NB LT lane. |
| Intersection of “A” Street (NS) and “C” Street (EW) | Modify geometries to provide:  
  - **NB**: N/A.  
  - **SB**: one shared LT/RT lane.  
  - **EB**: one shared TH/TH lane.  
  - **WB**: one shared TH/RT lane.  
  Note: Intersection to be controlled by Yield sign on “A” Street. |
| Intersection of “B” Street (NS) and Canal Street (EW) | Install geometries to provide:  
  - **NB**: one shared LT/RT lane.  
  - **SB**: N/A.  
  - **EB**: one shared TH/RT lane.  
  - **WB**: one shared LT/TH lane.  
  Note: Intersection to be controlled by Stop sign on “B” Street. |
### Conditions of Approval for MA17099 (TTM37211 & CZ17003)

**Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01 & Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection of “B” Street (NS) and “C” Street (EW)</th>
<th>Install geometries to provide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NB:</strong> N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SB:</strong> one shared LT/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EB:</strong> one shared LT/TH lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WB:</strong> one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> Intersection to be controlled by Stop sign on “B” Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: ________________
DATE: OCTOBER 24, 2018
TO: CHAIR HOFFERBER AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR
BY: ROCIO LOPEZ, SENIOR PLANNER
SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 17099: TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 37211, CHANGE OF ZONE (CZ) NO. 17003 AND EXCEPTION TO SECTION 7.10.080 (G)
PROPOSAL: PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION ON 10.4 ACRES (48 UNITS)
LOCATION: SEC OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60 FWY AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE
APNS: 177-130-007 & 177-142-018
APPLICANT: SEQUANATA PARTNERS, LP

RECOMMENDATION
By motion:
(1) Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01, recommending that the City Council (1) adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and (2) approve Change of Zone No. 17003; and
(2) Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02, (1) adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, (2) approving an Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Title 7 (Subdivisions) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, (3) approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and (4) approving a Development Plan to permit a planned residential development consisting of a 48-lot subdivision on a combined 10.4 gross acre site.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The Applicant ("Applicant" or "Sequonata Partners, LP"), has submitted an application for a Change of Zone from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) and Tentative Tract Map to allow the subdivision of combined 10.4 property into 48 single-family residential lots with minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet; two (2) water quality basin lots (Lot A & B) and three (3) lettered street lots (A-C). The existing General Plan land use designation of MDR (Medium Density Residential) will remain unchanged. The project's community name is Sequonata Heights. The applicant is also requesting an exception to Section 7.10.080 (G) of Title 7 (Subdivisions) for double frontage lots on Lots 3-7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACREAGE OF PROJECT SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING POLICY AREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING ZONING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ZONING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOCATION

As shown on Exhibit 1, the project site is located north of State Route (SR) 60, east of Pacific Avenue, and southeast of Canal and Opal Streets. The property is surrounded by single-family homes to the east and west, State Route (SR) 60 to the south and Union Pacific Railroad to the north. Beyond the railroad tracks are industrial land uses. Exhibit 1 provides an aerial view of the project site. Exhibit 2 provides the existing General Plan Land Use (GPLU) designations and zoning of the site and surrounding parcels.

EXHIBIT 1: SITE LOCATION MAP
REQUIRED ENTITLEMENTS

Subdivisions are regulated by Title 7 (Subdivisions) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. This project is a Schedule “A” subdivision per Section 7.30.040, defined as: “Any division of land into 5 or more parcels, where any parcel is less than 18,000 square feet in net area.” Additionally, the action of the Planning Commission on a tentative Schedule “A” map shall be final unless appealed by the Applicant or any interested party.

As the property is currently zoned R-1 (One Family Dwellings), the minimum required lot size is 7,200 square feet, with a minimum average lot width of 60 feet and a minimum average lot depth of 100 feet. Since the project proposes lot sizes ranging from 6,000 to 11,734 square feet, with a few lots proposed with less than the average lot width and average lot depth, the project will require a Change of Zone from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) to accommodate the lots which do not meet the R-1 zone development standards.

Additionally, Title 7 (Subdivisions) Section 7.10.080 (G) stipulates that “Lots less than two (2) acres in gross area shall not have double street frontage except that in hillside areas where the topography requires, lots may abut two (2) or more streets provided that the frontage and vehicular access is from only one (1) such street.” See Section for discussion of the proposed exception.

ANALYSIS

GENERAL PLAN

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MDR)

The MDR land use designation provides for the development of detached single-family dwellings on parcels typically ranging from 5,500 to 20,000 square feet. The density range is from 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre, with a minimum lot size of 5,500 square feet to encourage clustering.
The project is consistent with applicable policies of the MDR land use and density level, which permits 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre. Under the current land use designation, up to 52 dwelling units are permitted. The project proposes 48 residential lots at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density.

**ZONING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS**

**R-1 ZONE (ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS)**

The subject property is located within the R-1 zone and is subject to Section 9.55.020 (Development Standards), which states that the lot area of any parcel/lot shall not be less than 7,200 square feet with a minimum average lot width of 60 feet and a minimum average lot depth of 100 feet.

The Applicant proposes to subdivide the 10.4-acre parcel into 48 lots as defined in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT NO.</th>
<th>AREA (SF)</th>
<th>AVG. WIDTH</th>
<th>AVG. DEPTH</th>
<th>LOT NO.</th>
<th>AREA (SF)</th>
<th>AVG. WIDTH</th>
<th>AVG. DEPTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>65'</td>
<td>103'</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,170</td>
<td>59'</td>
<td>108'</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,853</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>127'</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,623</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>123'</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,441</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>118'</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,001</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>108'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,127</td>
<td>73'</td>
<td>121'</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6,360</td>
<td>54'</td>
<td>111'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,909</td>
<td>63'</td>
<td>121'</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6,210</td>
<td>62'</td>
<td>102'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7,606</td>
<td>66'</td>
<td>113'</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6,970</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>120'</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11,226</td>
<td>52'</td>
<td>154'</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6,252</td>
<td>52'</td>
<td>111'</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6,520</td>
<td>61'</td>
<td>108'</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7,176</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>118'</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6,949</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>115'</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6,035</td>
<td>59'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7,183</td>
<td>58'</td>
<td>112'</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6,188</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>117'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6,419</td>
<td>54'</td>
<td>98'</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6,340</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>105'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6,035</td>
<td>54'</td>
<td>102'</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6,493</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>108'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6,069</td>
<td>59'</td>
<td>102'</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6,645</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>59'</td>
<td>109'</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6,225</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>113'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6,158</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>112'</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6,938</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>115'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6,849</td>
<td>54'</td>
<td>120'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>6,625</td>
<td>59'</td>
<td>108'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>11,734</td>
<td>99'</td>
<td>115'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the majority of the proposed lots are less than the minimum development standard requirements within the R-1 zone, the applicant is requesting a Change of Zone to change the existing zone classification to R-4 (Planned Residential), see Attachment 3.
R-4 ZONE (PLANNED RESIDENTIAL)

According to Section 9.100.030, the R-4 zone shall not be applied to any area containing less than nine (9) acres. The subject site contains a combined 10.4 acres and is therefore qualified to be rezoned to R-4 with an approved Development Plan.

Pursuant to Section 9.100.050 (Subdivision and development plan requirements), before any structure is erected or use established in the R-4 Zone, there shall be a subdivision map recorded and a development plan approved as set forth in Section 9.100.060. This project includes both Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 and a Development Plan, see Attachment 8. The applicant intends to record the map and sell the entitled project to a home builder for future development.

Planned Residential Development. A Planned Residential Development is a residential development that allows "permitted reduced lot area, width and depth requirements, and building setback requirements by integrating into the overall development open space and outdoor recreational facilities."

This project is being processed as a Planned Residential Development to accommodate the project’s reduced lot area, reduced lot with and reduced lot depths. The Development Plan provides ample front and rear yard open space as well as decorative neighborhood entry monumentation along Canal Street and Pacific Avenue, perimeter landscaping and decorative perimeter walls, see Development Plan and Attachment 10 (Conceptual Landscape Plan).

The development plan also conforms to Section 9.100.040 (Land Use Regulations), which requires:

A. The minimum overall area for each dwelling unit, exclusive of the area used for set aside for street rights-of-way, but including recreation and service areas shall be six thousand (6,000) square feet; and

B. The minimum lot area for the individual lots used as a residential building site shall be three thousand, five hundred (3,500) square feet. The minimum width of each lot shall be forty (40) feet and the minimum depth shall be eighty (80) feet.

Additionally, the proposed development plan meets the R-4 zone’s minimum yard setback requirements of five (5) foot interior side yard; 10-foot corner and reversed corner lots; and 10-foot rear yard setback. The subdivision proposes 48 lots with minimum lot area of 6,000 square feet, lot widths ranging from 51 to 99 feet and lot depths ranging from 90 to 120 feet.

While the front yard setback requirement is a minimum of 20 feet, Lots 4, 23, 30, 37 and 44 show a 19 foot front yard setback to the front porches. Per Section 9.240.180, a one (1) foot encroachment into required yards is permitted for structures not adding additional floor space. The remaining lots comply with the 20 foot minimum front yard setback area.

The R-4 zone is the appropriate zoning for this project as the zone is consistent with proposed MDR land use designation and allows for Planned Residential Developments with reduced lot square footages and reduced minimum lot widths and depths. The Change of Zone exhibit is shown on Figure 1-2 and Figure 1-3 of the Development Plan and Attachment 3. With the Change of Zone, the proposed Development Plan complies with the conditions of development set forth in Table 4.
### TABLE 4: CONDITIONS OF DEVELOPMENT (SECTION 9.100.060)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Complies?</th>
<th>Supporting Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A subdivision conforming to the standards and conditions of Title 7, as presently worded or hereafter amended, not inconsistent with specific provisions of this section shall be recorded. All lots not to be used for residential purposes shall be given a lot letter instead of a lot number.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Tentative Tract Map No. 37211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A development plan conforming to the requirements of this chapter and containing the following minimum information shall be approved by the Planning Commission.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>A development plan is proposed which conforms with the requirements of zoning code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of each existing and each proposed structure in the development area, the use or uses to be contained therein. Typical plans indicating use on a lot may be used.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Per Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of all pedestrian walks, malls, recreation and other open areas for the use of occupants and members of the public.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Per Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location and height of all walls, fences and screen planting, including a plan for the landscaping of the development, types of surfacing, such as paving, turfing, or other landscaping to be used at various locations.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Per Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans and elevations of typical structures to indicate architectural type and construction standards.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Per Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents setting forth the method of conveying title, the type of estate to be granted, the method of maintaining the open areas and service areas, and the conditions of use of the open or recreation areas shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Commission. The following minimum standards shall be maintained:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Sheet 9 of 11 of the Landscape Plan and Figure 4-7 of the Development Plan shows the Maintenance Plan for areas outside of private property areas. As such, the homeowner is responsible for maintenance to their private properties and the CFD will maintain all other areas such as street lights, the two water quality basins, parkways, monument entry signs and graffiti abatement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The right to use recreational facilities and service areas shall be appurtenant to ownership of residential lots within the development, or shall be made a covenant to run with the land.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provisions shall be made for maintenance of the common and service areas by a corporation, partnership, trust or other legal entity having the right to assess the individual lot owners.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Walls & Fencing.** The Wall and Fence plan depicts several types of walls and fences on the tract.

A. **Perimeter Wall.** The City adopted the “County-wide Design Standards and Guidelines” upon incorporation. The “County-wide Design Standards and Guidelines” require the project to have a decorative block wall along the entire perimeter.
On the Wall & Fence Plan (see page 41, Figure 4-6 of the Development Plan and Sheet 10 of the Conceptual Landscape Plan), the Applicant proposes a 6 foot high decorative masonry wall from top of grade along the exterior of perimeter lots 1-8, 19, 21 and 40-48.

Staff has conditioned that for Lots 2, 19 and 22, no SOLID walls EXCEEDING 42-INCHES IN HEIGHT shall be placed within 30 feet of the front yard area.

Reviewing potential noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway on the future residents of the project is necessary for analyzing mitigation required for this project. As such, the City is addressing any noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway to the future residents as part of the land use entitlement process and is conditioning the project to address noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway as follows:

1. Staff has conditioned that the Applicant provide a sound wall along the SR-60 freeway as outlined in Condition No. 19 to mitigate noise, fumes and visual impacts from the freeway to future residents.

2. In the event that the agreements and improvement plans related to the freeway sound wall identified in Condition No. 19 are not approved and executed by the required times, or that the City Manager otherwise determines that construction of the sound wall is infeasible, Applicant shall instead construct sound walls around all habitable backyard and sideward areas for all lots in accordance with the specifications provided in Exhibit C, Table 2 of the Noise Impact Study dated September 11, 2018, see Attachment 5.

- **Interior Side Fencing/Wall.** The “County-wide Design Standards and Guidelines” requires decorative block wall for interior side lines. The Applicant proposes 6-foot high block walls for interior lot lines. Staff will condition that interior walls consists of splitface material to comply with the guidelines.

Staff has placed a general condition pertaining to overall walls and fencing as follows: **Maximum height of solid fencing and walls within the front setback. No solid fencing or wall shall exceed 42 inches in height within the front setback.**

**Plotting of Lots.** The Development Plan indicates the locations of the building footprints and future residential units must comply with the proposed setbacks and layout per the approved plan.

**Landscaping.** Planning Condition No. 11 requires that the Development Plan comply with the requirements of Title 9 (Planning and Zoning) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal code, which includes the Water Efficiency standards. The Engineering Department has conditioned street improvement plans and separate landscaping plans for landscaping within the public right-of-way.

The Conceptual Landscape Plan includes minimum 24-inch box evergreen screen trees planted 30 feet on center along the entire southern side of proposed “C” Street. The trees will be planted adjacent to a proposed six (6) foot high screen wall and are intended to grow rapidly to help buffer the project from the existing SR-60 Freeway. Additionally, the project includes landscaped parkway adjacent to curb and gutter, a variety of shrubs, ground covers and vines.

**Architecture.** The architectural styles are Tuscan, Spanish, Traditional and Craftsman. These styles are synonymous architectural styles of Southern California and the Development Plan includes a rich color palette with a variety of roof, exterior architectural treatments and colors. The Applicant proposes six (6) different plans with three varying exterior elevations and a different floor plan per each of the six (6) plans as depicted within the Development Plan.
Models 1-4 feature two-car garages, while Models 5 & 6 feature two-car garages with additional storage space. No garage conversions are permitted and units must maintain two-car covered spaces at all times.

The proposed architecture and varying floor plan models meet the goals and policies of the “Countywide Design Standards and Guidelines”. The Development Plan will serve as a form of design guidelines to assure quality development when the project is ready to move forward with design of the specific dwelling units for the lots. As such, a Site Development Permit (SDP) would not be required for the construction plans, so long as the project adheres to the approved Development Plan.

Currently, there is no residential development being proposed with the TTM and Development Plan at this time; however, the Applicant intends to process the final map as quickly as possible and intends to sell the entitled parcel once the map has been finalized.

**Section 7.10.080 (G) (Through Lots)**

The purpose of Section 7.10.080 (G) is to prevent the creation of through lots with more than one vehicular access: "Lots less than 2 acres in gross area shall not have double street frontage except that in hillside areas where the topography requires, lots may abut two or more streets provided that the frontage and vehicular access is from only one such street."

The project area is not in a hillside area. Therefore, the provision is applicable to this project. Lots 3-7 within the project are considered through lots per this section as these lots have double frontage on both Opal Street and the proposed “A” Street.

Sequanota Heights meets the intent of Section 7.10.080 (G) for the following reasons:

- Lots 3-7 have only one vehicular access from the interior street of this tract by design (as illustrated on Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, the Development Plan and the Conceptual Landscape Plan, which includes the Wall Plan).
- The community perimeter wall is proposed to be located on the rear lot lines of interior lots, thereby preventing multiple vehicular access points onto the lots. It also creates a lot design and layout similar to interior lots.

Even though the project meets the intent of the provision, the applicant has submitted an application to request for an exception to Section 7.10.080 (G) since the provision is applicable, see Attachment 4. Section 7.10.010 (C) allows for applicants to submit a request for exceptions to any provision of Title 7 (Subdivisions):

"Exceptions 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."

Opal Street borders the western edge of the tract. If the tract was designed to comply with Section 7.10.080 (G) by not creating any through lots, the tract's design would provide a neighborhood frontage street along Opal Street creating double street frontage on “A” Street, whereby the perimeter wall would be facing an interior tract street, furthermore negatively impacting six (6) lots (Lots 13-18) along “A” Street.
A condition has been imposed that prior to map recordation, lot access for the through lots shall be restricted along the public right-of-way, and on the final map, the applicant shall dedicate abutter’s right of access along Opal Street.

The proposed development plan creates a sense of community and produces a desirable streetscape along Opal Street as demonstrated in the Conceptual Landscape Plan. The current tract design creates a unified and cohesive community.

**TENTATIVE TRACT MAP**

Subdivisions are regulated by Title 7 (Subdivisions) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. This project is a Schedule “A” subdivision per Section 7.30.040, defined as: “Any division of land into 5 or more parcels, where any parcel is less than 18,000 square feet in net area.”

The proposed subdivision is consistent with the requirements of Title 7 (Subdivisions) – Chapter 7.15. - Tentative Maps. With the approval of Change of Zone No. 17003 and approval of exception to Section 7.10.080 (G), the project complies with all applicable development standards. The General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) permits up to five (5) dwelling units per acre. The project proposes 48 residential dwelling units at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density.

While lot sizes immediately adjacent to the subject parcel average 7,200 square feet, the project is consistent with the proposed R-4 zone and with other recently approved single family subdivisions, such as Highland Park, a 398 single family residential subdivision, with an approved R-4 Development Plan located to the north of Canal Street and east of Sierra Avenue.

**Secondary Access**

Per Section 7.10.020, General Street Design, of Title 7 (Subdivisions), “In order to assure adequate evacuation times, whenever lots of a proposed land division are located more than one thousand, three hundred and twenty (1,320) feet, or six hundred and sixty (660) feet in a high fire hazard area, from a publicly maintained circulatory road, alternate or secondary access shall be provided.

TTM37211 and the proposed Development Plan have been designed to show access to a secondary circulatory road (Pacific Avenue). C Street now connects Lots 1-39 to Lots 40-48 and out to Pacific Avenue via a proposed bridge over the Riverside County Flood Control channel (Sunnyslope Channel).

**Dedication and Public Right-Of-Way Improvements**

Opal Street is a Local Road with a right-of-way width of 60 feet and Canal Street is considered a Frontage Road with a right-of-way width of 52 feet. Right-of-way dedication will be required along Canal Street to provide 30 feet half ultimate-width from centerline to the property line.

Pacific Avenue shall be dedicated as public road and improved as Local Road. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 36-foot paved road on a 56-foot right-of-way; curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping.

The Applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements along the streets fronting the project. The improvements include, but are not limited to, curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaped parkway and signing and striping.

The project will be conditioned to annex into a Community Facilities District (CFD) in order to collect fees for the continual maintenance of the landscaping and lighting services within the tract, as well as maintenance to Lots A and B. The parkway will also be developed per Title 7 (Subdivisions) and underground utilities will be provided within the dedicated right-of-way.
Lots "A" and "B" will be dedicated to the City for maintenance and streets A, B and C will also be dedicated to the City for public road and utility purposes, see Exhibit 3.

EXHIBIT 3 –PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY SECTIONS

On-Site Utility and Drainage Improvements

Water and sewer service to the project site will be provided by the Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD). New water and sewer lines will connect to existing facilities and street, utility and drainage improvements will connect to existing systems located adjacent to the project boundaries within Canal Street, Opal Street and Pacific Avenue. The County Department of Environmental Health (DEH) has prepared the required SANS 53 clearance letter which states that RCSD will provide water and sewer service to the proposed subdivision, see Attachment 6.
Onsite runoff will be conveyed in the street and collected at catch basins provided at critical points. Offsite flows from the northwest end of the project will be intercepted and conveyed with a proposed Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District Master Drainage Plan storm drain pipe to the existing Sunnyslope Channel. Existing runoff on the westerly side of Opal Street will continue to be conveyed by the street towards an existing drainage swale that runs adjacent to project site and the State Route 60 Freeway. From there, the runoff will be collected by the existing drainage inlet and outlets to the Sunnyslope Channel. Treatment of first flush waters from the development will be accomplished by routing them through the proposed on-site water quality basins.

**Map Distribution**

The Subdivision Map Act requires a local agency to circulate proposed subdivision maps to the service providers (Fire, Sheriff, School District, etc.) and utility companies. This allows each entity the opportunity to review the proposal and determine the impacts of the subdivision relative to their services. Staff circulated the TTM to abovementioned agencies and internal departments such as Engineering, Building and Safety, Public Works and Code Enforcement. Staff received comments and recommended conditions from several external and internal agencies. Comments from these agencies have been considered and incorporated as modifications and/or conditions to this project as deemed necessary by Planning staff.

**FINDINGS FOR TENTATIVE LAND DIVISION MAPS (SECTION 7.15.180)**

Pursuant to Title 7 (Subdivisions) – Chapter 7.15. - Tentative Maps, Section 7.15.180, a tentative tract map shall be denied if it does not meet all requirements of this title, 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 proposed map is consistent with the requirements of the General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) which permits up to five (5) dwelling units per acre. The map will facilitate the future construction of 48 single family homes at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density. Furthermore, the map complies with Title 7 (Subdivisions) and Title 9 (Planning and Zoning), with the approval of Change of Zone No. 17003 and approval of exception to Section 7.10.080 (G).

B. That the design or improvement of the proposed land division is not consistent with applicable General and Specific Plans.

The proposed layout of the 48 parcels is consistent with the City’s General Plan and, with the approval of Change of Zone No. 17003 and approval of exception to Section 7.10.080 (G), all proposed parcels meet the following development standards: 1) minimum 6,000 square foot lot size; 2) minimum lot width of 40 feet; and, 3) minimum lot depth of 80 feet. Additionally, the Development Plan meets the criteria within the R-4 zone.

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

The combined 10.4 acre site is physically suitable as it is a relatively flat, undeveloped, vacant lot adjacent to other single-family residential land uses. The site is physically suitable to accommodate the subdivision and future development of 48 single family residential homes as there is adequate water and sewer connections and public services are available to the site.
D. That the site of the proposed land division is not physically suitable for the proposed density of the development.

The project is physically suitable for the proposed density of the development in that it proposes 48 single family residential dwelling units at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density under the General Plan designation.

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 is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially injure fish or wildlife of their habitat, in that the site is highly disturbed and occupied by ruderal flora and bare ground. Because of the existing degraded site condition, the absence of special-status plant communities, and overall low potential for most special-status species to utilize or reside on-site, the proposed project would not be expected to directly impact federal or state-listed threatened or endangered species.

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

An Initial Study was prepared that evaluated potential effects with respect to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry 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 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 mitigation measures have been required or revisions in the Project have been made or agreed to by the Applicant.

Furthermore a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) report prepared for this project did not reveal evidence of a recognized environmental condition in connection with this project site. The Initial Study determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. As such, the project will not 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 alternate easements for access or for use will be provided and that they will be substantially equivalent to ones previously acquired by the public.

There are no on-site easements within the subject site and therefore the project does not conflict with any on-site easements. The project will connect to existing water and sewer lines located on Canal Street, Opal Street and Pacific Avenue and all proposed utilities will be required to be undergrounded.

Staff has found the subdivision to be in conformance with above findings and in conformance with the City’s Zoning Code, General Plan Land Use designation and Title 7 (Subdivisions), with the approval of Change of Zone No. 17003 and approval of exception to Section 7.10.080 (G). The land division is physically suitable for the type of the development and the proposed density. The design of the project will not cause substantial environmental damage, harm any wildlife, nor cause serious public health problems.
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

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. 5 requires all the mitigation measures of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to be as conditions.

The Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration dated June 27, 2018, Attachment 2 (b), contains an analysis of the traffic noise impacts from SR-60 on future residents of the project. Subsequent to the preparation and circulation of the Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration, staff inquired of the City Attorney if it was required to include such an analysis in the CEQA documentation in light of the CBIA v. Bay Area Air Quality Mgmt. Dist. 62 Cal. 4th 369 (2015). In that case, the California Supreme Court determined that with limited exceptions, CEQA requires only that the lead agency analyze the proposed project’s impacts on the environment – not the impacts of the existing environment on potential future users/residents of a proposed project.

As it applies to this project, for the purposes of CEQA, the analysis must focus on the noise added by the project to the noise levels at existing sensitive receptors in the area (e.g., nearby existing residences, schools, etc.). The analysis for CEQA purposes should not analyze the existing environmental noise (i.e. SR-60 Freeway) on the future residents of the project, unless there is substantial evidence that the project will have impacts that would actually exacerbate an existing condition. The analysis shows that the project will not exacerbate an existing condition (i.e. adding significant amounts of traffic to SR-60 Freeway thus increasing noise levels).

Therefore, the noise analysis with respect to the noise impacts form the SR-60 Freeway in the Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration is to be considered for informational purposes only under CEQA and Mitigation Measure NOI-2-Sound Walls and Mitigation Measure NOI-3 -Interior Noise Analysis do not apply to the project for CEQA purposes.

However, analyzing the noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway on the future residents of the project is necessary for the land use approvals required for the project. As such, the City is addressing the noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway to the future residents as part of the land use entitlement process and is conditioning the project to address noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway accordingly. Please refer to the Walls and Fencing section of this report.

Public Review Period

The public review period for the environmental document began on July 5, 2018 and ended on August 3, 2018. The City did not receive any comments.

CONCLUSION

The proposed subdivision is in conformance with the General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) and the Zoning Code (with approval of Change of Zone No. 17003 and approval of exception to Section 7.10.080 (G). The project also conforms to
Schedule “A” map requirements of Title 7 (Subdivisions) and with other applicable provisions of the Subdivision Map Act. The project will not be a detriment to the public health, safety and welfare and is conditionally compatible with the present and future logical development of the area. Furthermore, the addition of 48 residential units complies with the City’s Housing Element Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) inventory.

The new single family residential development will serve to revitalize the underutilized parcel and visually improve the surrounding neighborhood, and provide much needed housing to the community as well as foster an increase in property values.

All required findings for approval have been affirmatively determined and staff therefore recommends that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 2018-10-24-01 and Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02.
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I. INTRODUCTION

A. DOCUMENT PURPOSE

Pursuant to the City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code (JVMC), Title 9 (Zoning), Chapter 9.100, Section 9.100.060, (R-4 Zone Conditions of Development), in order to apply the R-4 (Planned Residential) designation to a property, a Development Plan must be prepared that contains the following information:

1. Location of each existing and each proposed structure in the development area, the use or uses contained therein. Typical plans indicating use on a lot may be used.

2. Location of all pedestrian walks, malls, recreation and other open areas for the use of occupants and members of the public.

3. Location and Height of all walls, fences and screen planting, including a plan for the landscaping of the development, types of surfacing, such as paving, turf areas, or other landscaping to be used at various locations.

4. Plans and Elevations of the typical structure to indicate architectural type and construction standards.

This document is intended to serve as the Development Plan for Tentative Tract Map 37211 (TTM 37211) with the temporary marketing name “SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS”, which shall be enforced by the City of Jurupa Valley per the final conditions of approval for TTM 37211. The development in the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community is required to substantially conform to the physical characteristics and design concepts set forth in this document. The City has the discretion to determine if implementing actions substantially conform to this Development Plan. If an implementing action does not substantially conform, a formal modification to this Development Plan may be required, which shall require approval by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to the procedures outlined in Section 9.240.440, Applications for Modifications to Approved Permits, of JVMC.

The Site Planning and Design Standards (Section II) set forth minimum requirements that must be adhered to when plotting a home on a residential lot. The Architectural Design Guidelines (Section III) and Landscape Design Guideline (Section IV) set forth the community’s design theme and contain photographs, illustrated sketches and other graphic representations that are to be used as visual aids to achieve the intent of SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS design theme and its key implementing elements.
B. PROJECT LOCATION

SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community is located on a 10.4 acres site (Assessor’s Parcel No. 177-130-007 and 177-142-018), at the south east corner of Canal Street and Opal Street, in the City of Jurupa Valley, Riverside County California. See SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS Vicinity Map, for Figure 1-1 and Figure 1-2 (Zoning Exhibit) on the following page.

C. SUMMARY OF CHANGE OF ZONE (CZ 17003)

Approvals granted by the City of Jurupa Valley to implement the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS project included, but were not limited to, Change of Zone (CZ17003), and Tentative Tract Map (TTM37211). CZ17003 changed the property’s zoning designation to Planned Residential (R-4), refer to Figure 1-2 & 1-3, zoning exhibits. This Development Plan is required as a condition of the R-4 zone designation. TTM 37211 subdivided the property into 48 single family residential lots, two infiltration basins as well as roadways and other supporting infrastructure.

D. COMMUNITY THEME

SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS is a pedestrian orientated residential neighborhood. Broad sidewalks connect the homes within the community.

SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS residential neighborhood features a cohesive mix of architectural styles that complement the community’s location and reflect the rural, agricultural roots of City of Jurupa Valley. The Landscape concept for SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS creates a sense of nature utilizing informal masses of deciduous shade trees, drought tolerant plant materials and accent design features such as slate stone.
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II. SITE PLANNING AND DESIGN

This section includes site planning and design standards that will be enforced to avoid monotonous, repetitive appearances and to encourage a pleasant, pedestrian orientated neighborhood environment.

A. DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

In order to facilitate the City development policy that new residential subdivisions be designed to function as neighborhoods, encourage local social interaction, and promote walking and health activity and incorporate best practices in sustainable development planning, this development plan provides for an application of the following R4 development standards to accomplish these goals:

I. The only permitted use of each lot shall be a single family dwelling, including permitted accessory structures.

II. Variation of setbacks is encouraged along the residential street frontages such that the front setbacks along any street average not less than 15 feet, but in no event shall any habitable structure be located less than 15 feet from the property line.

III. A minimum setback of 20 feet shall be required between a front garage and the front property line.

These and other Standards are summarized in the following table.
Table 2-1 Development Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Requirements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area</td>
<td>6000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width</td>
<td>40 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Depth</td>
<td>80 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yard Requirements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Front Yard</td>
<td>20 feet to garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 feet to living area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Side Yard (Interior &amp; Through Lots)</td>
<td>5 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Side Yard (Corner &amp; Reversed Corner Lots)</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>10 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard (Through Lots)</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Height</td>
<td>40 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Height (Other Structures)</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pursuant to Section 9.100.040 of the JVMC, a minimum of 6,000 square feet of land be provided for each residential unit, inclusive of the individual residential lot area and recreation areas but exclusive of areas set aside for street rights-of-way. The SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community provides 7.08 acres or residential and recreational land uses, which corresponds to approximately 6425 square feet per residential unit. Pursuant to Section 9.100.030, the R-4 zone shall not be applied to any area containing less than nine (9) acres. The subject site contains a combined 10.4 acres and is therefore consistent with this section. As such, SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS complies with Section 9.100.030 & 9.100.040 of the JVMC.

B. Plotting Standards

Detached single-family homes within SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS shall creatively use varied setbacks, architectural designs, outdoor spaces, varied garage treatments, landscaping and other innovative neighborhood design techniques to create a visually interesting street scene and identifiable character. Varying front yard setbacks will break up stretches of linear massing and when combined with private outdoor spaces and front yards will result in a welcoming street scene. The homes within SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community shall comply with the following plotting requirements:
1. Neither the same floor plan nor the same elevation style shall be plotted next to itself or directly across the street from itself. “Directly across the street” shall be defined as more than half of the narrower lot overlapping with the wider lot across the street.

2. Front yard setbacks to living spaces shall vary (where possible) by minimum of two (2) feet between adjacent homes. All setbacks shall meet the minimum requirements listed in Table 2-1, Development Standards.

3. Repetitive patterns of garage placement shall be avoided where possible. Unless a street incline prevents otherwise a left or right sided garage may not be plotted more than three (3) times in a row.

4. Single Story architectural elements shall be incorporated into the elevations of homes on corner lots. Examples of single story architectural elements include architectural projections, bay windows, porches, one – story living spaces and or a one story garage element.

5. A landscaped parkway shall be provided between the curb and sidewalk along the interior neighborhood streets. The landscaped parkway shall include a minimum of one (1) street tree per residential lot. Additional landscape requirements for residential front yards can be found in Section IV of this Development Plan.
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III. ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN GUIDELINES

A. ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN

These guidelines convey the architectural design theme for the SEQUANOA HEIGHTS community. It is not the intent of these Design Guidelines to mandate that all of the identified design components and elements described herein be incorporated into the actual building designs. Rather, these guidelines serve as a “palette” of character-defining exterior elements that should be used in home design. It is expected that builders and their architects will prepare architectural building plans that substantially conform to these Guidelines, while also applying creativity and innovation in response to housing design trends, homebuyer expectations and other market conditions.

Six floors plans are proposed in SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS, as shown on Figures 3-1 through 3-6. All floor plans are designed for minimum 6,000 square foot lots. Plan 1, as shown on Figure 3-1, has 4 bedrooms, entertainment room and 2 baths, with an optional 5th bedroom and 3rd bath in lieu of the entertainment room with a two car garage, with 2,319 square feet of living space. Plan 2, as shown on Figure 3-2, has 4 bedrooms, loft and 3 baths, with an optional 5th bedroom or an optional flex room and a 4th bath in lieu of the loft with a two car garage, with 2,401 square feet of living space. Plan 3, as shown on Figure 3-3, has 5 bedrooms, teen room and 3 baths, with an optional 6th bedroom or optional den in lieu of the teen room with a two car garage, with 2,611 square feet of living space. Plan 4, as shown on Figure 3-4, has 4 bedrooms, entertainment room and 3.5 baths, with an optional grand dining room in lieu of the entertainment room with a two car garage, with 2,806 square feet of living space. Plan 5, as shown on Figure 3-5, has 3 bedrooms, Great Room/Den/Loft and 2.5 baths, with an optional 4th bedroom with 3rd bath in lieu of the den or an optional 5th bedroom in lieu of the loft with a two car garage and extra storage, with 3,042 square feet of living space. Plan 6, as shown on Figure 3-6, has 4 bedrooms, great/suite/loft and 3 baths, with an optional 5th bedroom in lieu of the loft with a two car tandem garage, with 3,134 square feet of living space.

1. Design Principles

While these Design Guidelines do not expressly limit architectural styles, the styles employed in SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS should be complementary and compatible with the styles described in this document. The defining features of the implemented architectural styles must be consistently implemented across the product offering to visually identify and differentiate the style. These guidelines allow for both traditional and contemporary styles, so long as the styles defining features can be visually identified, consistently applied and differentiated from the character – defining features of other styles implemented in the community.
Plan 1.2319
2319 SF
4 Bdrms/Entertainment/2 Baths
2 Car Garage
9' Plate
Plan 2.2401
2,401 SF
4 Bdrm./Loft/3 Bath
2 Bay Garage
Plan 3.2611
2,611 SF
5 Bdrms./Teen Room/3 Ba
2 Car Garage
8'x9' Plates

Upper Floor - 771 SF

Opt. Den

Opt. Bdrm. 6

Lower Floor - 1,840 SF
Plan 4.2806
2,806 SF
4 Bdrm./Dining/3.5 Ba/Entertainment Room
Opt. Grand Dining
2 Car Garage
9' Plate
Plan 5.3042

3,042 SF

3 Bdrm./Great Rom./ Den./ Loft/ 2.5 Ba
2 Bay Garage/ Ster.
8’ / 9’ Plates

Upper Floor - 1,394 SF

Opt. Bdrm. 4 w/ Bath 3

Opt. Bdrm. 5

Lower Floor - 1,446 SF
The selection of architectural styles should be compatible with the massing of their floor plans; as such a certain style should not be forced onto every floor plan if it is not compatible. By emphasizing the use of distinct and identifiable styles, these guidelines discourage sameness and monotony. The multi-style street scene should be diverse as to form, massing, features, front doors, garage doors, materials and colors.

To some extent, resource efficiency also should influence the final selection of architectural styles. The concept of resource efficiency includes reduction of wasteful elements in the design and construction of the home as well as conservation of energy and water during occupancy of the home.

2. Form and Massing

Building mass and scale are two primary design components that affect how a building is perceived. The creative use of design articulation of the building’s visible facades, variation of rooflines, balance of roof forms and changes in vertical and horizontal planes reduces the perceived mass of the building. Even if the front elevation for adjacent homes is the same, variations in massing can provide an abundance of visual interest.

It is important to provide variation in front elevation massing along every street in SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS to provide diversity and avoid monotonous pattern along the streetscape. Examples of design features that can reduce a home’s perceived visual mass include covered front porches, window and door articulation, balconies, extended overhangs and decorative building edge treatment (cornice, eave quoins, etc.) and one-story living spaces. Design elements shall also be included on the rear facades and sides that are visible from public street or adjacent open spaces.

i. Home shall be arranged in a manner that creates a harmonious, varied appearance of building heights and setbacks.

ii. The front sides of a two story house must have one plane break at the first and or second story to avoid monolithic elevations. A plane break must be offset by at least two feet (2’).

iii. The front sides of a single story house must have one plane break. A plane break must be offset by at least two feet (2’).
3. Roofs

The roofline is a dominant visual element of a home. A roof’s composition should allow for a clean interface with the building and the building façade. A roof’s form and composition should reflect the appropriate roof pitch, characteristics and materials that are consistent and true to the selected architectural style and shall not be overbearing nor give the appearance of being disjointed.

i. Rooflines of adjacent homes should vary to create a variety of silhouettes and ridge heights, were possible.

ii. Roof pitches should complement the building’s architectural style. Secondary roof pitches can vary from primary roof pitches only if such variation is consistent with the architectural style.

iii. Roof materials and colors selected for an architectural style must reflect the elements that are typically used in that style.

iv. Roofing materials shall be non-combustible

v. Solar panels, if used should be integrated into the roof design as an unobtrusive element, were possible.

4. Garage Location and Design

To achieve attractive street scenes throughout the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community, particular attention must be given to the design and placement of garages.

i. Garage door style, color and design shall reflect the architectural character of the home and vary between adjacent homes, when appropriate. Acceptable garage door styles include, but are not limited to raised panel, recessed panel and flush panel.

ii. Windows shall be incorporated into the garage door design for at least 20% of all the garages. Where provided, garage doors windows styles shall correspond to the architectural style of the house.
iii. Architectural features, such as varied rooflines and second story setbacks, shall be incorporated into the garage design to reduce building mass and scale and create a visually interesting street scene, when appropriate for the selected architectural style.

iv. Landscaped vines and trees wells should be introduced to soften the visual impact of the garage door and accent the garage façade.

Adherence to the following shall be required in all homes:

v. Front facing garage widths limited to 65% of the house width.

vi. A 220 volt outlet shall be plumbed in the garage as a standard feature on all homes to accommodate charging of electric vehicles.

vii. A minimum 3 foot wide landscape area shall be located on both sides of a driveway.

5. Windows and Doors

Window and door details are architectural components that carry a strong visual impact through their placement and design.

i. Front door details shall be consistent with the architectural style.

ii. Feature window shapes shall be consistent with the architectural style.

iii. Accent shutters are not required, however, when used, shutter size shall be proportional to the window and shall reflect the architectural style.

iv. Window trim details with silver and gold frames or reflective glass are prohibited.

6. Building Materials and Colors

A complementary mixture of colors, textures and building materials is encouraged throughout the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community. Building material and color selection are integral components in the definition of a specific architectural style and also provide a varied streetscape design. Material breaks, transitions and terminations should produce complementary and clear definitions of separation while maintaining a prescribed color and materials palette. A variety of
exterior accent materials (e.g. brick, stone, siding, pre-cast concrete, timber) should be used as an integral feature in home construction to convey the selected architectural style.

A Color Sample is provided as part of this Planned Development documents as Attachment A.

i. Color schemes shall be simple, tasteful and consistent with architectural styles.

ii. A scheme of color values on all exterior elements shall be distinct from one house to the next with deeper tones encouraged to promote variations. This avoid monotonous appearance of multiple buildings of the same colors and tones.

iii. Material breaks and transitions and termination shall produce complimentary and clear definitions of separation, while maintaining a prescribed color and materials theme. This especially important in changing from stucco and or siding to masonry veneers.

iv. Stucco finishes on exterior walls shall be accompanied by at least one other accent material appropriate to the architectural style.

7. Outdoor Lighting

Lighting standards throughout SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS shall be similar in style, color and materials embracing a natural and minimal lighting approach.

i. All outdoor lighting shall incorporate, to the extent feasible and permissible under City standards, measures to aid in reducing light pollution. Such measures include; wattage reduction, directing lighting downward, shielding lights (or using “cut-off” lights that only illuminate the side or underside of a fixture, rather than shining skyward) and lowering the height of light poles to reduce the illumination radius.

ii. All outdoor lighting fixtures shall be focused, directed and arranged to minimize glare and illumination on public streets and adjoining property.

8. Mechanical Equipment

Mechanical equipment such as air conditioners, heaters, evaporative coolers and other such devices shall not be mounted on any roof and must be located behind privacy walls or landscaping. Solar panels are permitted, but not required, on roofs.
B. ARCHITECTURAL STYLES

The residential architecture of SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS shall include a complementary palette of architectural styles that are authentic to southern California landscape. The architectural styles expected in the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community, and their character-defining elements, are described below. The list of styles contained herein is not intended to be exhaustive or limiting. Rather, it is intended to demonstrate that acceptable styles shall have some historical authenticity to southern California, defined by a unique set of design characteristics. Contemporary interpretations of historical styles are appropriate.

The following is a list of architectural styles appropriate for the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community along with defining characteristics of those styles. The list of characteristics provides guidance for implementing the style, but not every listed design element is required to be applied on every home. The characteristics are only representative because an authentic style can have several interpretations. The only requirement is that definable architectural styles be utilized so that elevations are easily identifiable and the street scene is diverse.

Architectural styles include:

- Tuscan
- Spanish
- Traditional
- Craftsman
## Tuscan

Use of stone, simple gable-ended architecture and, on occasion, hipped roofs. Narrow and tall windows openings and shutters with periodical use of arches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Features</th>
<th>Windows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Use of Stone</td>
<td>Deep Set (4” minimum) on front elevations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>Narrow and tall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Overhangs</td>
<td>Shutters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmetrical fenestration</td>
<td>Awning shutters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical forms</td>
<td><strong>Roofs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colors</strong></td>
<td>Simple gable and hipped roofs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth tones</td>
<td>Terra Cotta concrete tiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant accents</td>
<td><strong>Accent Materials</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stucco</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stone</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Spanish**

Use of stucco, low pitched clay colored roof, shutters, periodical use of arches, small porches and decorative ornaments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Features</th>
<th>Windows</th>
<th>Roofs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Arched entries</td>
<td>▪ Narrow and tall</td>
<td>▪ Low pitched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Symmetrical fenestration</td>
<td>▪ Shutters</td>
<td>▪ Shingle or tile-barrel, “S” or red clay or concrete tiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Minimal overhangs</td>
<td>▪ Wood or stucco accents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Small porches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ White</td>
<td>▪ Low pitched</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Light browns</td>
<td>▪ Shingle or tile-barrel, “S”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Dark accents</td>
<td>▪ red clay or concrete tiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accent Materials</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Wood</td>
<td>▪ Occasional use of decorative ornaments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mix of architectural styles with simple roof lines, covered entries, symmetrical fenestration, periodic use of roof gables, small porches, evenly spaced shuttered windows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Features</th>
<th>Windows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Symmetrical fenestration</td>
<td>▪ Symmetrical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Minimal overhangs</td>
<td>▪ Shutters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Small porches</td>
<td>▪ Wood or stucco accents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Straight or curved columns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Pediment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colors</th>
<th>Roofs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ White</td>
<td>▪ Simple gables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Light browns</td>
<td>▪ Concrete tiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Dark accents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accent Materials</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Stucco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Columns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Craftsman movement was a comprehensive design and art movement that was born at the turn of the century in Southern California. The basis of Craftsman architecture is originality, simplicity of form and visibility of handicraft.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craftsman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Craftsman movement was a comprehensive design and art movement that was born at the turn of the century in Southern California. The basis of Craftsman architecture is originality, simplicity of form and visibility of handicraft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Tapered posts and columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Porches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Straight or curved columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pediment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Rich Earth tones, especially browns and greens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bright contrasting colors are often used to highlight architectural features.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accent Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Stucco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Occasional use of brick, concrete, wooden paneling/siding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Windows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Use of wide single dormers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wood or stucco accents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roofs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Flat tile roofs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low pitched gabled roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wide, enclosed overhangs with extensive decorative supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roof rafters usually exposed with decorative beams/braces added underneath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IV. LANDSCAPE DESIGN GUIDELINES

These Landscape Design Guidelines articulate the various landscape design components of SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS thematic identity. SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS is a pedestrian orientated, single family community.

As demonstrated by Figure 4-1, Conceptual Landscape Plan, the landscape concept is intended to create a sense of community. The recommend plant palette and hardscape materials are designed to reinforce and emphasize the community’s landscape theme at major focal points.

Although a great deal of specific design information is provided in these Landscape Design Guidelines these Guidelines are not intended to establish a set of rigid landscaping requirements for the SEEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community. Rather, these Guidelines provide landscape principles and standards to ensure that plant materials, community walls, fences and compatible with the community’s design concept. As such, there will be at times be a need for an interpretation of the guidelines in keeping with the spirit of the community’s landscape concept. Regardless, it is important that the general landscape concept described herein be implemented to ensure a cohesive and unified community-wide landscape concept.

A. PLANT PALETTE

The plant palette for SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS complements and enhances the community’s natural setting, while also reducing irrigation needs and conserving water resources. The plant palette includes colorful plant materials all with evergreen and deciduous trees appropriate for the property’s climatic conditions. The plant palette also accentuates other design elements in the community, such as the recommended architectural styles, monumentation, walls and fences etc. Many of the plant materials are water efficient species native to southern California or naturalized to the arid southern California climate.

Table 4-2, Plant Palette, provides a list of plant materials approved for use in the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community. The utilization of some materials, depending on their site location, exposure and relationship to other influential factors may not be appropriate in all locations of the community. The plant palette listed in Table is provided as a base palette for the community’s landscape design. Other similar plant materials may be substituted provide the selected plan materials are water efficient and complement the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community theme. Plant selection for specific areas of the community shall have similar watering requirements so the irrigation systems can be designed to minimize water use and plant materials can thrive under optimal conditions.
Sequanota Heights Concept Statement

Sequanota Heights is a residential development that is located in eastern Jurupa Valley directly north of the 60 freeway between Pacific Ave. and Oak St. The area surrounding the site completely lacks any character with regards to landscaping. Streetscapes are absent, there are no sidewalks, and the residences lack any sense of design. With Sequanota, we aim to establish a character for this and future developments in the area.

The landscape concept for Sequanota Heights is derived from the local Jurupa Valley landscape. North-western Riverside County is primarily occupied by the California sage scrub (CSS) plant community, a community that is dominated by shrubs and groundcovers. The adjacent plant community, the oak woodland, has also been incorporated as the perimeter planting as it would naturally border the CSS. The plant palette for both the CSS and oak woodland will be kept simple. Where the two communities meet, an ecotone condition occurs. Ecotones contain the most diversity in plant and wildlife in nature. In these ecotone areas, additional plant material will be added to diversity textures and colors.

The plants that have been selected for each of these three typologies are either California natives or California adapted species that contain similar visual characteristics as those found in both the CSS and oak woodland. Plant material requiring low water will be used throughout the community.

- OAK WOODLAND PLANTING
- CALIFORNIA SAGE SCRUB PLANTING
- ECOTONE PLANTING
**PLANTING LEGEND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL WOODLAND PLANT PALETTE</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>O.C. SPACING</th>
<th>WUCOLS: REGION 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STREET TREES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRUNUS 'PHOENIX'</td>
<td>PHOENIX MESQUITE</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>24&quot; BOX MIN.</td>
<td>PER PLAN</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUERCUS AGRIPOFIA</td>
<td>COAST LIVE OAK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUERCUS SUBER</td>
<td>CORK OAK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUND COVER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACCHARIS PULIARIS 'PIGEON POINT'</td>
<td>DWARF COYOTE BRUSH</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,680</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>1'-6&quot; TO 3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREX TUMULICOLA</td>
<td>BERKELEY SEDGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYOPORUM PARVIFOLIUM ROEANUS</td>
<td>PROSTRATE MYOPORUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSEMARIS OFICINALIS 'PROSTRATUS'</td>
<td>PROSTRATE ROSEMARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA SAGE SCRUB PLANT PALETTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZONE 2 BASIN PLANTING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREX PARI ALEYMUS CONDENSATUS 'CANYON PRINCE'</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA MEADOW SEDGE</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,370</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>HYDROSEED</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mtrscoepingitolis &amp; 'tamariscifolia'</td>
<td>GIANT WILD RYE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYRISTO COMMISTS 'compactic'</td>
<td>DEER GRASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZONE 3 BASIN PLANTING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREX PARI ALEYMUS CONDENSATUS 'CANYON PRINCE'</td>
<td>GIANT WILD RYE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>4'-0&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mtrscoepingitolis &amp; 'tamariscifolia'</td>
<td>DEER GRASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECOTONE PLANT PALETTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINUS CANARIENSIS</td>
<td>CENTENNIAL ISLAND PINE</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>24&quot; BOX MIN.</td>
<td>PER PLAN</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLATANUS X ACERIFOLIA</td>
<td>LONDON PLANE TREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHRUBS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACCHARIS 'CENTENNIAL'</td>
<td>GIANT WILD RYE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>4'-0&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIPERUS SABINA 'TAMARISCIFOLIA'</td>
<td>DEER GRASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYRISTO COMMISTS 'COMPACTIC'</td>
<td>DEER GRASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTRINGIA FRUTICOSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERENNIAL GRASSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEYMUS CONDENSATUS 'CANYON PRINCE'</td>
<td>GIANT WILD RYE</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>2'-0&quot; TO 4'-0&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mtrscoepingitolis &amp; 'tamariscifolia'</td>
<td>DEER GRASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUND COVER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACCHARIS PULIARIS 'PIGEON POINT'</td>
<td>DWARF COYOTE BRUSH</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>2'-0&quot; TO 4'-0&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORPUSMALA A KIRKI</td>
<td>CREEPING MIRROR PLANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANTANA NEW GOLD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISC. PLANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIMBING VINE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PECIOS PULIFLORA</td>
<td>CREEPING FIG</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>15'-0&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACADAIENAN UNQUIS CATI</td>
<td>CATS CLAW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTHENOCISSUS TRICUSPIDATA</td>
<td>BOSTON IVY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**
A MINIMUM OF (10) TREES SHALL BE UPSIZED TO 48" BOX AS REPLACEMENTS FOR THE TREES THAT ARE INDICATED TO BE REMOVED BY THE TREE SURVEY.

PLANTING NOTES:
- PROVIDE 3" LAYER OF MULCH (MIN.) IN SHRUB BEDS AND UNPLANTED AREAS;
- 2" LAYER OF MULCH (MIN.) IN GROUNDCOVER AREAS;
- 3" LAYER OF SHREDDED, STABILIZING MULCH FOR SLOPES
- TREES SHALL BE STAKED WITH 2-3 STAKES AND 6 TREE TIES PER COUNTY STANDARD DETAILS. USE TRIPLE STAKING WITH 3" DIAMETER STAKES IN HIGH WIND AREAS.
- ROOT BARRIERS SHALL BE INSTALLED FOR TREES WITHIN 6' (MIN.) OF HARDSCAPE PER COUNTY STANDARD DETAILS. ROOT BARRIER SHALL NOT ENCIRCLE THE TREE ROOTBALL BUT SHALL BE LOCATED AT THE EDGE OF HARDSCAPE AND EXTEND BEYOND CENTER OF TREE A MINIMUM OF 5 IN EACH DIRECTION.
- TREES SHALL HAVE BREATHER TUBES PER COUNTY DETAIL.
- PLANT SELF CLINGING VINES 15" O.C. ON ALL STREET FACING PERIMETER WALLS EXCEPT REAR YARD WALLS OF LOTS 40 - 49.
B. **MONUMENTATION**

Two entry points to the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS are provided from Pacific Ave and Canal Street. The primary entrance to SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS is provided from Pacific Ave. The primary entry includes an entry monument wall with a stucco veneer treatment, stone and precast concrete caps. Landscaping provided at the primary entry includes groundcover, low shrubs, border plants and larger specimen trees.

A secondary entry to SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS is provided from Canal Street at “B” Street. The secondary entry follows the design theme for the primary entry but at a scaled down design.

C. **STREETSCAPES**

Landscaping of the roadway streetscapes within SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS is critical in creating a sense of plan with maintaining a high quality community theme. The scale and proportion of the street scene provides separation of vehicular and pedestrian travel. Varied streetscapes are intended to create a high quality, visual pleasing experience at the pedestrian and vehicular level. Streetscapes throughout the community are planned with a combination of street trees, low shrubs and groundcover. The landscaping plant palette for the streetscapes links the roadways to the rest of the community by providing visual continuity.

1. **Street C.** The landscape treatment along Street C is intended to act as a buffer between the community and the 60 freeway. The south side of street C is planted with evergreen trees 30’ on center.

2. **Opal Street:** Includes a 5-foot landscaped parkway, a 5-foot sidewalk and additional 2-foot landscape setback area between the sidewalk and the community’s perimeter wall.

3. **Local Street:** As shown on Figure 4-3 local streets within SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS feature a 5-foot wide parkway with street trees and turf and a 5-foot sidewalk.

As shown on Figure 4-4 typical front yard landscape plan, the front yard of each unit shall include a minimum of five (5) 5-gallon shrubs, one (1) 24-inch box tree and one (1) 15 gallon or larger tree. Corner lots shall be required to provide landscaping between the community wall and sidewalk.
D. WALLS AND FENCES

The conceptual Wall and Fence plan for the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community is illustrated on Figure 4-6. As shown, the walls and fences are provided throughout the community to minimize roadway noise, maximize view of scenic resources, and increase privacy within each residential lot and increase safety for pedestrians along primary community roads. Community walls and fences are designed as an integral component and extension of the building design and surrounding landscape. Periphery walls can be integrated into the adjacent structure and extended into the landscape to help integrate the building into its environment. Gates should be complementary color to its fence or wall. Similarly, walls and fences shall be constructed of materials, colors and textures that are similar to and harmonious with the architecture.

The types of wall and fencing within the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community are described below and illustrated on Figure 4-6, Wall and Fence plan.

- **Community Wall.** Community Walls are general located along the exterior of the community and to separate private yards from roadways. Community walls will be constructed with 6-foot split face CMU and pilasters with a 4” precision cap. Color shall be Tan for the CMU Wall and Tan V CMU for the Pilasters. On the street side of the walls facing a street, climbing vines shall be included.

- **Interior Block Wall.** Interior block wall are provided between private yards. Interior Block Walls will be 6-feet tall and be made of Tan Precision CMU.

- **Open View Fence.** Open View Fences will enclose the two retention basins and a small portion along the south side of Street C at the Flood Control Crossing. Open View Fencing will be constructed of 6-foot tubular steel painted black.
Figure 4-6
SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS

WALL & FENCE PLAN
Sequanota Partners, LP
Jurupa Valley, CA
Conceptual Landscape Design
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E. GENERAL LANDSCAPE STANDARDS

General landscape standards for the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community are provided below and on the following pages:

1. Required Planting and Irrigation Plan

A landscape architect licensed in California shall be retained to prepare the planting and irrigation plans for all public areas. Arrangement of plants should be relatively informal; plants should be placed to allow them to grow to their natural sizes and forms. Sheared hedges should be kept at a minimum.

2. Irrigation

Proper consideration of irrigation system design and installation in the climate extremes of the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community is critical to the landscape investment. In particular, the combined summer elements of heat and wind must be carefully considered in proper irrigation design and equipment selection.

i. All landscaped areas shall be watered with a permanent irrigation system with the goal to minimize water use and runoff.

ii. Irrigation systems that adjoin a separate maintenance responsibility area shall be designated in a manner to ensure complete water coverage between areas.

iii. All irrigation systems shall have automatic controllers designed to properly water plant materials given the site’s soil conditions.

iv. Irrigation systems for all public landscapes shall have automatic rain shut off devices.

v. Southern California native and drought tolerant shrub areas shall be watered using a combination spray and drip or bubbler irrigation to shrubs and trees. In addition, irrigation controllers should be evapotranspiration based and be capable of providing multiple repeat start times.

vi. All irrigation heads adjacent to walks, drives and curbs shall be of the pop-up type.

vii. Irrigation backflow prevention devices and controllers shall be located with minimum public visibility or shall be screened with appropriate plant materials.
viii. Irrigation systems shall be designed per AB 1881 guidelines and comply with the City of Jurupa Valley ordinance.

3. Ownership and Maintenance of Common Areas.

Ownership and maintenance responsibilities for common areas with the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community are illustrated on Figure 4-7, Maintenance Plan. Individual homeowners shall be responsible for the maintenance of public street landscape along their property frontage unless otherwise identified within their legal ownership documents. Private homeowners shall also be responsible for all maintenance within their private lot area as well as fences and wall on their internal boundaries. For all other areas of the community maintenance responsibilities shall be through a community facilities district.
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4 Bdrm./Entertainment, 3 Ba.
Opt. 1drm. 5 w/ 3a. 3/3a Opt. Den
2 Bay Garage
9' Ht.
Elevation A - Spanish

Elevation D - Tuscan

Elevation B - Traditional

Plan 1.2319
PLAN 4A – SPANISH
PLAN 2A – TUSCAN
PLAN 3B – TRADITIONAL
PLAN 5C – CRAFTSMAN
PLAN 6A – TUSCAN
PLAN 3A – SPANISH
Elevation A - Spanish

Elevation D - Tuscan

Elevation B - Traditional

Plan 2.2401
Elevation A - Spanish

Elevation B - Traditional

Elevation D - Tuscan

Plan 3.2611
Elevation A - Spanish

Elevation B - Traditional

Elevation D - Tuscan

Plan 3.2611
Plan 3.2611
Left Elevation D

Right Elevation D

Front Elevation D - Tuscan

Rear Elevation D

Plan 3.2611
Elevation A - Spanish

Elevation D - Tuscan

Elevation C - Craftsman

Plan 4.2806
Left Elevation A

Front Elevation A - Spanish

Right Elevation A

Rear Elevation A

Plan 4.2806
Plan 5.3042
3042 SF
3 Bdrm./Great Rm./Den/Lkt./2.5 Ba
2 Bay Garage/Stor.
8"/9" Plates
Elevation A - Spanish

Elevation D - Tuscan

Elevation C - Craftsman

Plan 5.3042
Plan 6.3124
3,134 SF
4 Bdrm/Grat Rm./Suite/Loft/3 Ba
Opt. Bdrm 5
2 Bay Garage/Tandem
8' / 9' Plates

Upper Floor - 1,360 SF

Lower Floor - 1,746 SF w/ Home Stair
Lower Floor - 1,172 SF w/ Home Share
Home Share - 594 SF
Elevation A

Elevation C

Elevation D

Plan 6.3124
Elevation A - Spanish

Elevation D - Tuscan

Elevation C - Craftsman

Plan 6.3124
Left Elevation C

Front Elevation C - Craftsman

Right Elevation C

Rear Elevation C

Plan 6.3124
ATTACHMENT NO. 14

Conceptual Landscape Plans (Wall/Fence and Maintenance Plan included)
Sequanota Heights Concept Statement
Sequanota Heights is a residential development that is located in western Jurupa Valley, directly north of the 60 freeway between Pacific Ave. and Oak St. The area surrounding the site completely lacks any character with regards to landscaping. It's streetscapes are absent, there are no sidewalks, and the residences lack any sense of design. With Sequanota, we aim to establish a character for this and future developments in the area.

The landscape concept for Sequanota Heights is derived from the local Jurupa Valley landscape. Northwestern Riverside County is primarily occupied by the California sage scrub (CSS) plant community, a community that is dominated by shrubs and groundcovers. The adjacent plant community, the oak woodland, has also been incorporated as the perimeter planting as it would naturally border the CSS. The plant palette for both the CSS and oak woodland will be kept simple. Where the two communities meet, an ecotone condition occurs. Ecotones contain the most diversity in plant and wildlife in nature. In these ecotone areas, additional plant material will be added to diversify textures and colors.

The plants that have been selected for much of these three typologies are either California natives or California adapted species that contain similar visual characteristics as those found in both the CSS and oak woodland. Plant material requiring low water will be used throughout the community.

- OAK WOODLAND PLANTING
- CALIFORNIA SAGE SCRUB PLANTING
- ECOTONE PLANTING
Sequanoita Partners, LP  
Sequanoita Heights  
Jurupa Valley, CA  
Conceptual Landscape Design

**PLANTING LEGEND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>O.C. SPACING</th>
<th>WUCOLS: REGION 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>QUERCUS SUBER</td>
<td>CORK OAK</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>2'-0&quot; TO 4'-0&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>PROSTRATE ROSEMARY</td>
<td>DEER GRASS</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>CAREX PANSA</td>
<td>MEADOW SEDGE</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1'-6&quot; TO 3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GROUND COVER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>O.C. SPACING</th>
<th>WUCOLS: REGION 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>PROSTRATE ROSEMARY</td>
<td>DEER GRASS</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>CAREX PANSA</td>
<td>MEADOW SEDGE</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1'-6&quot; TO 3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SIDEWALK PLANT PALETTE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>O.C. SPACING</th>
<th>WUCOLS: REGION 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>PROSTRATE ROSEMARY</td>
<td>DEER GRASS</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>CAREX PANSA</td>
<td>MEADOW SEDGE</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1'-6&quot; TO 3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANT PALLETTE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>O.C. SPACING</th>
<th>WUCOLS: REGION 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>PROSTRATE ROSEMARY</td>
<td>DEER GRASS</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>CAREX PANSA</td>
<td>MEADOW SEDGE</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1'-6&quot; TO 3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**  
A minimum of (1) tree shall be upsized to 4" box as replacements for the trees that are indicated to be removed by the tree survey.
Sequonota Partners, LP
Sequonota Heights
Jurupa Valley, CA
Conceptual Landscape Design

Cavity(s) in tree
Trunk Damage
Hollow Trunk
Mainstem Dieback
Cable / Brace
Diseased
Soil buildup at Base
Leaning
Regrown Stump
Safety Hazard
Safety Prune (crown reduction)
Raise Canopy
Insect Treatment
Disease Treatment
Drought Stressed
Nutritional needs
Sparse Foliage
Caliper @36''ABH
Tree Number
Eucalyptus spc
Casuarinas spc
chinos molle
Insect Damaged
Box size
Tree Declining
STAFF REPORT

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

FROM: GARY THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER
BY: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 12.B

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA16005) FROM LDR (LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL – COUNTRY NEIGHBORHOOD) TO MDR (MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL) AND NOTICE OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION’S DECISION TO APPROVE MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 16146 (TTM37052) A PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT FOR NOTICING THE ADVISORY AGENCY’S (PLANNING COMMISSION) DECISION OF APPROVING A SUBDIVISION OF A PROPERTY LOCATED WEST OF HUDSON STREET BETWEEN 60TH AND 59TH STREETS (APN: 165-100-027) (APPLICANTS: ANDREW SHORES AND PAUL TALANIAN)

RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-04, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM AND APPROVING GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 16005 TO CHANGE THE LAND USE DESIGNATION OF APPROXIMATELY 7.25 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED WEST OF HUDSON STREET BETWEEN 60TH AND 59TH STREETS (APN: 165-100-027) FROM LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL – COUNTRY NEIGHBORHOOD (LDR) TO MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MDR)

2) That the City Council receive and file the Notice of Decision, initiating the commencement of a ten-day appeal period for Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37052.

BACKGROUND

On November 28, 2018, the Planning Commission held a public hearing and, on a 4-0 vote, took the following actions:
(1) Adopted Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-11-28-03, recommending that the City Council (1) adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and (2) approve General Plan Amendment (GPA) No. 16005; and

(2) Adopted Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-11-28-04, (1) adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and (2) approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37052, authorizing the subdivision of a 7.25-acre property into 28 residential lots, averaging 7,793 square feet, for the development of future single-family homes.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Applicant (“Applicant” or “Andrew Shores and Paul Talanian”), submitted an application for a General Plan Amendment to change the existing land use designation from LDR (Low Density Residential – Country Neighborhood) to MDR (Medium Density Residential) and a Tentative Tract Map to allow the subdivision of a 7.25 gross acre property into 28 single-family residential lots with average lot size of 7,793 square feet; two (2) water retention basins; three (3) lettered street lots (A-C) and the construction of associated infrastructure.

The existing R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) zone will remain unchanged.

The adopted Planning Commission Resolution is included as Attachment 2. Detailed project information is presented within the November 28, 2018 Planning Commission staff report and excerpt from the meeting minutes (Attachments 3 and 4).

The property is surrounded by a single-family housing tract to the west, single-family homes to the east, southeast and Pedley Elementary School to the north, and vacant property to the immediate south. A summary of the existing General Plan land use and zoning designations for the project site and surrounding properties is provided in Table 1 and maps are provided under Exhibit 1.

TABLE 1: EXISTING GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>State Route 60 Freeway</td>
<td>State Route 60 Freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac and Highest Density Residential (HHDR)</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City of Jurupa Valley General Plan Land Use and Zoning Map
EXHIBIT 1: EXISTING LAND USE (LDR) AND ZONING (R-1) MAPS

ANALYSIS

General Plan Amendment

The property and surrounding area is zoned R-1, which accommodates subdivisions that range from 3.5 to 4.0 units per acre. However, it is within a General Plan Land Use designation of LDR (Low Density Residential - Country Neighborhood) which permits up to two (2) dwelling units per acre. Under the current LDR land use designation, up to 14 dwelling units are permitted. The project proposes 28 residential dwelling units at a density of 3.8 dwelling units per acre, consistent with the existing R-1 zoning, and which is above the maximum density established in the General Plan. The project therefore requires a General Plan Amendment (GPA16005) to change the land use from LDR to MDR (Medium Density Residential) which allows 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre.

Land Use Compatibility

While the subject site is located within the LDR land use designation, the site and existing surrounding land uses are all zoned and developed as R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) which permit 7,200 square-foot lots with minimum average lot widths of 60 feet and minimum average lot depths of 100 feet. The project proposes lots which range from 7,200 to 8,479 square feet, with lot widths from 62 to 68 feet and lot depths from 102 to 156 feet.

The single-family housing tract located to the immediate west of the subject site on Scheelite Street was originally subdivided in 1976 with 7,200 square-foot lots and the single-family housing tract located west of Scheelite Street on Azurite Street and along
the west side of Felspar Street between 61st and 59th Street were originally subdivided in 1954, also with 7,200 square-foot lots. Additionally, several parcels located to the immediate east of the subject site were subdivided in the mid-1950s with 7,200 square-foot residential lots.

Exhibit 2 depicts the proposed land use for the subject property:

EXHIBIT 2: PROPOSED MDR LAND USE

The proposed General Plan Amendment from LDR to MDR is consistent with the existing land use development, which is primarily single-family housing tracts developed under the R-1 zone development standards of 7,200 square-foot minimum lot area, 60-foot minimum average lot width and 100-foot minimum average lot depth.

The project, if approved, would be consistent with applicable policies of the MDR land use and density level, which permits 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre. Under the MDR land use designation, up to 36 dwelling units are permitted. The project proposes 28 residential lots, which is below the density range established in the MDR land use designation.
As the subject site is located adjacent to several housing tracts which have been developed with R-1 development standards, a change of land use to MDR, which allows a density of 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre, is appropriate within the entire R-1 zoned area. Additionally, the subject site and R-1 zoned area is within the Pedley Village Center (PVC) and the GPA to MDR is consistent with the General Principles within the PVC. Furthermore, the GPA promotes the housing goals and policies of the Economic Sustainability Element as follows:

**While tax base development focuses on commerce, including retail, dining, entertainment, services, and industrial, it is interactive with the housing market. The quality and diversity of residential neighborhoods create the basis for the local job market. To attract higher paying jobs to Jurupa Valley, residential neighborhoods that meet the needs and preferences of skilled and professional labor must be available in the community. This leads to increasing median income and, in turn, attracts the diversity of commercial and industrial development that benefits the entire community and builds a tax base which will help fund local government services.**

Ultimately, in order to make the zoning consistent with the General Plan, the City will need to change the General Plan Land Use designation for all the parcels currently zoned R-1 in this neighborhood to MDR inasmuch as they are already developed per the MDR land use designation and the R-1 zoning standards. The R-1 neighborhood is bounded by 58th Street to the north, Felspar Street to the west, 61st and Main Streets to the south and Van Buren Blvd. to the east (see Exhibit 1 zoning map).

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

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. Staff has implemented a condition which requires that all mitigation measures of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) be incorporated into the Conditions of Approval.
Public Review Period
The public review period for the Initial Study/MND began on November 8, 2018 and ended on November 27, 2018. The City did not receive any comments.

PUBLIC NOTICING
As required by the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, staff provided the public hearing notice to property owners within the required 1,000-foot radius, see Attachment 6.

CONCLUSION
With approval of GPA16005, the proposed subdivision is in conformance with the General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) and the R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) zone and development standards. The project also conforms to Schedule “A” map requirements of Title 7 (Subdivisions) and with other applicable provisions of the Subdivision Map Act. The project will not be a detriment to the public health, safety and welfare and is conditionally compatible with the present and future logical development of the area. Furthermore, the addition of 28 residential units complies with the City’s Housing Element Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) inventory.

The new single-family residential development will serve to revitalize the surrounding neighborhood, and provide much needed housing to the community as well as promote an increase in property values.

All required findings for approval have been affirmatively determined and staff therefore recommends that the City Council adopt Resolution 2019-04.

Per Title 7 (Subdivisions) Section 7.15.150. Appeal of Advisory Agency Actions, Procedure, a notice of the decision of the Planning Commission for the action on Tentative Parcel Map No. 37052 shall be filed with the City Council. The decision of the Planning Commission shall be final unless the decision is appealed to the City Council. Such appeal must be filed with the City Clerk within 10 days of the date that the notice of decision appears on the City Council’s Agenda.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
There are no financial impacts associated with the notice of decision or the Change of Zone as the Applicant’s deposit account covers all associated costs for processing.

ALTERNATIVES
1. Approve the project, taking the following actions:
   a) Adopt Resolution No. 2019-04, entitled:

   A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING
PROGRAM AND APPROVING GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 16005 TO CHANGE THE LAND USE DESIGNATION OF APPROXIMATELY 7.25 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED WEST OF HUDSON STREET BETWEEN 60TH AND 59TH STREETS (APN: 165-100-027) FROM LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL – COUNTRY NEIGHBORHOOD (LDR) TO MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MDR)

b) Receive and file the Notice of Decision, initiating the commencement of a ten-day appeal period for Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37052.

2. Determine the tract map should be considered by the Council along with the General Plan amendment, appeal the Planning Commission approval of the tract map, set a hearing date for the appeal and continue the public hearing for the GPA to the same date as the appeal.

3. Deny the GFA, which will deny the Tract Map by default.

Prepared by:

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director

Submitted by:

Gary Thompson
City Manager

Reviewed by:

Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Reviewed by:

Peter M. Thorson
City Attorney

Reviewed by:

George A. Wentz
Deputy City Manager

ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution No. 2019-04
   a) Exhibit A: Conditions of Approval
   b) Exhibit B: Initial Study Checklist / Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
3. November 28, 2018 Planning Commission Staff Report (without exhibits)
4. Excerpt of PC Minutes (11-28-18)
5. GPA Exhibit
6. Radius Map showing 1,000 foot radius from project boundaries
7. TTM37052
8. Conceptual Landscape Plan
9. Wall and Fence Plan
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-04

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM AND APPROVING GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 16005 TO CHANGE THE LAND USE DESIGNATION OF APPROXIMATELY 7.25 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED WEST OF HUDSON STREET BETWEEN 60TH AND 59TH STREETS (APN: 165-100-027) FROM LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL – COUNTRY NEIGHBORHOOD (LDR) TO MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MDR)

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. **Project.** Andrew Shores and Paul Talanian (collectively, the “Applicant”) have applied for General Plan Amendment No. 16005 and Tentative Tract Map No. 37052 (collectively, Master Application No. 16146 or MA No. 16146) to change the land use designation of real property located west of Hudson Street between 60th and 59th Streets (APN: 165-100-027) from Low Density Residential - Country Neighborhood (LDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR), and to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 7.25 gross acres into twenty-eight (28) single-family residential lots, two (2) water retention basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots (A-C) on real property located west of Hudson Street between 60th and 59th Streets (APN: 165-100-027) in the One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone (the “Project”). General Plan Amendment No. 16005 is the subject is this Resolution.

Section 2. **General Plan Amendment.**

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of General Plan Amendment No. 16005 to redesignate 7.25 gross acres located west of Hudson Street between 60th and 59th Streets (APN: 165-100-027) from Low Density Residential - Country Neighborhood (LDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR).

(b) Section 9.30.010.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that any amendment to any part of the Jurupa Valley General Plan, shall be adopted in accordance with the provisions of Section 65300 et seq. of the Government Code, as now written or hereafter amended, and Chapter 9.30 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(c) Section 9.30.010.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the initiation of proceedings for the amendment of any part of the Jurupa Valley General Plan shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 9.30 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.
(d) Section 9.30.040.D. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the owner of real property, or a person authorized by the owner, seeking to change the land use designation on that real property, shall have the right to apply for a General Plan amendment without having to request that the City Council adopt an order initiating proceedings for an amendment as detailed in Section 9.30.040. Instead, the owner of real property, or a person authorized by the owner, seeking to change the land use designation on that real property may apply for a General Plan amendment through the Planning Department and pay the required fee. Upon submittal of an application, the amendment shall be processed, heard and decided in accordance with Sections 9.30.010 and 9.30.100 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(e) Section 9.30.100.(1) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that proposals to amend any part of the Jurupa Valley General Plan shall be heard by the Planning Commission during a public hearing on the matter. Further, Government Code Section 65353 provides that when a city has a planning commission authorized by local ordinance or resolution to review and recommend action on a proposed general plan, the commission shall hold at least one public hearing before approving a recommendation on the adoption of a general plan.

(f) Section 9.30.100.(2) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after closing the public hearing, the Planning Commission shall make a recommendation for approval or disapproval within a reasonable time, by resolution, including therein its findings, and transmit it to the City Council with a copy mailed to the applicant. A recommendation for approval shall be made by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the total membership of the Planning Commission. If the Planning Commission cannot reach a decision within a reasonable time after closing the hearing, that fact shall be reported to the City Council and shall be deemed a recommendation to deny the proposal. Further, Government Code Section 65354 provides that the planning commission shall make a written recommendation on the adoption of a general plan, that a recommendation for approval shall be made by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the total membership of the commission, and that the planning commission shall send its recommendation to the legislative body.

(g) Section 9.30.100.(3) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that upon receipt of a recommendation of the Planning Commission on an amendment of the General Plan, the City Clerk must set the matter for public hearing before the City Council at the earliest convenient day and give notice of public hearing in the same manner as notice was given of the hearing before the Planning Commission.

(h) Section 9.30.100.(4) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after closing the public hearing, the City Council must render its decision within a reasonable time. A decision to amend the General Plan, or any part or element thereof, must be made by resolution, which resolution must be adopted by the affirmative vote of not less than the majority of the total membership of the City Council. The City Council may approve, modify, or disapprove the recommendation of the Planning Commission; provided, however, that any substantial modification of the Planning Commission's recommendation not previously considered by the Commission must first be referred to the Commission for its recommendation.

(i) Section 9.30.100.(5) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that a proposal to amend any part or element of the General Plan shall not be approved by the City
Council until all procedures required by the Jurupa Valley EQA implementing procedures to approve a matter have been completed.

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

(a) The application for MA No. 16146 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 November 28, 2018, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 16146, 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. Following a discussion of the Project the Planning Commission voted to recommend the City Council’s approval of General Plan Amendment No. 16005 by adopting Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-11-28-03, 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 General Plan Amendment No. 16005 to Change the Land Use Designation of Approximately 7.25 Gross Acres of Real Property Located West of Hudson Street between 60th and 59th Streets (APN: 165-100-027) from Low Density Residential – Country Neighborhood (LDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR). Further, the Planning Commission voted to approve Tentative Tract Map No. 37052 by adopting Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-11-28-04, A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and Approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37052, a Schedule “A” Subdivision of Approximately 7.25 Gross Acres of Real Property Located West of Hudson Street Between 60th and 59th Streets (APN: 165-100-027) into Twenty-Eight Single-Family Residential Lots.

(c) On November 30, 2018, a copy of the notice of decision on Tentative Tract Map No. 37052 was mailed to the Applicant and to any person who has made a written request for a copy of the decision.

(d) On January 17, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley conducted a public hearing on General Plan Amendment No. 16005, at which time all persons interested in General Plan Amendment No. 16005 had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing.

(e) All legal preconditions to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.
Section 4. California Environmental Quality Act Findings and Adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

The City Council 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 8, 2018, and expired on November 27, 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) On November 28, 2018, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Project and the MND, reviewed the staff report, accepted and considered public testimony. After due consideration, the Planning Commission found that agencies and interested members of the public were afforded ample notice and opportunity to comment on the MND and the Project and approved Resolution No. 2018-11-28-03 recommending that City Council adopt the MND, adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and approve the proposed General Plan Amendment No. 16005.

(d) The City Council 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 City Council.

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

(f) The Planning Director is authorized and directed to file a Notice of Determination in accordance with CEQA.
Section 5. **Findings for Approval of General Plan Amendment No. 16005.** The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find and determine that General Plan Amendment No. 16005 should be adopted because:

(a) The proposed change in land use designation does not involve a change in or conflict with: the Pedley Village Center, which General Plan Principles include the following: Residential density should be concentrated around activity centers such as transit stops and retail centers to promote and encourage walkability; Neighborhoods should be located within a comfortable walking and biking distance to a neighborhood center with basic commercial amenities, such as shops, services and restaurants; and Strategy to attract new residents should focus on providing and maintaining high quality of life amenities, attractions, views, walkability, experience, quality schools, and services;

(b) The proposed General Plan Amendment would either contribute to the purposes of the General Plan or, at a minimum, would not be detrimental to them in that, the proposed General Plan Amendment from LDR to MDR is consistent with the existing land use development, which is primarily single-family housing tracts developed under the R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) zone development standards of 7,200 square foot minimum lot area, 60 foot minimum average lot width and 100 foot minimum average lot depth;

(c) As the subject site is located adjacent to several housing tracts which have been developed within the R-1 development standards, a change of land use to MDR, which allows a density of 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre, is appropriate and consistent within the R-1 zoned area. Additionally, the subject site and general R-1 zoned area is within the Pedley Village Center (PVC) and the GPA to MDR is consistent with the General Principles within the PVC, and consistent with all other policies within the General Plan, including the Economic Sustainability Element which includes attractive residential developments and increased tax base; and

(d) Special circumstances or conditions have emerged that were unanticipated in preparing the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan. The City should revisit the current LDR land use designation for the R-1 zoned neighborhood in which the subject site is located, which is bounded by 58th Street to the north, Felspar Street to the west, 61st and Main Streets to the south, and Van Buren Boulevard to the east. As half of the area is developed under the development standards applicable to premises in the R-1 Zone, changing the land use designation of premises in this area to MDR would make the existing land uses consistent with a 2-5 dwelling unit per acre designation and with the requirements of the R-1 Zone.

Section 6. **Approval of General Plan Amendment No. 16005.** Based on the foregoing, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby approve General Plan Amendment No. 16005 to change the land use designation of real property located west of Hudson Street between 60th and 59th Streets (APN: 165-100-027) from Low Density Residential - Country Neighborhood (LDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR).
Section 7. Certification. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 17th day of January, 2019.

______________________________
Brian Berkson
Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
I, Victoria Wasko, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-04 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 17th day of January, 2019 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, on the 17th day of January, 2019.

________________________________
Victoria Wasko, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
EXHIBIT A OF ATTACHMENT 1

Conditions of Approval
EXHIBIT “A”

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR MA16146 (TTM37052 & GPA16005)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. **PROJECT PERMITTED.** Master Application (MA) No. 16146: Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37052 and General Plan Amendment (GPA) No. 16005 is for the approval to subdivide a 7.25 acre parcel into 28 single-family residential lots with two (2) water quality basin lots (Lot 29 & 30); three (3) lettered street lots (A-C) and related infrastructure improvements. The property is located west of Hudson Street between 60th and 59th Streets, APN: 165-100-027.

2. **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 “Indemnees”) 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, and any finding or determination made and any other action taken by any of the Indemnees 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. **CONSENT TO CONDITIONS.** Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to the required conditions of approval to the Planning Director or designee.

4. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM.** Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to having received a copy of the “Applicant’s Acknowledgement of Comments and Code Information from Internal/External Agencies”. The receipt form shall be given to the Planning Director or designee.
5. **MITIGATION MEASURES.** This project shall be subject to the mitigation measures adopted with the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) prepared for the project and included with these conditions of approval.

6. **FEES.** The approval of MA16146 (TTM37052 & GPA16005) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

7. **CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA).** This project is approved subject to the provisions of a Mitigated Negative Declaration. Within forty-eight (48) hours of final approval for this project, the owner or designee shall deliver to the Planning Department a check payable to the Riverside County Clerk in the amount of $2,330.75 (includes $50.00 County Clerk Processing Fee) or the fees that are currently in effect at the time. This will enable the City to file the Notice of Determination.

8. **COPYED 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.

9. **APPROVAL PERIOD – TENTATIVE TRACT MAP.** An approved or conditionally approved tentative tract 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 (Subdivisions). If the tentative map expires before the recording of the final map, or any phase thereof, no recording of the final map, or any phase thereof, shall be permitted. The variance conditionally approved in connection with this 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.

10. **CONFORMANCE TO APPROVED EXHIBITS.** The project shall be in conformance to the approved plans (listed below) with any changes in accordance to these conditions of approval:
    a. Tentative Tract Map No. 37052: prepared by Sake Engineers, dated November 15, 2018
    b. Conceptual Landscape Plans (Wall/Fence Plan included) dated November 15, 2018

11. **SUBMITTAL AND APPROVAL OF A SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT.** Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit an application for a Site Development Permit that includes the following plans to the City for review and approval: site plan, floor plan, elevations, landscape plan, and a wall and fence plan. The plans must be in substantial conformance with the R-1 (One Family Dwellings) Development Standards and with the County of Riverside’s Design Guidelines. Each set of plans may be submitted separately with a Site Development Permit application. Wall and Fence Plans shall adhere to the approved exhibits (10b).

12. **ON-SITE LANDSCAPING.** Prior to the issuance of any Building permit, the applicant shall submit a “Professional Services (PROS)” application (with current fees) and the following items for Planning Director review and approval:
    a. The total cost estimate of landscaping, irrigation, and one-year of maintenance.
b. Completed City Faithful Performance Bond for Landscape Improvements form with original signatures after the City provides the applicant with the required amount of bond.

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

d. Final landscape, maintenance, planting, and irrigation plans and digital copies (CD format). The plans shall include the following:
   i. Compliance with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Biological Resources Mitigation Measure BIO-6-Tree Preservation and Replacement.
   ii. Compliance with approved Development Plan.
   iii. Compliance with Title 9 (Planning and Zoning) landscaping requirements.

e. STREET TREES. Street trees and related security and agreements are required pursuant to Chapter 7.55 of Title 7 (Subdivisions). Tree size, specimen and installation shall be under the direction of the Engineering Department if they are within the public right-of-way.

Prior to the final inspection of any Building permit, the Landscape Architect of Record shall conduct an inspection and submit a letter to the City of Jurupa Valley once s/he has deemed the installation is in conformance to the approved plans. Following the inspection of the Landscape Architect of Record, the applicant shall schedule a City inspection with the City's landscape architect.

13. MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF SOLID FENCING AND WALLS WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK. No solid fencing or wall shall exceed 42-inches in height within the front setback. Walls/Fencing outside of the front setback areas shall not exceed six (6) feet in overall height.

14. BLOCK WALL FOR INTERIOR AND SIDE LOT LINES. Block walls shall be used for interior side lot lines. Decorative wrought iron gates shall be used on all side gates at individual parcels.

Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a Wall and Fence plan that is consistent with this condition to the Planning Department for review and approval.

15. GRAFFITI PROTECTION FOR WALLS. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit a wall plan that includes anti-graffiti coating or protection for the exterior side of all perimeter walls for City review and approval. The applicant shall remove any graffiti on the property as soon as possible. In addition, if the applicant was notified by the City, the applicant shall remove the graffiti within seven (7) days of the City's notice.

16. TWO-CAR GARAGE PER DWELLING UNIT. All residential units shall have a minimum two-car garage with automatic sectional roll-up doors. No garage conversions are permitted and units must maintain two-car covered spaces at all times.
17. 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.

18. MULTIPLE SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN MITIGATION FEE (ORD. NO. 810). The applicant shall pay any owed fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 810. In order for the agency to determine that the project qualifies for any exemptions for any of the subject fees, the applicant needs to submit sufficient evidence to the City to demonstrate that it qualifies for the exemption.

19. SALE OF INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS. No structure constructed on Project site may be sold until the subject Project on which the structure is located is divided and a final map recorded in accordance with the City’s subdivision regulations such that the structure is located on a separate legally divided parcel.

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

1. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (ENGINEERING)

1.1. The use hereby conditioned is for a Schedule “A” subdivision, Tentative Tract No. 37052; being a subdivision of Lot 57 and portion of Lot 58 of Fairhaven Farms, Map Book 6, Page 2, of Maps on file in Official Records of Riverside County, California; more particularly Assessor’s Parcel Number APN 1 65-100-027; containing 7.25 acres gross. Lots 1 through 28 inclusive are for residential purposes; Lots 29 and 30 will be retained by the owner and shall be for open space water quality purposes; Lots “A” through “E” inclusive, will be dedicated to the City of Jurupa Valley for public road and utility purposes. Exhibit titled Tentative Tract No. 37052, prepared by SAKÉ Engineers, Inc., dated October 18, 2017, 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 Project proponent 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 Project proponent may be required to amend or revise the permit application.

1.4. 59th Street is a Local Road with a right-of-way width of 60 feet. Right-of-way dedication to provide parkway improvements and cul-de-sac improvements at road terminus is required. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on 59th Street along the project’s frontage. The improvements include, but are not limited to, cul-de-sac curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaped parkway and signing and striping. Improvements shall be constructed per modified Riverside County Road Standard No. 105 and
as approved by the Public Works Director. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer. The Project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.5. 60th Street is a Local Road with a right-of-way width of 60 feet. Right-of-way dedication to provide 30 feet half ultimate-width from centerline to the property line is required. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on 60th Street as identified on these conditions of approval. The improvements include, but are not limited to, curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaped parkway and signing and striping. Improvements shall be constructed per modified Riverside County Road Standard No. 105 and as approved by the Public Works Director. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.6. Street "A" and Street "B" shall be dedicated as public road and improved as Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 40 feet road on a 60-foot right-of-way; curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.7. Hudson Street is an existing Local Road. Applicant is required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements for Street “B” and Hudson Street intersection, as identified on these conditions of approval or approved by the City Engineer. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.8. New street lights are required on 59th Street, 60th Street, Street “A”, Street “B”, and Hudson Street intersection. The project proponent shall cause streetlight plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.9. 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.

1.10. 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.

1.11. Owner will be required to annex into Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-1-C for the
maintenance of the following improvements: tree trimming of trees on right-of-way on proposed Street “A”, Street “B”, 60th Street, and 59th Street; and streetlights per approved streetlight plans for this subdivision; or as approved by the City Engineer.

1.12. 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)

Grading and Drainage

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 Project Proponent 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 located as shown on the referenced exhibit(s) or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer. The 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 existing, and landscape and irrigation improvements/modifications shall be shown on the street improvement plans.

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 Project Proponent shall prepare a geotechnical/soils report for the proposed grading, infrastructure improvements and post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs) for review and approval of the City Engineer. All recommendations of that report shall be incorporated in the grading plan. The title and date of the geotechnical/soils report and the name and contact information of the Project Geotechnical/Soils Engineer shall be included on the face of the grading plan. The geotechnical/soils engineer must sign the grading plan.

2.4. Prior to approval of precise grading plans, the Project Proponent 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.

2.5. 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.

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

2.7. Where grading involves import or export the Project Proponent shall obtain approval for the import/export location, from the Engineering department, if located in the City. If import/export location is outside the City the Project Proponent shall provide evidence that the jurisdictional agency has provided all necessary, separate approvals for import/export to/from the site.

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

2.9. Prior to approval of the grading plan the Project Proponent shall prepare a final Drainage Study, corresponding with the proposed improvements, for approval of the City Engineer. The drainage study and the grading plan shall be signed by a California licensed civil engineer.

2.9.1. All drainage and storm drain improvements shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District's standards. Drainage shall be designed to accommodate 100-year storm flows. Minimum drainage grade shall be 1% except on Portland Cement Concrete where 0.5% shall be the minimum.

2.10. The Project Proponent shall prepare separate landscaping and irrigation plans for areas within the street right-of-way for review and approval by the City Engineer. Plans shall be per Ordinance 859 and meet these conditions of approval; any modifications shall be approved by the City Engineer.
2.11. The Project Proponent shall prepare separate street improvement and street lighting plans for review and approval by the City Engineer.

2.12. 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.

2.12.1. Applicant is responsible for obtaining any required easements and authorizations.

2.13. 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 MAP RECORDATION

3.1. No final Map shall be recorded until the Site Development Permit (SDP) and all other related cases are approved and are in effect unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

3.2. No final Map shall be recorded until the annexation process, if applicable, for the annexation to Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-1-C associated with this project is finalized.

3.2.1. Project Proponent shall prepare Landscape and Irrigation plans for CFD/ L&LMD. Plans shall be prepared per Riverside County Ordinance 859 and per the City's submittal guidelines and package.

3.2.2. Jurupa Valley L&LMD Zone created will include, but is not limited to, the operation and maintenance of the following:
   a) Tree trimming for trees within the public right-of-way, as identified on the L&LMD Landscape Plans and approved by the Director of Public Works;
   b) Streetlights, as identified on City approved streetlight plans.

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

3.2.4. HOA shall be responsible for maintenance and upkeep of improvements identified on these conditions of approval which include, but are not limited, to the following:
   a) Water Quality Basins maintenance and operation, lot 29 and lot 30 of the approved TTM;
b) Entry monuments.

3.3. The Project Proponent 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 Project Proponent shall prepare improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer.

3.6. Applicant shall be responsible for obtaining drainage easement from adjacent property owner (APN 165-100-003), if necessary, for proposed drainage improvements affecting the property.

3.7. Plans shall be approved by the City Engineer. Bonds and agreements shall be in place to be accepted along with the Final Map.

3.7.1. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on 59th 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 (60 feet wide ultimate right-of-way);
   b) Design of cul-de-sac per Riverside County Standard No. 800A and as approved by the City Engineer;
   c) Applicant shall be responsible for any right-of-way acquisition that may be required in order to provide for the design and construction of cul-de-sac;
   d) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   e) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk, within a 10-foot parkway along the south side of 59th Street and around cul-de-sac. Final parkway design at north side of 59th Street shall be approved by City Engineer at cul-de-sac design.
   f) Design shall include curb-ramps and meet current ADA standards.

3.7.2. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on 60th Street consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible for the construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:
   a) Ultimate right-of-way width of 60 feet and improved per Riverside
County Standard No. 105C; any modifications shall be approved by the City Engineer.
b) Provide half-width plus 12 feet improvements extending from end of existing improvements (east of Sheelite Street) to the subdivision’s easterly boundary (proposed Lot 12) and full width improvements to Hudson Street.
c) Improvements on the south side of 60th Street shall include curb and gutter as approved by the City Engineer.
d) Improvements on the north side of 60th Street shall include 5-foot curb adjacent landscaping and 5-foot sidewalk. Improvements shall be per Riverside County Standard 105C.
e) Improvements shall include full intersection improvements at west side of Hudson Street and 60th Street intersection.
f) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
g) Design shall include curb-ramps and meet current ADA standards.

3.7.3. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Street “B” and 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) Ultimate right-of-way width of 60 feet and improved per Riverside County Standard No. 105C; any modifications shall be approved by the City Engineer.
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway.
   e) Design shall include curb-ramps and meet current ADA standards.

3.7.4. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Street “A” and consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible of construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:
   f) Ultimate road and pavement conditions;
   g) Ultimate right-of-way width of 60 feet and improved per Riverside County Standard No. 105C; any modifications shall be approved by the City Engineer.
   h) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   i) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway.

3.7.5. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on proposed Street "A" and Street "B" 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) 36-ft paved section on 56-ft right-of-way;
c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
d) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway on both sides of the street.
e) Applicant

3.7.6. Separate Street Improvement, Street Lighting, and Utility Plans will be required.

3.8. Signing and striping plans for the project shall show appropriate school zone signage and striping; including, but not limited to, crosswalk across Street “B” at Hudson Street intersection or as approved by the City Engineer.

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

3.10. 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 Project Proponent 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.

3.11. Project proponent 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.

3.12. The applicant shall make every effort and shall provide good-faith proof of working with the school district to provide connectivity from 59th Street cul-de-sac to Hudson Street, in compliance with the Pedley Village Design Guidelines (PVCDG) and the City’s Mobility Element within the General Plan.

3.12.1. The improvements will be within the school district’s property; applicant shall be responsible for obtaining any and all required permissions for work within their property.

3.12.2. Design shall be per the School District’s guidelines and comply with minimum ADA standards.

3.12.3. Applicant shall coordinate with the School District and present proposed maintenance plan of improvements, to the City's Engineer.
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 Project Proponent 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. Grading agreement and securities shall be in place prior to the commencement of grading.

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.

4.6. A fair-share contribution towards signal timing and corridor operations’ City project shall be placed to addressed project’s at intersections identified on the TIA. The project’s fair share contribution is of $5,966, which corresponds to about 15.7% of the total estimated cost of the City’s estimate ($38,000). The fair share shall be paid in a per lot basis at time of building permit request.

5. PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION (ENGINEERING)

5.1. The Project Proponent 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 Appendix J.

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

5.4. The Project Proponent is responsible for completing all landscaping and irrigation improvements within the public right-of-way as applicable.

5.5. The Project proponent 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).

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: ________________
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MASTER APPLICATION 16146 SUMMARY

**General Plan Amendment (GPA) 16005**: Amend the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan Land Use Map from LDR (Low Density Residential – Country Neighborhood: ½ acre lots) to MDR (Medium Density Residential up to 5 dwelling units per acre)

**Tentative Tract Map (TTM) 37052**: Subdivide an existing 7.25 acre vacant lot into 28 residential lots averaging 7,793 square 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/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/Mitigated Negative Declaration

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Notice of Intent to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration was distributed to the following entities for a 20-day public review period:

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

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

3) 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 20-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 20-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 and City Council 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 conclusions of the Initial Study determined that 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.

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [x] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [x] Land Use / Planning
- [ ] Population / Housing
- [x] Transportation / Traffic
- [x] Mandatory Findings of Significance
- [ ] Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- [x] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources
- [ ] Public Services
- [x] Tribal Cultural Resources
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology / Soils
- [ ] Hydrology / Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Utilities / Service Systems

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, 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 west side of Hudson Street between 59th and 60th Streets (Refer to Exhibit 1).

The Project site is identified by the following Assessor Parcel Number: 165-100-027.

2.2 Project Description

The Project Applicant, Paul Talanian and Andrew Shores, submitted the following applications to the City of Jurupa Valley, which comprise the proposed Project: General Plan Amendment (GPA) No. 16005 and Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37052. The City of Jurupa Valley also refers to these applications as Master Application (MA) No. 16146. 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. General Plan Amendment (GPA) No. 16005: Amend the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan Land Use Map from LDR (Low Density Residential – Country Neighborhood: ½ acre lots) to MDR (Medium Density Residential up to 5 dwelling units per acre).

B. Tentative Tract Map No. 37052: Subdivide an existing 7.25 acre vacant lot into 28 residential lots averaging 7,793 square feet.

Street Improvements

- Hudson Street will be improved to provide intersection improvements at Proposed Street B.
- 59th Street will be improved with 2 travels lanes, curb, gutter, sidewalk, and a landscaped parkway adjacent to the Project site.
- 60th Street will be improved with 2 travels lanes, curb, gutter, sidewalk, and a landscaped parkway adjacent to the Project site.

Drainage Improvements

Drainage will flow from the interior streets where it will be captured in the water quality basin located on the southside of proposed Street B where it intersects with Hudson Street.

Sewer and Water Improvements

8-inch sewer lines will be constructed in 60th Street, proposed Street A, and proposed Street B to connect to existing facilities.
8-inch water lines will be constructed in 60th Street, proposed Street A, and proposed Street B to connect to existing facilities.

**Construction Duration**

Project construction is anticipated to occur over a 10-month period.

### 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 in August, 2016.

The site is undeveloped and highly disturbed. Historically, the site was utilized for agriculture purposes. Currently, the site is routinely subjected to weed abatement activities, as evidenced by the discing observed onsite and in historical aerial imagery. Pedestrian footpaths and vehicular dirt access roads crisscross the Project site. Trash and debris piles resulting from illegal dumping are scattered throughout the site, most notably at the northeastern corner of the Project site in the form of evenly spaced debris piles.

The topography of the Project site is relatively flat with slight, hilly undulations. The site slopes gently to the southwest. The general elevation of the site ranges from approximately 695 to 705 feet above mean sea level.

Vegetation was dominated by non-native species including Russian thistle (Salsola tragus), dry bromegrasses (Bromus sp.), and Bermuda grass (Cynodon dactylon). Common sunflower (Helianthus annuus), a native species, was also a dominant species observed onsite. Trees observed onsite are non-native and include Mexican palo verde (Parkinsonia aculeata), Chinese elm (Ulmus parvifolia), and eucalyptus (Eucalyptus sp.).

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>59th Street with Pedley Elementary School further to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Vacant land and single-family homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hudson Street with single-family homes further to the east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Single-family homes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Inspection, February, 2018*
2.4 Existing General Plan Land Use Designations and Zoning Classifications

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.

A summary of the existing General Plan land use designations and zoning classifications 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>Country Neighborhood (LDR) 2 dwellings per acre</td>
<td>R-1 (One-Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Country Neighborhood (LDR) 2 dwellings per acre</td>
<td>R-1 (One-Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Country Neighborhood (LDR) 2 dwellings per acre</td>
<td>R-1 (One-Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Country Neighborhood (LDR) 2 dwellings per acre</td>
<td>R-1 (One-Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Country Neighborhood (LDR) 2 dwellings per acre</td>
<td>R-1 (One-Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City of Jurupa Valley-General Plan Land Use Map March 2018, City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map March 2018
Project Location Map/Aerial Photo

Exhibit 1
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.

- □ Aesthetics
- □ Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- □ Air Quality
- □ Biological Resources
- □ Cultural Resources
- □ Geology /Soils
- □ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- □ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- □ Hydrology / Water Quality
- □ Land Use / Planning
- □ Mineral Resources
- □ Noise
- □ Population / Housing
- □ Public Services
- □ Recreation
- □ Transportation/Traffic
- □ Tribal Cultural Resources
- □ Utilities/Service Systems
- □ Mandatory Findings of Significance
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

________________________
Agency

________________________
November 1, 2018

________________________
Printed Name/Title

________________________
Date
Appendices (Under Separate Cover or on Compact Disk)


Appendix F. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment*, Priority 1 Environmental, June 8, 2018.


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) (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.*

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.

A scenic vista in the Project vicinity is the Santa Ana River located approximately 4,000 feet to the south of the Project site. The elevation at the Project site is approximately 695 to 705 feet above mean sea level. The elevation of the Santa Ana River south of the Project site ranges in elevation from approximately 664 to 724 feet above mean sea level. Because the elevations between the Project site and the Santa Ana River are similar and because of the intervening development...
between the Project site and the Santa Ana River, the Project site does not provide a public view of the Santa Ana River. As such, the Project would not block or completely obstruct views from surrounding public vantage points to the Santa Ana River.

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 28 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 approximately 7.25 gross acres in size and is located in an area largely characterized by residential development and vacant land. To the north is 59th Street with Pedley Elementary School further to the north, to the south is vacant land and single-family homes, to the east is Hudson Street with single-family homes further to the east, and to the west are single-family homes. The construction of single-family homes is consistent with the character of the development in the immediate vicinity of the Project site.

In addition, the development with single-family residences has been anticipated for the Project site by the *General Plan*.

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.
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>
</table>

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

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

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))?

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

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?
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-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 Map My County website, 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 site currently has a zoning classification of R-1 (One-Family Dwellings) which allows single-family detached housing with a minimum lot size of 7,200 square feet. 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: No 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 classify portions of the Project site as “Other Lands” and “Urban Built-Up Land.” According to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "Other Lands" are defined as "Land not included in any other mapping category. Common examples include low density rural developments; brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing; confined livestock, poultry or aquaculture facilities; strip mines, borrow pits; and water bodies smaller than 40 acres. Vacant and nonagricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development and greater than 40 acres is mapped as Other Land."

"Urban Built-Up Land" is defined as "Land occupied by structures with a building density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres, or approximately 6 structures to a 10-acre parcel. This land is used for residential, industrial, commercial, institutional, public administrative purposes, railroad and other transportation yards, cemeteries, airports, golf courses, sanitary landfills, sewage treatment, water control structures, and other developed purposes."

The Project site is approximately 7.25 gross acres in size and is located in an area largely characterized by residential development and vacant land. To the north is 59th Street with Pedley Elementary School further to the north, to the south is vacant land and single-family homes, to the east is Hudson Street with single-family homes further to the east, and to the west are single-family homes. 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>Determination</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. 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 Emission 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 LDR (Low Density Residential – Country Neighborhood: ½ acre lots) which would allow up to 14 dwelling units to be constructed on the Project site. The Project is proposing to amend the General Plan Land Use Map to Medium Density Residential (MDR) in order to develop 28 dwelling units. 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 2 dwelling units per acre at the time the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan adopted. The proposed General Plan amendment will allow 28 units, which is an increase of 14 dwelling units. Because the development of 28 dwelling units will not result in significant air quality impacts as shown in the analysis under Issue 3.3 (b) below, the additional 14 dwelling units will not exceed the growth forecast estimates used in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan from an air quality emissions perspective and impacts are less than significant.

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.

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

**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.

**Table 4. South Coast Air Quality Management District Air Quality Regional Significance Thresholds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Emissions (Construction) (pounds/day)</th>
<th>Emissions (Operational) (pounds/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOx</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District CEQA Air Quality Significance Thresholds (2009)*

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 typical construction equipment used for the Project of this size.

**Table 5. Construction Equipment by Phase**

<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>Site Preparation</td>
<td>Rubber Tired Dozers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>Excavators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubber Tired Dozers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>Cranes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forklifts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The estimated maximum regional daily construction emissions are summarized in Table 6 below.

<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></td>
<td>Generator Sets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welders</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: CalEEMod.

As shown in Table 6, with implementation of PPP 3.3-1 through PPP 3.3-4, emissions resulting from PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ would be reduced (i.e. “mitigated”) and overall emissions from 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 7 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 7. Maximum Regional Operational Daily Emissions (lbs/day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Pollutants</th>
<th>Unmitigated lbs/day</th>
<th>Mitigated lbs/day</th>
<th>Threshold lbs/day</th>
<th>Significant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG (VOC)</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOx</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis (Appendix A)

As shown in Table 7, with implementation of PPP 3.3-1 through PPP 3.3-4, emissions resulting from NOx would be reduced (i.e. “mitigated”) and overall emissions from 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 (NO$_x$), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter less than 10 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM$_{10}$) and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM$_{2.5}$). 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 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 (NO$_x$), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$) emissions will occur during construction of the Project, grading of the Project site, and paving of streets and driveways. Tables 8 below summarize on-site emissions as compared to the local screening thresholds established for Source Receptor Area (SRA) 23 (Metropolitan Riverside/Mira Loma).

For most land use projects, the highest daily emission rates occur during the site preparation and grading phases of construction – due to the use of heavy earthmoving equipment. Since land use
operational emissions – mainly from associated traffic – are dispersed over a wide area, localized impacts from project operation are substantially lower than during project construction. The proposed Project site is 7.25 acres in source-receptor area zone 23 – Metropolitan Riverside County. The peak daily soil disturbance occurs during the site preparation phase, and equates to a maximum soil disturbance of 5 acres on any given day. Thus, the 5-acre screening lookup tables were used to evaluate NOx, CO, PM_{10}, and PM_{2.5} impacts on nearby receptors at the closest, most conservative, distance of 25 meters for construction as shown on Table 8 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Pollutants</th>
<th>Emissions lbs/day</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Significant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM_{10}</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM_{2.5}</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis (Appendix A)

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) **Exposure to sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

Sources: 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.

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 Pedley Elementary School to the north, and the single-family homes to the east, west, and south of the Project site.

Localized Impacts

As shown on Tables 8 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 the 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 Limonite, 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, PM\textsubscript{10} (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 the Pedley Elementary School located to the north and the single-family homes located to the east, west, and south 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 10 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 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. The construction odor emissions would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature.
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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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: Habitat Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis (Appendix B), Burrowing Owl 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.

Plant Species

The study area is highly disturbed due to past and current land use practices. As a result of the disturbance caused by these land use practices, the vegetation on the Project site is dominated by ruderal, non-native vegetation. The site was recently subjected to weed abatement, as evidenced by discing. Vegetation was dominated by non-native species including Russian thistle (Salsola tragus), dry brome grasses (Bromus sp.), and Bermuda grass (Cynodon dactylon). Common sunflower (Helianthus annuus), a native species, was also a dominant species observed onsite. Trees observed onsite are non-native and include Mexican palo verde (Parkinsonia aculeata), Chinese elm (Ulmus parvifolia), and eucalyptus (Eucalyptus sp.).

The Project site is within MSHCP NEPSSA Survey Area 7 for San Diego ambrosia (Ambrosia pumila), Brand's phacelia (Phacelia stellaris), and San Miguel savory (Satureja chandleri). Suitable soils and/or habitat conditions for the three target species do not occur on site; therefore, focused surveys were not required for these species.

Conclusions

The Project area is vegetated by highly disturbed, ruderal vegetation. Impacts to these plant communities would not result in substantial loss of habitat, or direct impacts to, any sensitive plant species

Wildlife Species

Wildlife common to suburban areas was observed using the site. Some species observed include mourning dove (Zenaida macroura), common raven (Corvus corax), and California ground squirrel (Spermophilus beecheyi).

Burrowing Owl

The habitat assessment for burrows and owls was conducted in accordance with accepted
guidelines (Burrowing Owl Survey Instructions for the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Area). The burrow survey was conducted on September 23, 2017, and the focused burrowing owl surveys were conducted on June 8, 9, 11, and 12, 2018.

The site is undeveloped and highly disturbed. Pedestrian footpaths and vehicular dirt access roads crisscross the Project site. Trash and debris piles resulting from illegal dumping are scattered throughout the site, most notably at the northeastern corner of the Project site in the form of evenly spaced debris piles. Subsequently, the Project site is predominantly vegetated by dense non-native grasses and ruderal vegetation.

No burrowing owls, their sign, or features potentially occupied by burrowing owls were detected during the survey. However, since burrowing owls can quickly occupy a site, a pre-construction survey is required to confirm absence before ground-disturbing activities commence as required by Mitigation Measure BIO-1 below.

**MM-BIO-1: 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.

**Delhi Sand Flower-Loving Fly (DSF)**

The entire Project site consists of undeveloped, vacant land that has been heavily disturbed from previous maintenance activities (i.e., disking, mowing, and weed abatement) as well as illegal dumping. The Delhi fine sands on the Project site occupy about 4 acres and are predominantly vegetated by non-native, ruderal vegetation with approximately 80 to 100 percent cover. This patch of Delhi fine sands is isolated and has been affected by surrounding development and land uses. The closest known occurrences of the DSF to the Project site are north of State Route 60, in the area of the Jurupa Hills. The Delhi fine sands mapped within the Project site are not shown in MSHCP Figure 9.9. Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly Suitable Habitat with Criteria Area.
The Delhi fine sands soils on the Project are not considered suitable habitat to support the DSF because the soils within the boundary of the Project site have been mechanically disturbed by maintenance activities and the surrounding development and lack connectivity to areas containing clean Delhi Sands soils or areas subject to wind erosion processes. Additionally, this isolated patch of Delhi fine sand is not identified as potentially suitable habitat in the MSHCP, and as previously described; the site is predominantly vegetated by dense ruderal, non-native species. Thus, the Project will not affect the DSF or conflict with MSHCP conservation objectives for this species.

Conclusions

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, 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: Habitat 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.*

Riparian/riverine areas are lands that contain habitat dominated by trees, shrubs, and persistent emergents, which occur close to or depend upon soil moisture from a nearby water source; or areas with fresh water flowing during all or a portion of the year. Riverine/riparian/wetland areas may support species federally/State listed as threatened/endangered riparian bird species, such as the southwestern willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*), least Bell’s vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*), and yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americus occidentalis*). California's vernal pools are depressions that seasonally pond with winter rains as a result of a shallow, relatively impermeable layer of soil or rock that creates a perched water table. Ponding in vernal pools occurs for sufficient duration to inhibit growth of upland vegetation and facilitate growth of annual or small perennial plants specially adapted to initial growth in saturated soils. Under the MSHCP, vernal pools include seasonal wetlands (having indicators of hydric soil, hydrophytic vegetation, and wetland hydrology) in natural depressions or in artificial depressions created to provide wetland habitat (*MSHCP Vol. I, p. 6-22*). Vernal pool fairy shrimp typically inhabit small depressions in sandstone or vernal pools or similar habitats in unplowed grassland. Artificially created features do not meet the MSHCP definition of vernal pool unless created for the purpose of providing wetlands habitat. The
proposed Project site does not contain vegetative, hydrologic, or soil characteristics associated with vernal pool habitat. No vernal pools or fairy shrimp habitat, including other potential fairy shrimp habitat (e.g., depressions), are present.

An isolated ephemeral drainage feature exists on the Project site. The feature originates from the west side of Hudson Street where a curbside storm drain diverts runoff flows onto the Project site. Nuisance flows from road runoff travel approximately 12 feet from the sidewalk outlet before dissipating into sheet flows on the project site. Additionally, two 12-inch diameter corrugated pipes located offsite also direct stormwater runoff from Hudson Street along the southern boundary of the Project site. This second ephemeral drainage exists outside of the parcel boundary, but within the road easement area slated for the extension of 60th Street as part of the proposed Project. The stormwater runoff associated with the corrugated pipes eventually dissipates into sheet flows onto the southernmost portion of Project site and the road easement area. The flows do not leave the general area, and do not connect to any downstream waters. Neither drainage feature supports riparian vegetation. Based on the site visit and a review of historical aerial imagery, neither of the ephemeral drainage features appears to be historically occurring drainages. Both drainages are isolated and occur in upland areas. For these reasons, the drainage features are not considered to be riverine resources regulated by the MSHCP. Therefore, riparian/riverine resources are not present within the proposed Project site.

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: No Impact.

Source: Habitat 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 two isolated ephemeral drainage features associated with the Project site are created as a result of roadside runoff. The features exist in upland areas do not leave the site, and do not connect to any downstream waters. This type of drainage feature is generally not considered jurisdictional under the Clean Water Act because it is excavated in and drains only uplands, and does not carry a relatively permanent flow of water. Additionally, these drainage features do not contain California Department of Fish and Wildlife riparian habitat and are likely not considered a streambed regulated by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Therefore, these drainages would not be subject to the regulatory authority of the United States Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act.
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 With Mitigation Incorporated.

Source: Habitat 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)**

The site contains vegetation that may provide habitat for nesting birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). To avoid any potential effects to nesting birds protected by the MBTA and the California Fish and Game Code, the following mitigation measure is required:

**Mitigation Measure BIO-2- Nesting Bird Survey.** As a condition of approval for all grading permits, vegetation clearing and ground disturbance shall be prohibited during the migratory bird nesting season (February 1 through October 1), unless a migratory bird nesting survey is completed in accordance with the following requirements:

a. A migratory nesting bird survey of the Project’s impact footprint shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three business (3) days prior to initiating vegetation clearing or ground disturbance.

b. A copy of the migratory nesting bird survey results report shall be provided to the City of Jurupa Planning Department. If the survey identifies the presence of active nests, then the qualified biologist shall provide the Planning Department with a copy of maps showing the location of all nests and an appropriate buffer zone around each nest sufficient to protect the nest from direct and indirect impact. The size and location of all buffer zones, if required, shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Department and shall be no less than a 300-foot radius around the nest for non-raptors and a 500-foot radius around the nest for raptors. The nests and buffer zones shall be field checked weekly by a qualified biological monitor. The approved buffer zone shall be marked in the field with construction fencing, within which no vegetation clearing or ground disturbance shall commence until the qualified biologist and Planning Department verify that the nests are no longer occupied and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2, impacts would be less than significant.
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 that are subject to protection by the General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element.

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.
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 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 (MSHCP) 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-1 (30-day Pre-Construction Survey) is required:

With implementation of PPP 3.4-1 and Mitigation Measure BIO-1, 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 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></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></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></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></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: Eastern Information Center Records Search (Appendix D).

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.

According to a records search obtained from the Eastern Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System dated September 28, 2017, a Phase I Cultural Resource Study (RI-5628) identified no cultural resources were found on the site and that further study is not recommended.

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: Eastern Information Center Records Search (Appendix D).*

**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.

As noted above, according to a records search obtained from the Eastern Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System dated September 28, 2017, a Phase I Cultural Resource Study (RI-5628) identified no cultural resources were found on the site and that further study is not recommended. However, the records search also indicated that "If, during construction, cultural resources are encountered, work should be halted or diverted in the immediate area while a qualified archaeologist evaluates the finds and makes recommendations.” As such, the following mitigation measure is required:

**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.

### 3.5(c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

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

*Source: Eastern Information Center Records Search (Appendix D).*

**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.

According to the Riverside County Geographic Information System, the Project site is identified as having a “high potential” for paleontological resources. Therefore, the following mitigation measures are 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.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*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 GEOLGY 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 E), 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 E), 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 E), 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 “high” potential for liquefaction. However, information from the Jurupa Community Services District indicates that the closest water well to the subject site has a recorded high water table at 152 feet. Borings conducted for the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix E), encountered perched water at 32 feet. Based on the depth of the groundwater, liquefaction potential is considered to be “very low.”

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 ensure liquefaction potential is less than significant.
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 paving and 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 E).
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 32-feet.
Collapse

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 “very low” because the depth of groundwater is more than 32-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 “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 wastewater disposal systems. The Project would install domestic sewer infrastructure and connect to the Jurupa 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 Emission 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 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Source</th>
<th>GHG Emissions (metric tons per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Construction Emissions</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(amortized over 30 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>597.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂O</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CO₂E (All Sources)</td>
<td>600.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance Threshold</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant?</td>
<td>NO</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.**


**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 Impact 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></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></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></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></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></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></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></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></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 F), Soil Sampling Report (Appendix G).

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.

Pedley Elementary School is located to the north of the Project site across 59th Street. As discussed in the responses to issues 3.8 (b) and 3.8 (b) above, 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. 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 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.

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: Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Development Review-Director’s Determination (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 located within Airport Compatibility Zone E of the 2005 Riverside Municipal Airport Compatibility Plan. Compatibility Zone E does not restrict residential density. 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 Hudson Street, 59th Street, and 60th Street. Hudson Street is an existing paved roadway and 59th Street and 60th Street would be improved within the Project boundaries to meet City standards 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 Hudson Street, 59th Street, and 60th 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.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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 not shown as being in a 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 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.

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 thereeto, 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 retain all stormwater runoff for percolation into the groundwater. The detention basin 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 bioretention 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.**
*Source: Jurupa 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 would be served with potable water by the Jurupa Community Services District. Domestic water supplies from this service provider are reliant on groundwater from the Chino Groundwater Basin as a primary source. All municipal water entities that exceed their safe yield incur a groundwater replenishment obligation, which is used to recharge the groundwater basin with water from the State Water Project sources. Thus, the Project’s demand for domestic water service would not 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.

Development of the Project site 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 Chino Groundwater Basin that are managed for that purpose, since those recharge areas do not encompass the Project site.

Water supplies to the project area are provided by the Jurupa Community Services District, which obtains water supplies entirely from groundwater production. The largest source of groundwater is the Chino Groundwater Basin that supplies all of the District’s potable wells. In addition, a small amount of non-potable water is supplied from the Riverside Groundwater Basin.

The Chino Basin was adjudicated by the California Superior Court in 1978 to regulate the amount of groundwater that can be pumped from the basin by creating the Chino Basin Watermaster to oversee management of water rights. The Jurupa Community Services District currently has total production water rights of 14,659 AFY from the Chino Basin. In addition, the District has rights to “carry over” supplies of water that was previously not used. Due to the existing regulations related to groundwater pumping that are implemented by the Chino Basin Watermaster, the Jurupa Community Services District would not pump substantial ground water amounts that could result in a substantial depletion of groundwater supplies. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

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: Hydrology and Hydraulic Report (Appendix I), Impact Analysis Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

**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.

Under existing conditions, the Project site slopes from north to south with the highest point in the north portion of the Project site at 701 feet above mean sea level and the lowest point in the south portion at 697 feet above mean sea level. There is an area on Hudson Street draining to this Project site. Ultimately, the runoff from the Project site drains to 60th Street.

Under the proposed conditions, Lots 9 through 11 will drain to 60th Street. The remaining lots will drain to the proposed bioretention basin. A drainage easement is proposed to carry the off-site drainage from Hudson Street to 60th Street.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.9-1 through 3.9-4 and PDF 3.9-1, 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.

*Source: Hydrology and Hydraulic Report (Appendix I), Impact Analysis Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

Refer to PPP 3.9-1 through 3.9-4 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

Plans, Policies, 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.

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

Would the Project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
---|---|---|---|
a. Physically divide an established community? | | | | ☐ |

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? | | | ☐ |

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | | ☑ |

3.10(a) Physically divide an established community?

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.

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. To the north is 59th Street with the Pedley Elementary School further to the north, to the south is vacant land and single-family homes, to the east is Hudson Street with single-family homes further to the east, and to the west are single-family homes. The site can be considered as an “infill” development site. 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.

Under existing conditions, the Project site is designated as LDR (Low Density Residential – Country Neighborhood: ½ acre lots) by the General Plan Land Use Map. A General Plan Amendment (GPA) application is being proposed by the Project to re-designate the Project site from LDR (Low Density Residential – Country Neighborhood: ½ acre lots) to MDR (Medium Density Residential (up to 5 dwelling units per acre) to allow the applicant to create lots with a minimum lot size of 7,200 square feet with a maximum density of five (5) units per acre. The proposed Project will be developed with a density allocation of 3.8 du/acre.

The proposed Project would increase the maximum number of residential dwelling units permitted on the Project site, as compared to the existing General Plan Land Use designations that govern the site. If the Project site were built out in accordance with its existing, underlying land use designations, a maximum of 14 residential dwelling units could be constructed on the subject property, whereas the Project is designed to include 28 residential dwelling units.

Although the proposed Project would be inconsistent with the existing General Plan Land Use designation for the Project site, such an inconsistency would only be significant if it were to result in significant, adverse physical effects to the environment. 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), Burrowing Owl Survey (Appendix C).

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 (MSHCP) 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, 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 Impact 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.*
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.” 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: Project Application Materials.

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 Hudson Street, 59th Street, 60th Street, and activities at the Pedley Elementary School.

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 10 shows 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 10, 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. 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 10. Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels (dBA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Reference Noise Level at 50 feet (Lmax)</th>
<th>Predicted Noise Levels (Leq) at Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulldozer</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact Roller</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixer</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraper</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Truck</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Roller</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</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 85 dBA during grading which would exceed the exterior noise level for residential uses of 55 dBA CNEL. The following mitigation measure is required to reduce construction noise impacts to the maximum extent feasible:
**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 28 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 267 average daily vehicle trips (21 trips in the AM Peak hours and 28 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: 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.

**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.

*Source: Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

Refer to PPP 3.12-1 and PPP 3.12-2 under Issue 3.12(a) above.
**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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: Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

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

Refer to PPP 3.12-1 and PPP 3.12-2 under Issue 3.12(a) above.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.
According to Map RI-3, Noise Compatibility Contours of the 2005 Riverside Municipal Airport Compatibility Plan, 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 28 houses. 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 94 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.

There are existing utilities (i.e. gas, electricity, sewer, water etc.) to serve the Project site in the immediate vicinity. New 8-inch sewer lines will be constructed in 60th Street, proposed Street A, and proposed Street B to connect to existing facilities. 8-inch water lines will be constructed in 60th...
Street, proposed Street A, and proposed Street B to connect to existing facilities. No expansion or new construction of utilities is required other than to connect to the existing utilities. 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 Pedley Fire Station No. 16, an existing station located approximately 0.8 roadway miles south of the Project site at 9270 Limonite Avenue.

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.
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, 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 28 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.

**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, the Project proposes 28 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 94 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 28 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 94 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: Traffic Impact Study (Appendix J).*
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

For purposes of determining the significance of traffic impacts, the City relies upon the County of Riverside Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines which contains the following significance criteria:

1) When existing traffic conditions exceed the General Plan target Level of Service (LOS) D.

2) When project traffic, when added to existing traffic will deteriorate the LOS to below the target LOS D, and impacts cannot be mitigated through project conditions of approval.

3) When cumulative traffic exceeds the target LOS D, and impacts cannot be mitigated through the TUMF network (or other funding mechanism), project conditions of approval, or other implementation mechanisms.

Table 11 below shows the Level of Service (LOS) Thresholds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service (LOS)</th>
<th>Signalized Intersection</th>
<th>Unsignalized Intersection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>≤10 seconds</td>
<td>≤10 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10–20 seconds</td>
<td>10–15 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20–35 seconds</td>
<td>15–25 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35–55 seconds</td>
<td>25–35 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>55–80 seconds</td>
<td>35–50 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;80 seconds</td>
<td>&gt;50 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: County of Riverside Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines
Study Area Intersections

The following study intersections were included in the analysis as shown on Table 12.

**Table 12. Study Area Intersections.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Felspar Street and Limonite Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hudson Street and Limonite Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Archer Street and Limonite Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Collins Street and Limonite Avenue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Traffic Impact Study (Appendix J)*

Roadway Segments Analyzed

The roadway segment of Limonite Avenue between Felspar Street and Hudson Street was analyzed.

Traffic Scenarios Analyzed

The *Traffic Impact Study* prepared for the Project examined the following scenarios:

1) Existing Conditions (2016).

2) Project Completion (2019) (Existing conditions plus ambient growth plus project).

3) Cumulative Conditions (2019) (Existing conditions plus ambient growth plus project plus cumulative projects)

Trip Generation

The proposed Project is projected to generate approximately 267 trip-ends per day with 21 total vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 28 total vehicles per hour during the PM peak hour.

Scenario #1: Existing Traffic Conditions Analysis

The intersection of Hudson Street and Limonite Avenue is currently operating at a LOS E during the morning peak hour, with the worst movement being the southbound left turning movement. The intersection of Archer Street and Limonite Avenue is operating at LOS E during the evening peak hour, with the worst movement being the northbound left turning movement.

The roadway segment of Limonite Avenue between Felspar Street and Hudson Street is currently not operating at an acceptable LOS.
Scenario #2: Project Completion (2019) Analysis

The intersection of Hudson Street and Limonite Avenue is currently operating at a LOS F during the morning peak hour and at LOS E during the evening peak hour, with the southbound left turning movement contributing the worst delay during both peak periods. The intersection of Archer Street and Limonite Avenue is operating at LOS F during the morning peak hour and LOS E during the evening peak hour, with the northbound left turning movement contributing the worst delay during both peak periods.

Table 13 below shows that there are increases in delay for the critical movement of both unsignaled intersections (No. 2 and 3). For Hudson Street and Limonite Avenue, the level of service changed from LOS E to LOS F during the morning peak hour and from LOS D to LOS E during the evening peak hour. For Archer Street and Limonite Avenue, the level of service changed from LOS C to LOS F during the morning peak hour and unchanged at LOS E during the evening peak hour.

The roadway segment of Limonite Avenue between Felspar Street and Hudson Street is currently not operating at an acceptable LOS. Under the Project Completion scenario the V/C ratio does not significantly increase.

Scenario #3: Cumulative Conditions Analysis

The intersection of Hudson Street and Limonite Avenue is currently operating at a LOS F during the morning peak hour and at LOS E during the evening peak hour. Again, the southbound left turning movement is contributing the worst delay at this location. The intersection of Archer Street and Limonite Avenue is operating at LOS F during the morning peak hour and LOS E during the evening peak hour. The northbound left turning movement is once again contributing the worst delay at this study intersection. The Project incrementally increases the delay.

Overall, the roadway link of Limonite Avenue between Felspar Street and Hudson Street will remain at LOS E after the construction of the proposed Project and any approved cumulative projects in the future.

Summary

As shown in Table 13, the following study intersection is currently operating at an unacceptable Level of Service for Existing Conditions:

- #3. Archer Street and Limonite Avenue (LOS E).

As shown in Table 13, the following study intersections will operate at an unacceptable Level of Service for Project Completion (2019):

- #2. Hudson Street and Limonite Avenue (LOS F in the AM Peak Hour and LOS E in the PM Peak Hour).

- # 3. Archer Street and Limonite Avenue (LOS F in the AM Peak Hour and LOS E in the PM Peak Hour).
As shown in Table 13, the following study intersections will operate at an unacceptable Level of Service for Project Completion (2019) with Cumulative Conditions:

- #2. Hudson Street and Limonite Avenue (LOS F in the AM Peak Hour and LOS E in the PM Peak Hour).
- #3. Archer Street and Limonite Avenue (LOS F in the AM Peak Hour and LOS E in the PM Peak Hour).

Table 13. Summary of Intersection Level of Service (LOS) and Impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection #/Location</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Project Completion (2019)</th>
<th>Project Completion (2019) with Cumulative Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Felspar Street and Limonite Avenue</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hudson Street and Limonite Avenue</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Archer Street and Limonite Avenue</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Collins Street and Limonite Avenue</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Traffic Impact Study(Appendix J)

Since the level of services is impacted incrementally by the Project, the Project will be required to provide fair share contributions dependent on the volumes contributed by the Project site to the impacted intersections. The City is currently evaluating a corridor capacity enhancement program to address projected poor operating conditions on Limonite Avenue between Felspar and Van Buren Boulevard. Since the City has this in place, the Project will need to pay a fair share to address its share of the projected future impacts. The following mitigation measure is required:

**Mitigation Measure TR-1. Transportation System Improvement Fair Share Contribution.** The City has a project that will address signal timing and operations that when completed, will mitigate the Project’ impacts at the two unsignalized intersections analyzed in the Traffic Impact Study prepared by KOA dated April 5, 2018. A fair share contribution towards that City project will address the Project’s share of the impact identified in the Project’s traffic study. The current estimated cost of the City project is $38,000. The Project traffic on Limonite Avenue is estimated to be approximately 15.7% of the identified project growth, less any approved, but unbuilt development traffic per the Caltrans fair-share formula. Based on those values, the Project's fair share for the City project along Limonite Avenue will be $213.00 per unit, or a total of $5,964.00 This amount is to be paid at the time the applicant is required to pay the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF) and City of Jurupa Valley Development Impact Fees (DIF).
**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 59th Street, 60th Street, and Hudson 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 With Mitigation Incorporated.**

*Source: Riverside County Congestion Management Program, Traffic Impact Study (Appendix J).*

**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.

Limonite Avenue is a designated Congestion Management Program roadway. As shown in the analysis under Issue 3.16 (a) above, the Project will incrementally contribute to existing deficiencies at the intersections of Hudson Street and Limonite Avenue and Archer Street and Limonite Avenue. Mitigation Measure TR-1 is required in order to mitigate this impact to 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: Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Development Review-Director’s Determination (Appendix H).*

**Impact Analysis**
Impact Analysis

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. In addition, the Project site is located within Airport Compatibility Zone E of the 2005 Riverside Municipal Airport Compatibility Plan. Compatibility Zone E does not restrict residential density. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

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 is located in an area with existing residential development and an elementary school. As such, 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. 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.
Project Design Features (PDF)

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

The Project proposes 28 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 59th Street, 60th Street, and Hudson Street. 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: Eastern Information Center Records Search (Appendix D). |

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.

According to a records search obtained from the Eastern Information Center of the California a Historical Resources Information System dated September 28, 2017 indicated that a Phase I Cultural Resource Study (RI-5628) identified no cultural resources were found on the site and that further study is not recommended.

Based on the analysis above, there are no impacts to above ground historical resources.

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: Eastern Information Center Records Search (Appendix D), AB52 and SB18 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.

**AB 52 Consultation**

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 – Kizh Nation
- Soboba Band Luiseño Indians
- Torres Martinez Band of Cahuilla Indians.

The Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation and the Soboba Band Luiseño requested consultation and indicated that tribal cultural resources could be present on the site.

**Senate Bill (SB) 18 Consultation**

Signed into law in September 2004, and effective March 1, 2005, SB 18 requires that, prior to the adoption or amendment of a city or county's general plan, the city or county consult with California Native American tribes for the purpose of preserving specified places, features, and objects located within the city or county's jurisdiction. SB 18 also applies to the adoption or amendment of specific plans. This bill requires the planning agency to refer to the California Native American tribes specified by the Native American Heritage Commission and to provide them with opportunities for involvement. As required by SB18, the Planning Department sent out a notification to the Native American tribes on the Consultation List provided by the Native American Heritage Commission. The following tribes responded:

- Soboba Band Luiseño Indians (requested consultation).
- Aqua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians (indicated that a records check of the ACBCI cultural registry revealed that this Project is not located within the Tribe’s Traditional Use Area (TUA). Therefore, they defer to the other tribes in the area.

As a result the AB52 and SB 18 consultation processes, the following mitigation measure is required:

**Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Native American Monitoring, Treatment of Discoveries, and Disposition of Discoveries.**

**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.

**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 City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department, the Eastern Information Center, and the appropriate Native American Tribe.

**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:

a) 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.

b) 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.
c) 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.

d) 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.
### 3.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<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: Jurupa 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 Jurupa Community Services District ("District"). Wastewater generated by any development proposed on the Project site 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.

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: Jurupa 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 Jurupa Community Services District.

Water:

Water service is available from an existing 6-inch diameter waterline in Hudson Street east of the Project boundary, from an existing 6-inch diameter waterline in 60th Street southwest of the Project boundary, and from an existing 8-inch diameter waterline in 59th Street northwest of the Project boundary. Approximately 200 linear feet of offsite waterlines will need to be constructed in order to connect to the waterline in 60th Street. The waterline(s) will be constructed within the improved right-of-way of the aforementioned existing streets.

Sewer:

Sewer service is available from an existing 15-inch diameter sewerline in Hudson Street east of the Project boundary, from an existing 8-inch diameter waterline in 60th Street southwest of the Project boundary, and from an existing 6-inch sewerline in 59th Street north of the Project boundary. The sewerline(s) will be constructed within the improved right-of-way of the aforementioned existing streets.
The installation of water and sewer lines in the locations as described above are evaluated throughout this Initial Study. In instances where impacts have been identified, 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 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 from the interior streets where it will be captured in the water quality basin located on the southside of proposed Street B where it intersects with Hudson Street.

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. 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 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: Water and Sewer Availability for Tract 37052 (Appendix K).*

**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 supplies to the Project area site provided by the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD), which obtains water supplies entirely from groundwater production. The largest source of groundwater is the Chino Groundwater Basin that supplies all of the District’s potable wells. In addition, a small amount of non-potable water is supplied from the Riverside Groundwater Basin.

The Chino Basin was adjudicated by the California Superior Court in 1978 to regulate the amount of groundwater that can be pumped from the basin by creating the Chino Basin Watermaster to oversee management of water rights. The Jurupa Community Services District currently has total production water rights of 14,659 AFY from the Chino Basin. In addition, the District has rights to “carry over” supplies of water that was previously not used. Due to the existing regulations related to groundwater pumping that are implemented by the Chino Basin Watermaster, the Jurupa Community Services District would not pump substantial ground water amounts that could result in a substantial depletion of groundwater supplies. JCSD’s current water supply exceeds projected maximum day demand projected in the next five years (2016 -2021).

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 District purchases treatment capacity at the Riverside Water Quality Control Plant (RWQCP), which is located on Acorn 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 1.42 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 4.35 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.
Sources: 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
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 7.46 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 3.73 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 1.87 tons per year.

According to the Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details website accessed on November 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 November 2, 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? (“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)?</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, 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, BIO-2, 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, BIO-2, CR-1 through CR-4, NOI-1, TR-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 and TR-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: General Plan Amendment No. 16005, Tentative Tract Map 37052.

DATE: November 1, 2018

PROJECT MANAGER: Rocio Lopez, Senior Planner

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

- **General Plan Amendment (GPA) 16005**: Amend the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan Land Use Map from LDR (Low Density Residential – Country Neighborhood: ½ acre lots) to MDR (Medium Density Residential up to 5 dwelling units per acre)

- **Tentative Tract Map (TTM) 37052**: Subdivide an existing 7.25 acre vacant lot into 28 residential lots averaging 7,793 square feet.

PROJECT LOCATION: West side of Hudson Street between 59th and 60th Streets, Jurupa Valley, CA, APN: 165-100-027.

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.
**MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</strong></th>
<th><strong>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</strong></th>
<th><strong>VERIFIED BY:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit and during project operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>During grading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AESTHETICS

**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.

### AIR QUALITY

**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:

1. “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.”
2. “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.”
3. “The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and Project site...
### MITIGATION MEASURE (MM)
#### PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP)
#### PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)

| Areas are reduced to 15 miles per hour or less. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
<th>Building &amp; Safety Department</th>
<th>During construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 and 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

| 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. | Planning Department | Prior to the issuance of a grading permit |

---

M-3
<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure-BIO-1: Pre-Construction Burrowing Owl Survey.</strong> 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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure BIO-2- Nesting Bird Survey.</strong> As a condition of approval for all grading permits, vegetation clearing and ground disturbance shall be prohibited during the migratory bird nesting season (February 1 through October 1), unless a migratory bird nesting survey is completed in accordance with the following requirements:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. A migratory nesting bird survey of the Project's impact footprint shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three business (3) days prior to initiating vegetation clearing or ground disturbance.

b. A copy of the migratory nesting bird survey results report shall be provided to the City of Jurupa Planning Department. If the survey identifies the presence of active nests, then the qualified biologist shall provide the Planning Department with a copy of maps showing the location of all nests and an appropriate buffer zone around each nest sufficient to protect the nest from direct and indirect impact. The size and location of all buffer zones, if required, shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Department and shall be no less than a 300-foot radius around the nest for non-raptors and a 500-foot radius around the nest for raptors. The nests and buffer zones shall be field checked weekly by a qualified biological monitor. The approved buffer zone shall be marked in the field with construction fencing, within which no vegetation clearing or ground disturbance shall commence until the qualified biologist and Planning Department verify that the nests are no longer occupied and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests.

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. A migratory nesting bird survey of the Project's impact footprint shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three business (3) days prior to initiating vegetation clearing or ground disturbance.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Before grading begins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A copy of the migratory nesting bird survey results report shall be provided to the City of Jurupa Planning Department. If the survey identifies the presence of active nests, then the qualified biologist shall provide the Planning Department with a copy of maps showing the location of all nests and an appropriate buffer zone around each nest sufficient to protect the nest from direct and indirect impact. The size and location of all buffer zones, if required, shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Department and shall be no less than a 300-foot radius around the nest for non-raptors and a 500-foot radius around the nest for raptors. The nests and buffer zones shall be field checked weekly by a qualified biological monitor. The approved buffer zone shall be marked in the field with construction fencing, within which no vegetation clearing or ground disturbance shall commence until the qualified biologist and Planning Department verify that the nests are no longer occupied and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTURAL RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM- CR-1: Archaeological Monitoring.</strong> A qualified archaeologist (the &quot;Project Archaeologist&quot;) 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM- CR-2: Archeological Treatment Plan.</strong> If a significant archaeological resource(s) is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be stopped and a mitigation plan shall be submitted for approval. The approved mitigation plan shall be implemented before any further work commences on the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning Department Prior to the issuance of grading permit

Engineering Department During grading
### MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)

| 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. |
| RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION |
| TIME FRAME/MILESTONE |
| VERIFIED BY: |

| 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. |
| Engineering Department |
| During grading |

<p>| 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. |
| Planning Department |
| Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit or as otherwise determined by the Planning Director |</p>
<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>During grading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</td>
<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>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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 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>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></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 plans, the Project proponent shall prepare and submit landscape plans that demonstrate compliance with this section.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></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>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.8-1 As required by <em>General Plan</em> Policy CSSF 1.31-Federal/State Laws. Comply with federal and state laws regarding the management of hazardous waste and materials.</td>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M-7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Increase permeable areas by leaving highly porous soil and low lying area undisturbed by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Incorporating landscaping, green roofs and open space into the project design;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Using porous materials for or near driveways, drive aisles, parking stalls and low volume roads and walkways; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Incorporating detention ponds and infiltration pits into the project design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Installing rain-gutters oriented towards permeable areas;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Designing curbs, berms or other structures such that they do not isolate permeable or landscaped areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Rain gardens may be proposed in-lieu of a water quality basin when applicable and approved by the City Engineer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NOISE

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a building permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>During operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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."

PUBLIC SERVICES

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a building permit or occupancy permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Per Municipal Code Chapter 3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.14-4 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>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.16-1 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).</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure TR-1. Transportation System Improvement Fair Share Contribution. The City has a project that will address signal timing and operations that when completed, will mitigate the Project’ impacts at the two unsignalized intersections analyzed in the Traffic Impact Study prepared by KOA dated April 5, 2018. A fair share contribution towards that City project will address the Project’s share of the impact identified in the Project’s traffic study. The current estimated cost of the City project is $38,000. The Project traffic on Limonite Avenue is estimated to be approximately 15.7% of the identified project growth, less any approved, but unbuilt development traffic per the Caltrans fair-share formula. Based on those values, the Project’s fair share for the City project along Limonite Avenue will be $213.00 per unit, or a total of $5,964.00 This amount is to be paid at the time the applicant is required to pay the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF) and City of Jurupa Valley Development Impact Fees (DIF).</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>At the time the applicant is required to pay the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF) and City of Jurupa Valley Development Impact Fees (DIF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Native American Monitoring, Treatment of Discoveries, and Disposition of Discoveries.</td>
<td>Planning Department Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and during grading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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 City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department, the Eastern Information Center, and the appropriate Native American Tribe.
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:

a) 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.

b) 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.

c) 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.

d) 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.

**UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

**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.

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.17-1</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT NO. 2

RESOLUTION NO. 2018-11-28-03

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 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 16005 TO CHANGE THE LAND USE DESIGNATION OF APPROXIMATELY 7.25 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED WEST OF HUDSON STREET BETWEEN 60TH AND 59TH STREETS (APN: 165-100-027) FROM LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL - COUNTRY NEIGHBORHOOD (LDR) TO MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MDR)

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

Section 1. Project. Andrew Shores and Paul Talanian (collectively, the “Applicant”) have applied for General Plan Amendment No. 16005 and Tentative Tract Map No. 37052 (collectively, Master Application No. 16146 or MA No. 16146) to change the land use designation of real property located west of Hudson Street between 60th and 59th Streets (APN: 165-100-027) from Low Density Residential - Country Neighborhood (LDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR), and to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 7.25 gross acres into twenty-eight (28) single-family residential lots, two (2) water retention basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots (A-C) on real property located west of Hudson Street between 60th and 59th Streets (APN: 165-100-027) in the One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone (the “Project”). General Plan Amendment No. 16005 is the subject of this Resolution.

Section 2. General Plan Amendment.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of General Plan Amendment No. 16005 to redesignate 7.25 gross acres located west of Hudson Street between 60th and 59th Streets (APN: 165-100-027) from Low Density Residential - Country Neighborhood (LDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR).

(b) Section 9.30.010.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that any amendment to any part of the Jurupa Valley General Plan, shall be adopted in accordance with the provisions of Section 65300 et seq. of the Government Code, as now written or hereafter amended, and Chapter 9.30 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(c) Section 9.30.010.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the initiation of proceedings for the amendment of any part of the Jurupa Valley General Plan shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 9.30 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.
Section 9.30.040.D. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the owner of real property, or a person authorized by the owner, seeking to change the land use designation on that real property, shall have the right to apply for a General Plan amendment without having to request that the City Council adopt an order initiating proceedings for an amendment as detailed in Section 9.30.040. Instead, the owner of real property, or a person authorized by the owner, seeking to change the land use designation on that real property may apply for a General Plan amendment through the Planning Department and pay the required fee. Upon submittal of an application, the amendment shall be processed, heard and decided in accordance with Sections 9.30.010 and 9.30.100 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

Section 9.30.100.(1) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that proposals to amend any part of the Jurupa Valley General Plan shall be heard by the Planning Commission during a public hearing on the matter. Further, Government Code Section 65353 provides that when a city has a planning commission authorized by local ordinance or resolution to review and recommend action on a proposed general plan, the commission shall hold at least one public hearing before approving a recommendation on the adoption of a general plan.

Section 9.30.100.(2) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after closing the public hearing, the Planning Commission shall make a recommendation for approval or disapproval within a reasonable time, by resolution, including therein its findings, and transmit it to the City Council with a copy mailed to the applicant. A recommendation for approval shall be made by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the total membership of the Planning Commission. If the Planning Commission cannot reach a decision within a reasonable time after closing the hearing, that fact shall be reported to the City Council and shall be deemed a recommendation to deny the proposal. Further, Government Code Section 65354 provides that the planning commission shall make a written recommendation on the adoption of a general plan, that a recommendation for approval shall be made by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the total membership of the commission, and that the planning commission shall send its recommendation to the legislative body.

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. 16146 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 November 28, 2018, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 16146, 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 8, 2018, and expired on November 27, 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 General Plan Amendment No. 16005. 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 General Plan Amendment No. 16005 should be adopted because:

(a) The proposed change in land use designation does not involve a change in or conflict with: the Pedley Village Center, which General Principles include the following: Residential density should be concentrated around activity centers such as transit stops and retail centers to promote and encourage walkability; Neighborhoods should be located within a comfortable walking and biking distance to a neighborhood center with basic commercial amenities, such as shops, services and restaurants; and Strategy to attract new residents should
focus on providing and maintaining high quality of life amenities, attractions, views, walkability, experience, quality schools and services;

(b) The proposed General Plan Amendment would either contribute to the purposes of the General Plan or, at a minimum, would not be detrimental to them in that, the proposed General Plan Amendment from LDR to MDR is consistent with the existing land use development, which is primarily single-family housing tracts developed under the R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) zone development standards of 7,200 square foot minimum lot area, 60 foot minimum average lot width and 100 foot minimum average lot depth;

(c) As the subject site is located adjacent to several housing tracts which have been developed within the R-1 development standards, a change of land use to MDR, which allows a density of 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre, is appropriate and consistent within the R-1 zoned area. Additionally, the subject site and general R-1 zoned area is within the Pedley Village Center (PVC) and the GPA to MDR is consistent with the General Principles within the PVC, and consistent with all other policies within the General Plan, including the Economic Sustainability Element which includes attractive residential developments and increased tax base; and

(d) Special circumstances or conditions have emerged that were unanticipated in preparing the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan. The City should revisit the current LDR land use designation for the R-1 zoned neighborhood in which the subject site is located. which is bounded by 58th Street to the north, Felspar Street to the west, 61st and Main Streets to the south, and Van Buren Boulevard to the east. As half of the area is developed under the development standards applicable to premises in the R-1 Zone, changing the land use designation of premises in this area to MDR would make the existing land uses consistent with a 2-5 dwelling unit per acre designation and with the requirements of the R-1 Zone.

Section 6. Recommendation of Approval of General Plan Amendment No. 16005. 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 General Plan Amendment No. 16005 to change the land use designation of real property located west of Hudson Street between 60th and 59th Streets (APN: 165-100-027) from Low Density Residential - Country Neighborhood (LDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR).

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 28th day of November, 2018.

George Ruiz
Chair Pro Tem of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission
ATTEST:

[Signature]

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. 2018-11-28-03 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 28th day of November, 2018, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Ruiz, Moore, Pruitt, Silva

NOES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP
PLANNING DIRECTOR
EXHIBIT “A”

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR MA16146 (TTM37052 & GPA16005)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. PROJECT PERMITTED. Master Application (MA) No. 16146: Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37052 and General Plan Amendment (GPA) No. 16005 is for the approval to subdivide a 7.25 acre parcel into 28 single-family residential lots with two (2) water quality basin lots (Lot 29 & 30); three (3) lettered street lots (A-C) and related infrastructure improvements. The property is located west of Hudson Street between 60th and 59th Streets, APN: 165-100-027.

2. 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, 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. CONSENT TO CONDITIONS. Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to the required conditions of approval to the Planning Director or designee.

4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM. Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to having received a copy of the “Applicant’s Acknowledgement of Comments and Code Information from Internal/External Agencies”. The receipt form shall be given to the Planning Director or designee.
5. **MITIGATION MEASURES.** This project shall be subject to the mitigation measures adopted with the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) prepared for the project and included with these conditions of approval.

6. **FEES.** The approval of MA16146 (TTM37052 & GPA16005) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

7. **CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA).** This project is approved subject to the provisions of a Mitigated Negative Declaration. Within forty-eight (48) hours of final approval for this project, the owner or designee shall deliver to the Planning Department a check payable to the Riverside County Clerk in the amount of $2,330.75 (includes $50.00 County Clerk Processing Fee) or the fees that are currently in effect at the time. This will enable the City to file the Notice of Determination.

8. **COPIED 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.

9. **APPROVAL PERIOD – TENTATIVE TRACT MAP.** An approved or conditionally approved tentative tract 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 (Subdivisions). If the tentative map expires before the recordation of the final map, or any phase thereof, no recordation of the final map, or any phase thereof, shall be permitted. The variance conditionally approved in connection with this 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.

10. **CONFORMANCE TO APPROVED EXHIBITS.** The project shall be in conformance to the approved plans (listed below) with any changes in accordance to these conditions of approval:
    a. Tentative Tract Map No. 37052: prepared by Sake Engineers, dated November 15, 2018
    b. Conceptual Landscape Plans (Wall/Fence Plan included) dated November 15, 2018

11. **SUBMITTAL AND APPROVAL OF A SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT.** Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit an application for a Site Development Permit that includes the following plans to the City for review and approval: site plan, floor plan, elevations, landscape plan, and a wall and fence plan. The plans must be in substantial conformance with the R-1 (One Family Dwellings) Development Standards and with the County of Riverside’s Design Guidelines. Each set of plans may be submitted separately with a Site Development Permit application. Wall and Fence Plans shall adhere to the approved exhibits (10b).

12. **ON-SITE LANDSCAPING.** Prior to the issuance of any Building permit, the applicant shall submit a “Professional Services (PROS)” application (with current fees) and the following items for Planning Director review and approval:
    a. The total cost estimate of landscaping, irrigation, and one-year of maintenance.
b. Completed City Faithful Performance Bond for Landscape Improvements form with original signatures after the City provides the applicant with the required amount of bond.

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

d. Final landscape, maintenance, planting, and irrigation plans and digital copies (CD format). The plans shall include the following:
   i. Compliance with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Biological Resources Mitigation Measure BIO-6-Tree Preservation and Replacement.
   ii. Compliance with approved Development Plan.
   iii. Compliance with Title 9 (Planning and Zoning) landscaping requirements.

e. STREET TREES. Street trees and related security and agreements are required pursuant to Chapter 7.55 of Title 7 (Subdivisions). Tree size, specimen and installation shall be under the direction of the Engineering Department if they are within the public right-of-way.

Prior to the final inspection of any Building permit, the Landscape Architect of Record shall conduct an inspection and submit a letter to the City of Jurupa Valley once s/he has deemed the installation is in conformance to the approved plans. Following the inspection of the Landscape Architect of Record, the applicant shall schedule a City inspection with the City's landscape architect.

13. MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF SOLID FENCING AND WALLS WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK. No solid fencing or wall shall exceed 42-inches in height within the front setback. Walls/Fencing outside of the front setback areas shall not exceed six (6) feet in overall height.

14. BLOCK WALL FOR INTERIOR AND SIDE LOT LINES. Block walls shall be used for interior side lot lines. Decorative wrought iron gates shall be used on all side gates at individual parcels.

Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a Wall and Fence plan that is consistent with this condition to the Planning Department for review and approval.

15. GRAFFITI PROTECTION FOR WALLS. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit a wall plan that includes anti-graffiti coating or protection for the exterior side of all perimeter walls for City review and approval. The applicant shall remove any graffiti on the property as soon as possible. In addition, if the applicant was notified by the City, the applicant shall remove the graffiti within seven (7) days of the City’s notice.

16. TWO-CAR GARAGE PER DWELLING UNIT. All residential units shall have a minimum two-car garage with automatic sectional roll-up doors. No garage conversions are permitted and units must maintain two-car covered spaces at all times.
17. 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.

18. MULTIPLE SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN MITIGATION FEE (ORD. NO. 810). The applicant shall pay any owed fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 810. In order for the agency to determine that the project qualifies for any exemptions for any of the subject fees, the applicant needs to submit sufficient evidence to the City to demonstrate that it qualifies for the exemption.

19. SALE OF INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS. No structure constructed on Project site may be sold until the subject Project on which the structure is located is divided and a final map recorded in accordance with the City’s subdivision regulations such that the structure is located on a separate legally divided parcel.

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

1. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (ENGINEERING)

1.1. The use hereby conditioned is for a Schedule "A" subdivision, Tentative Tract No. 37052; being a subdivision of Lot 57 and portion of Lot 58 of Fairhaven Farms, Map Book 6, Page 2, of Maps on file in Official Records of Riverside County, California; more particularly Assessor's Parcel Number APN 1 65-100-027; containing 7.25 acres gross. Lots 1 through 28 inclusive are for residential purposes; Lots 29 and 30 will be retained by the owner and shall be for open space water quality purposes; Lots "A" through "E" inclusive, will be dedicated to the City of Jurupa Valley for public road and utility purposes. Exhibit titled Tentative Tract No. 37052, prepared by SAKE Engineers, Inc., dated October 18, 2017, 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 Project proponent 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 Project proponent may be required to amend or revise the permit application.

1.4. 59th Street is a Local Road with a right-of-way width of 60 feet. Right-of-way dedication to provide parkway improvements and cul-de-sac improvements at road terminus is required. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on 59th Street along the project’s frontage. The improvements include, but are not limited to, cul-de-sac curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaped parkway and signing and striping. Improvements shall be constructed per modified Riverside County Road Standard No. 105 and
as approved by the Public Works Director. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.5. 60th Street is a Local Road with a right-of-way width of 60 feet. Right-of-way dedication to provide 30 feet half ultimate-width from centerline to the property line is required. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on 60th Street as identified on these conditions of approval. The improvements include, but are not limited to, curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaped parkway and signing and striping. Improvements shall be constructed per modified Riverside County Road Standard No. 105 and as approved by the Public Works Director. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.6. Street "A" and Street "B" shall be dedicated as public road and improved as Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 40 feet road on a 60-foot right-of-way; curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.7. Hudson Street is an existing Local Road. Applicant is required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements for Street "B" and Hudson Street intersection, as identified on these conditions of approval or approved by the City Engineer. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.8. New street lights are required on 59th Street, 60th Street, Street "A", Street "B", and Hudson Street intersection. The project proponent shall cause streetlight plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.9. 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.

1.10. 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.

1.11. Owner will be required to annex into Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-1-C for the
maintenance of the following improvements: tree trimming of trees on right-of-way on proposed Street “A”, Street “B”, 60th Street, and 59th Street; and streetlights per approved streetlight plans for this subdivision; or as approved by the City Engineer.

1.12. 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)

Grading and Drainage

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 Project Proponent 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 located as shown on the referenced exhibit(s) or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer. The 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 existing, and landscape and irrigation improvements/modifications shall be shown on the street improvement plans.

2.2.5. Grading agreement and securities shall be in place prior to
2.3. Prior to approval of the grading plan, the Project Proponent shall prepare a
gootechnical/soils report for the proposed grading, infrastructure improvements
and post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs)
for review and approval of the City Engineer. All recommendations of that report
shall be incorporated in the grading plan. The title and date of the
gootechnical/soils report and the name and contact information of the Project
Geotechnical/Soils Engineer shall be included on the face of the grading plan.
The gootechnical/soils engineer must sign the grading plan.

2.4. Prior to approval of precise grading plans, the Project Proponent 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.

2.5. 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.

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

2.7. Where grading involves import or export the Project Proponent shall obtain
approval for the import/export location, from the Engineering department, if
located in the City. If import/export location is outside the City the Project
Proponent shall provide evidence that the jurisdictional agency has provided all
necessary, separate approvals for import/export to/from the site.

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

2.9. Prior to approval of the grading plan the Project Proponent shall prepare a final
Drainage Study, corresponding with the proposed improvements, for approval of
the City Engineer. The drainage study and the grading plan shall be signed by a
California licensed civil engineer.

2.9.1. All drainage and storm drain improvements shall be designed in
accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation
District's standards. Drainage shall be designed to accommodate 100-
year storm flows. Minimum drainage grade shall be 1% except on
Portland Cement Concrete where 0.5% shall be the minimum.

2.10. The Project Proponent shall prepare separate landscaping and irrigation plans
for areas within the street right-of-way for review and approval by the City
Engineer. Plans shall be per Ordinance 859 and meet these conditions of
approval; any modifications shall be approved by the City Engineer.
2.11. The Project Proponent shall prepare separate street improvement and street lighting plans for review and approval by the City Engineer.

2.12. 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.

2.12.1. Applicant is responsible for obtaining any required easements and authorizations.

2.13. 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 MAP RECORDATION

3.1. No final Map shall be recorded until the Site Development Permit (SDP) and all other related cases are approved and are in effect unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

3.2. No final Map shall be recorded until the annexation process, if applicable, for the annexation to Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-1-C associated with this project is finalized.

3.2.1. Project Proponent shall prepare Landscape and Irrigation plans for CFD/ L&LMD. Plans shall be prepared per Riverside County Ordinance 859 and per the City's submittal guidelines and package.

3.2.2. Jurupa Valley L&LMD Zone created will include, but is not limited to, the operation and maintenance of the following:
   a) Tree trimming for trees within the public right-of-way, as identified on the L&LMD Landscape Plans and approved by the Director of Public Works;
   b) Streetlights, as identified on City approved streetlight plans.

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

3.2.4. HOA shall be responsible for maintenance and upkeep of improvements identified on these conditions of approval which include, but are not limited, to the following:
   a) Water Quality Basins maintenance and operation, lot 29 and lot 30 of the approved TTM;
b) Entry monuments.

3.3. The Project Proponent 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 Project Proponent shall prepare improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer.

3.6. Applicant shall be responsible for obtaining drainage easement from adjacent property owner (APN 165-100-003), if necessary, for proposed drainage improvements affecting the property.

3.7. Plans shall be approved by the City Engineer. Bonds and agreements shall be in place to be accepted along with the Final Map.

3.7.1. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on 59th 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 (60 feet wide ultimate right-of-way);
   b) Design of cul-de-sac per Riverside County Standard No. 800A and as approved by the City Engineer;
   c) Applicant shall be responsible for any right-of-way acquisition that may be required in order to provide for the design and construction of cul-de-sac;
   d) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   e) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk, within a 10-foot parkway along the south side of 59th Street and around cul-de-sac. Final parkway design at north side of 59th Street shall be approved by City Engineer at cul-de-sac design.
   f) Design shall include curb-ramps and meet current ADA standards.

3.7.2. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on 60th Street consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible of construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:
   a) Ultimate right-of-way width of 60 feet and improved per Riverside
County Standard No. 105C; any modifications shall be approved by the City Engineer.

b) Provide half-width plus 12 feet improvements extending from end of existing improvements (east of Sheelite Street) to the subdivision’s easterly boundary (proposed Lot 12) and full width improvements to Hudson Street.

c) Improvements on the south side of 60th Street shall include curb and gutter as approved by the City Engineer.

d) Improvements on the north side of 60th Street shall include 5-foot curb adjacent landscaping and 5-foot sidewalk. Improvements shall be per Riverside County Standard 105C.

e) Improvements shall include full intersection improvements at west side of Hudson Street and 60th Street intersection.

f) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;

g) Design shall include curb-ramps and meet current ADA standards.

3.7.3. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Street “B” and 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) Ultimate right-of-way width of 60 feet and improved per Riverside County Standard No. 105C; any modifications shall be approved by the City Engineer.

c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;

d) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway.

e) Design shall include curb-ramps and meet current ADA standards.

3.7.4. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Street “A” and consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible of construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:

f) Ultimate road and pavement conditions;

g) Ultimate right-of-way width of 60 feet and improved per Riverside County Standard No. 105C; any modifications shall be approved by the City Engineer.

h) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;

i) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway.

3.7.5. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on proposed Street "A" and Street "B" 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) 36-ft paved section on 56-ft right-of-way;
c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;

d) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway on both sides of the street.

e) Applicant

3.7.6. Separate Street Improvement, Street Lighting, and Utility Plans will be required.

3.8. Signing and striping plans for the project shall show appropriate school zone signage and striping; including, but not limited to, crosswalk across Street “B” at Hudson Street intersection or as approved by the City Engineer.

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

3.10. 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 Project Proponent 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.

3.11. Project proponent 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.

3.12. The applicant shall make every effort and shall provide good-faith proof of working with the school district to provide connectivity from 59th Street cul-de-sac to Hudson Street, in compliance with the Pedley Village Design Guidelines (PVCDG) and the City’s Mobility Element within the General Plan.

3.12.1. The improvements will be within the school district’s property; applicant shall be responsible for obtaining any and all required permissions for work within their property.

3.12.2. Design shall be per the School District’s guidelines and comply with minimum ADA standards.

3.12.3. Applicant shall coordinate with the School District and present proposed maintenance plan of improvements, to the City’s Engineer
satisfaction.

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 Project Proponent 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. Grading agreement and securities shall be in place prior to the commencement of grading.

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.

4.6. A fair-share contribution towards signal timing and corridor operations’ City project shall be placed to addressed project’s at intersections identified on the TIA. The project’s fair share contribution is of $5,966, which corresponds to about 15.7% of the total estimated cost of the City’s estimate ($38,000). The fair share shall be paid in a per lot basis at time of building permit request.

5. PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION (ENGINEERING)

5.1. The Project Proponent 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 Appendix J.

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 Project Proponent is responsible for completing all landscaping and irrigation improvements within the public right-of-way as applicable.

5.5. The Project proponent 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).

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: ________________
RESOLUTION NO. 2018-11-28-04

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM AND APPROVING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 37052, A SCHEDULE “A” SUBDIVISION OF APPROXIMATELY 7.25 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED WEST OF HUDSON STREET BETWEEN 60TH AND 59TH STREETS (APN: 165-100-027) INTO TWENTY-EIGHT SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS

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

Section 1. Project. Andrew Shores and Paul Talanian (collectively, the “Applicant”) have applied for General Plan Amendment No. 16005 and Tentative Tract Map No. 37052 (collectively, Master Application No. 16146 or MA No. 16146) to change the land use designation of real property located west of Hudson Street between 60th and 59th Streets (APN: 165-100-027) from Low Density Residential - Country Neighborhood (LDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR), and to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 7.25 gross acres into twenty-eight (28) single-family residential lots, two (2) water retention basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots (A-C) on real property located west of Hudson Street between 60th and 59th Streets (APN: 165-100-027) in the One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone (the “Project”). Tentative Tract Map No. 37052 is the subject is this Resolution.

Section 2. Tentative Tract Map.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37052, a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 7.25 gross acres into twenty-eight (28) single-family residential lots, two (2) water retention basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots (A-C) on real property located west of Hudson Street between 60th and 59th Streets (APN: 165-100-027).

(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 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. 16146 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 November 28, 2018, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 16146, 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 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 8, 2018, and expired on November 27, 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 5. Findings for Approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37052. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37052 should be granted because:

(a) With the approval of proposed General Plan Amendment No. 16005, the proposed land division will be consistent with the requirements of the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and the General Plan land use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR), which permits up to five (5) dwelling units per acre. Proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37052 will facilitate the future construction of twenty-eight (28) single family residential lots at a density of 3.8 dwelling units per acre, which is below the maximum allowable density for the MDR land use designation;

(b) With the approval of proposed General Plan Amendment No. 16005, the design or improvement of the proposed land division will be consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan, in that the proposed General Plan Amendment from Low Density Residential – Country Neighborhood (LDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) is consistent with the existing land use development, which is primarily single-family housing tracts developed under the R-1 zone development standards of 7,200 square foot minimum lot area, 60 foot minimum average lot width and 100 foot minimum average lot depth;

(c) The 7.25 gross acre site of the proposed land division is physically suitable for the type of development in that it is a relatively flat, undeveloped, vacant lot located adjacent to other single-family residential land uses, with adequate water and sewer connections and public services available to the site;

(d) With the approval of proposed General Plan Amendment No. 16005, the site of the proposed land division is physically suitable for the proposed density of the development in that it proposes twenty-eight (28) single-family residential dwelling units at a density of 3.8 dwelling units per acre, which is below the maximum allowable density under the MDR land use designation;

(e) The design of the proposed land division or proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat in that the subject site is highly disturbed and occupied by ruderal flora and bare ground. Because of the existing degraded site condition, the absence of special-status plant communities, and overall low potential for most special-status species to utilize or reside on-site, the design of the proposed land division and the proposed improvements are not expected to directly impact federal or state-listed threatened or endangered species;
(f) The design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements are not likely to cause serious public health problems. An Initial Study was prepared that evaluated potential effects with respect to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry 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 MND 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 mitigation measures have been required or revisions in the Project have been made or agreed to by the Applicant. Furthermore a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) report prepared for the proposed Project did not reveal evidence of a recognized environmental condition in connection with the subject site. The Initial Study determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the proposed Project may have a significant effect on the environment. As such, the proposed Project will not cause serious public health problems; and

(g) The design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed land division in that there are no on-site easements within the subject site, the proposed Project will connect to water and sewer lines that will be constructed in in 60th Street, proposed Street A, and proposed Street B, and all proposed utilities are required to be undergrounded.

Section 6. Approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37052 with Conditions. Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission hereby approves an Tentative Tract Map No. 37052 to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 7.25 gross acres into twenty-eight (28) single-family residential lots, two (2) water retention basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots (A-C) on real property located west of Hudson Street between 60th and 59th Streets (APN: 165-100-027), subject to the recommended conditions of approval attached hereto as Exhibit “A.” The Planning Commission’s approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37052 is conditioned upon the City Council’s adoption of a resolution or ordinance approving General Plan Amendment No. 16005, and this approval shall not take effect until the effective date of the resolution or ordinance approving General Plan Amendment No. 16005.

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 28th day of November, 2018.

George Ruiz
Chair Pro Tem 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 Merrell, Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2018-11-28-04 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 28th day of November, 2018, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:  
Ruiz, Moore, Pruitt, Silva  

NOES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:  

ABSENT: COMMISSION MEMBERS:  

ABSTAIN: COMMISSION MEMBERS:  

THOMAS G. MERRELL  
PLANNING DIRECTOR
EXHIBIT “A”

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR MA16146 (TTM37052 & GPA16005)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. **PROJECT PERMITTED.** Master Application (MA) No. 16146: Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37052 and General Plan Amendment (GPA) No. 16005 is for the approval to subdivide a 7.25 acre parcel into 28 single-family residential lots with two (2) water quality basin lots (Lot 29 & 30); three (3) lettered street lots (A-C) and related infrastructure improvements. The property is located west of Hudson Street between 60th and 59th Streets, APN: 165-100-027.

2. **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 “Indemnities”) 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, and any finding or determination made and any other action taken by any of the Indemnities 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. **CONSENT TO CONDITIONS.** Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to the required conditions of approval to the Planning Director or designee.

4. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM.** Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to having received a copy of the “Applicant’s Acknowledgement of Comments and Code Information from Internal/External Agencies”. The receipt form shall be given to the Planning Director or designee.
5. **MITIGATION MEASURES.** This project shall be subject to the mitigation measures adopted with the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) prepared for the project and included with these conditions of approval.

6. **FEES.** The approval of MA16146 (TTM37052 & GPA16005) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

7. **CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA).** This project is approved subject to the provisions of a Mitigated Negative Declaration. Within forty-eight (48) hours of final approval for this project, the owner or designee shall deliver to the Planning Department a check payable to the Riverside County Clerk in the amount of $2,330.75 (includes $50.00 County Clerk Processing Fee) or the fees that are currently in effect at the time. This will enable the City to file the Notice of Determination.

8. **COPIED 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.

9. **APPROVAL PERIOD – TENTATIVE TRACT MAP.** An approved or conditionally approved tentative tract 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 (Subdivisions). If the tentative map expires before the recodification of the final map, or any phase thereof, no recodification of the final map, or any phase thereof, shall be permitted. The variance conditionally approved in connection with this 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.

10. **CONFORMANCE TO APPROVED EXHIBITS.** The project shall be in conformance to the approved plans (listed below) with any changes in accordance to these conditions of approval:
   a. Tentative Tract Map No. 37052: prepared by Sake Engineers, dated November 15, 2018
   b. Conceptual Landscape Plans (Wall/Fence Plan included) dated November 15, 2018

11. **SUBMITTAL AND APPROVAL OF A SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT.** Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit an application for a Site Development Permit that includes the following plans to the City for review and approval: site plan, floor plan, elevations, landscape plan, and a wall and fence plan. The plans must be in substantial conformance with the R-1 (One Family Dwellings) Development Standards and with the County of Riverside’s Design Guidelines. Each set of plans may be submitted separately with a Site Development Permit application. Wall and Fence Plans shall adhere to the approved exhibits (10b).

12. **ON-SITE LANDSCAPING.** Prior to the issuance of any Building permit, the applicant shall submit a "Professional Services (PROS)" application (with current fees) and the following items for Planning Director review and approval:
   a. The total cost estimate of landscaping, irrigation, and one-year of maintenance.
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b. Completed City Faithful Performance Bond for Landscape Improvements form with original signatures after the City provides the applicant with the required amount of bond.

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

d. Final landscape, maintenance, planting, and irrigation plans and digital copies (CD format). The plans shall include the following:
   i. Compliance with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Biological Resources Mitigation Measure BIO-6 Tree Preservation and Replacement.
   ii. Compliance with approved Development Plan.
   iii. Compliance with Title 9 (Planning and Zoning) landscaping requirements.

e. STREET TREES. Street trees and related security and agreements are required pursuant to Chapter 7.55 of Title 7 (Subdivisions). Tree size, specimen and installation shall be under the direction of the Engineering Department if they are within the public right-of-way.

Prior to the final inspection of any building permit, the Landscape Architect of Record shall conduct an inspection and submit a letter to the City of Jurupa Valley once s/he has deemed the installation is in conformance to the approved plans. Following the inspection of the Landscape Architect of Record, the applicant shall schedule a City inspection with the City's landscape architect.

13. MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF SOLID FENCING AND WALLS WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK. No solid fencing or wall shall exceed 42-inches in height within the front setback. Walls/Fencing outside of the front setback areas shall not exceed six (6) feet in overall height.

14. BLOCK WALL FOR INTERIOR AND SIDE LOT LINES. Block walls shall be used for interior side lot lines. Decorative wrought iron gates shall be used on all side gates at individual parcels.

Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a Wall and Fence plan that is consistent with this condition to the Planning Department for review and approval.

15. GRAFFITI PROTECTION FOR WALLS. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit a wall plan that includes anti-graffiti coating or protection for the exterior side of all perimeter walls for City review and approval. The applicant shall remove any graffiti on the property as soon as possible. In addition, if the applicant was notified by the City, the applicant shall remove the graffiti within seven (7) days of the City's notice.

16. TWO-CAR GARAGE PER DWELLING UNIT. All residential units shall have a minimum two-car garage with automatic sectional roll-up doors. No garage conversions are permitted and units must maintain two-car covered spaces at all times.
17. 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.

18. MULTIPLE SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN MITIGATION FEE (ORD. NO. 810). The applicant shall pay any owed fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 810. In order for the agency to determine that the project qualifies for any exemptions for any of the subject fees, the applicant needs to submit sufficient evidence to the City to demonstrate that it qualifies for the exemption.

19. SALE OF INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS. No structure constructed on Project site may be sold until the subject Project on which the structure is located is divided and a final map recorded in accordance with the City’s subdivision regulations such that the structure is located on a separate legally divided parcel.

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

1. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (ENGINEERING)

1.1. The use hereby conditioned is for a Schedule "A" subdivision, Tentative Tract No. 37052; being a subdivision of Lot 57 and portion of Lot 58 of Fairhaven Farms, Map Book 6, Page 2, of Maps on file in Official Records of Riverside County, California; more particularly Assessor’s Parcel Number APN 165-100-027; containing 7.25 acres gross. Lots 1 through 28 inclusive are for residential purposes; Lots 29 and 30 will be retained by the owner and shall be for open space water quality purposes; Lots "A" through "E" inclusive, will be dedicated to the City of Jurupa Valley for public road and utility purposes. Exhibit titled Tentative Tract No. 37052, prepared by SAKE Engineers, Inc., dated October 18, 2017, 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 Project proponent 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, quieted, vacated, abandoned, easement holder cannot be found, or is otherwise of no effect. Should such approvals or alternate action regarding the easements not be provided, the Project proponent may be required to amend or revise the permit application.

1.4. 59th Street is a Local Road with a right-of-way width of 60 feet. Right-of-way dedication to provide parkway improvements and cul-de-sac improvements at road terminus is required. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on 59th Street along the project’s frontage. The improvements include, but are not limited to, cul-de-sac curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaped parkway and signing and striping. Improvements shall be constructed per modified Riverside County Road Standard No. 105 and
as approved by the Public Works Director. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer. The Project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.5. 60th Street is a Local Road with a right-of-way width of 60 feet. Right-of-way dedication to provide 30 feet half ultimate-width from centerline to the property line is required. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on 60th Street as identified on these conditions of approval. The improvements include, but are not limited to, curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaped parkway and signing and striping. Improvements shall be constructed per modified Riverside County Road Standard No. 105 and as approved by the Public Works Director. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.6. Street "A" and Street "B" shall be dedicated as public road and improved as Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 40 feet road on a 60-foot right-of-way; curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.7. Hudson Street is an existing Local Road. Applicant is required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements for Street "B" and Hudson Street intersection, as identified on these conditions of approval or approved by the City Engineer. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.8. New street lights are required on 59th Street, 60th Street, Street "A", Street "B", and Hudson Street intersection. The project proponent shall cause streetlight plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.9. 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.

1.10. 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.

1.11. Owner will be required to annex into Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-1-C for the
maintenance of the following improvements: tree trimming of trees on right-of-way on proposed Street “A”, Street “B”, 60th Street, and 59th Street; and streetlights per approved streetlight plans for this subdivision; or as approved by the City Engineer.

1.12. 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)

Grading and Drainage

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 Project Proponent 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 located as shown on the referenced exhibit(s) or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer. The 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 existing, and landscape and irrigation improvements/modifications shall be shown on the street improvement plans.

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 Project Proponent shall prepare a geotechnical/soils report for the proposed grading, infrastructure improvements and post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs) for review and approval of the City Engineer. All recommendations of that report shall be incorporated in the grading plan. The title and date of the geotechnical/soils report and the name and contact information of the Project Geotechnical/Soils Engineer shall be included on the face of the grading plan. The geotechnical/soils engineer must sign the grading plan.

2.4. Prior to approval of precise grading plans, the Project Proponent 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.

2.5. 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.

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

2.7. Where grading involves import or export the Project Proponent shall obtain approval for the import/export location, from the Engineering department, if located in the City. If import/export location is outside the City the Project Proponent shall provide evidence that the jurisdictional agency has provided all necessary, separate approvals for import/export to/from the site.

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

2.9. Prior to approval of the grading plan the Project Proponent shall prepare a final Drainage Study, corresponding with the proposed improvements, for approval of the City Engineer. The drainage study and the grading plan shall be signed by a California licensed civil engineer.

2.9.1. All drainage and storm drain improvements shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District's standards. Drainage shall be designed to accommodate 100-year storm flows. Minimum drainage grade shall be 1% except on Portland Cement Concrete where 0.5% shall be the minimum.

2.10. The Project Proponent shall prepare separate landscaping and irrigation plans for areas within the street right-of-way for review and approval by the City Engineer. Plans shall be per Ordinance 859 and meet these conditions of approval; any modifications shall be approved by the City Engineer.
2.11. The Project Proponent shall prepare separate street improvement and street lighting plans for review and approval by the City Engineer.

2.12. 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.

2.12.1. Applicant is responsible for obtaining any required easements and authorizations.

2.13. 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 MAP RECORDATION

3.1. No final Map shall be recorded until the Site Development Permit (SDP) and all other related cases are approved and are in effect unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

3.2. No final Map shall be recorded until the annexation process, if applicable, for the annexation to Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-1-C associated with this project is finalized.

3.2.1. Project Proponent shall prepare Landscape and Irrigation plans for CFD/ L&LMD. Plans shall be prepared per Riverside County Ordinance 859 and per the City’s submittal guidelines and package.

3.2.2. Jurupa Valley L&LMD Zone created will include, but is not limited to, the operation and maintenance of the following:
   a) Tree trimming for trees within the public right-of-way, as identified on the L&LMD Landscape Plans and approved by the Director of Public Works;
   b) Streetlights, as identified on City approved streetlight plans.

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

3.2.4. HOA shall be responsible for maintenance and upkeep of improvements identified on these conditions of approval which include, but are not limited, to the following:
   a) Water Quality Basins maintenance and operation, lot 29 and lot 30 of the approved TTM;
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b) Entry monuments.

3.3. The Project Proponent 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 Project Proponent shall prepare improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer.

3.6. Applicant shall be responsible for obtaining drainage easement from adjacent property owner (APN 165-100-003), if necessary, for proposed drainage improvements affecting the property.

3.7. Plans shall be approved by the City Engineer. Bonds and agreements shall be in place to be accepted along with the Final Map.

3.7.1. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on 59th 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 (60 feet wide ultimate right-of-way);
   b) Design of cul-de-sac per Riverside County Standard No. 800A and as approved by the City Engineer;
   c) Applicant shall be responsible for any right-of-way acquisition that may be required in order to provide for the design and construction of cul-de-sac;
   d) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   e) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk, within a 10-foot parkway along the south side of 59th Street and around cul-de-sac. Final parkway design at north side of 59th Street shall be approved by City Engineer at cul-de-sac design.
   f) Design shall include curb-ramps and meet current ADA standards.

3.7.2. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on 60th Street consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible of construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:
   a) Ultimate right-of-way width of 60 feet and improved per Riverside
County Standard No. 105C; any modifications shall be approved by the City Engineer.
b) Provide half-width plus 12 feet improvements extending from end of existing improvements (east of Sheelite Street) to the subdivision’s easterly boundary (proposed Lot 12) and full width improvements to Hudson Street.
c) Improvements on the south side of 60th Street shall include curb and gutter as approved by the City Engineer.
d) Improvements on the north side of 60th Street shall include 5-foot curb adjacent landscaping and 5-foot sidewalk. Improvements shall be per Riverside County Standard 105C.
e) Improvements shall include full intersection improvements at west side of Hudson Street and 60th Street intersection.
f) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
g) Design shall include curb-ramps and meet current ADA standards.

3.7.3. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Street “B” and 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) Ultimate right-of-way width of 60 feet and improved per Riverside County Standard No. 105C; any modifications shall be approved by the City Engineer.
c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
d) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway.
e) Design shall include curb-ramps and meet current ADA standards.

3.7.4. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Street “A” and consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible of construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:
f) Ultimate road and pavement conditions;
g) Ultimate right-of-way width of 60 feet and improved per Riverside County Standard No. 105C; any modifications shall be approved by the City Engineer.
h) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
i) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway.

3.7.5. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on proposed Street "A" and Street "B" 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) 36-ft paved section on 56-ft right-of-way;
3.7.6. Separate Street Improvement, Street Lighting, and Utility Plans will be required.

3.8. Signing and striping plans for the project shall show appropriate school zone signage and striping; including, but not limited to, crosswalk across Street “B” at Hudson Street intersection or as approved by the City Engineer.

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

3.10. 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 Project Proponent 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.

3.11. Project proponent 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.

3.12. The applicant shall make every effort and shall provide good-faith proof of working with the school district to provide connectivity from 59th Street cul-de-sac to Hudson Street, in compliance with the Pedley Village Design Guidelines (PVCDDG) and the City’s Mobility Element within the General Plan.

\[3.12.1.\] The improvements will be within the school district’s property; applicant shall be responsible for obtaining any and all required permissions for work within their property.

\[3.12.2.\] Design shall be per the School District’s guidelines and comply with minimum ADA standards.

\[3.12.3.\] Applicant shall coordinate with the School District and present proposed maintenance plan of improvements, to the City’s Engineer.
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 Project Proponent 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. Grading agreement and securities shall be in place prior to the commencement of grading.

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.

4.6. A fair-share contribution towards signal timing and corridor operations’ City project shall be placed to addressed project’s at intersections identified on the TIA. The project’s fair share contribution is of $5,966, which corresponds to about 15.7% of the total estimated cost of the City’s estimate ($38,000). The fair share shall be paid in a per lot basis at time of building permit request.

5. PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION (ENGINEERING)

5.1. The Project Proponent 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 Appendix J.

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 Project Proponent is responsible for completing all landscaping and irrigation improvements within the public right-of-way as applicable.

5.5. The Project proponent 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).

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: __________________
STAFF REPORT

DATE: NOVEMBER 28, 2018
TO: CHAIR PRO TEM RUIZ AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR
BY: ROCIO LOPEZ, SENIOR PLANNER
SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 6.3

MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 16146: TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 37052 AND GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NO. 16005

PROPOSAL: REQUEST TO SUBDIVIDE A 7.25 ACRE PARCEL INTO 28 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS AND AMEND THE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION FROM LDR (LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL – COUNTRY NEIGHBORHOOD) TO MDR (MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)

LOCATION: VACANT PARCEL LOCATED WEST OF HUDSON STREET BETWEEN 60TH AND 59TH STREETS / APN: 165-100-027

APPLICANT: ANDREW SHORES AND PAUL TALANIAN

RECOMMENDATION

By motion:

(1) Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-11-28-03, recommending that the City Council (1) adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and (2) approve General Plan Amendment No. 16005; and

(2) Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-11-28-04, (1) adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and (2) approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37052

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Applicant (“Applicant” or “Andrew Shores and Paul Talanian”), have submitted an application for a General Plan Amendment to change the existing land use designation from LDR (Low Density Residential – Country Neighborhood) to MDR (Medium Density Residential) and a Tentative Tract Map to allow the subdivision of a 7.25 gross acre property into 28 single-family residential lots with average lot size of 7,793 square feet; two (2) water retention basins; three lettered street lots (A-C) and the construction of associated infrastructure. The existing R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) zone will remain unchanged.

Table 1 provides general project information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ACREAGE OF PROJECT SITE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.25 gross acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING GENERAL PLAN LAND USE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGNATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDR (Low Density Residential – Country Neighborhood): 1 to 2 dwelling units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN LAND USE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGNATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDR (Medium Density Residential): 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING POLICY AREA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian Lifestyle Overlay and Pedley Village Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING ZONING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) – No change proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOCATION**

The project site is located west of Hudson Street, between 60th and 59th Streets. The property is surrounded by a single-family housing tract to the west, single family homes to the east, southeast and Pedley Elementary School to the north, and vacant property to the immediate south. Exhibit 1 provides the general location and aerial view of the project site. Exhibit 2 provides the existing General Plan Land Use (GPLU) designations and zoning of the site and surrounding parcels.

**EXHIBIT 1: SITE LOCATION MAP**
REQUIRED ENTITLEMENTS

Subdivisions are regulated by Title 7 (Subdivisions) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. This project is a Schedule “A” subdivision per Section 7.30.040, defined as: “Any division of land into 5 or more parcels, where any parcel is less than 18,000 square feet in net area.” Additionally, the action of the Planning Commission on a tentative Schedule “A” map shall be final unless appealed by the Applicant or any interested party.

While the project meets the current R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) development standards, the project does not meet the 1 to 2 dwelling units per acre land use criteria within the LDR (Low Density Residential – Country Neighborhood) land use designation. As the project proposes 3.8 dwelling units per acre, the Applicant is requesting General Plan Amendment No. 16005 to change the existing land use from: LDR (Low Density Residential – Country Neighborhood: 1-2 dwelling units per acre) to MDR (Medium Density Residential: 2-5 dwelling units per acre) to accommodate the proposed 28 single family residential lots, see General Plan exhibit (Attachment 3).

BACKGROUND

The Applicant purchased the property with the intent on subdividing the property per the R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) development standards which would yield 28 residential lots with a 7,200 square foot minimum lot size. The subdivision also includes public right-of-way dedication and improvements as illustrated on Exhibit 3. A larger version of the proposed subdivision map has been provided under separate cover, see Attachment 9.
The map includes building pad elevations on the individual parcels in an effort to analyze future construction of single-family homes for hydrological calculations. Staff proposes a condition that will require a Site Development Permit for the subsequent construction and location of homes. Pad elevations will be deemed approximate only and future construction will be further evaluated for appropriate design, size and architecture.

ANALYSIS

GENERAL PLAN

LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (LDR) – COUNTRY NEIGHBORHOOD

The property is located within a General Plan Land Use designation of LDR (Low Density Residential - Country Neighborhood) which permits up to two (2) dwelling units per acre. Under the current land use designation, up to 14 dwelling units are permitted. The project proposes 28
residential dwelling units at a density of 3.8 dwelling units per acre which is above the maximum allowable density.

The Applicant has therefore requested a General Plan Amendment (GPA16005) to change the land use from LDR to MDR (Medium Density Residential) which allows 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre.

**MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MDR)**

The MDR land use designation provides for the development of detached single-family dwellings on parcels typically ranging from 5,500 to 20,000 square feet. The density range is from 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre, with a minimum lot size of 5,500 square feet to encourage clustering.

The project, if GPA16005 is approved, would be consistent with applicable policies of the MDR land use and density level, which permits 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre. Under the MDR land use designation, up to 36 dwelling units are permitted. The project proposes 28 residential lots, which is below the maximum allowable density in the MDR land use designation.

**Adjacent Land Uses**

The single family housing tract located to the immediate west of the subject site on Scheelite Street was originally subdivided in 1976 with 7,200 square foot lots and the single family housing tract located west of Scheelite Street on Azurite Street and along the west side of Felspar Street between 61st and 59th Street were originally subdivided in 1954, also with 7,200 square foot lots. Additionally, several parcels located to the immediate east of the subject site were subdivided in the mid-1950s with 7,200 square foot residential lots. Exhibit 4 provides an illustration of the previously approved housing tracts within the immediate area.

**EXHIBIT 4: VARIOUS HOUSING TRACTS WITH 7,200 SQUARE FOOT LOTS**
Currently, the above noted housing tracts are all within the LDR land use designation of 1 to 2 dwelling units per acre. It’s possible that when the County approved these housing tract subdivisions, the state law did not require the zoning to be consistent with the General Plan. Currently, however, these housing tracts are not in conformance with the LDR land use designation. In order to bring the land use of these 7,200 square foot lots into consistency with...
the LDR designation, the 7,200 foot housing tracts would all have to be rezoned to either R-A (Residential Agricultural) or A-1 (Light Agricultural). Since most of the parcels within this area were subdivided and developed under the R-1 zone development standards with minimum lot areas of 7,200 square feet, average lot widths of 60 feet and a minimum average lot depths of 100 feet, achieving consistency between the current R-1 zone and LDR designation is not possible.

Ultimately, the City will need to change to General Plan Land Use designation for all the parcels currently zoned R-1 in this area to MDR inasmuch as they are already developed per the MDR land use designation and the R-1 zoning standards.

PEDLEY VILLAGE CENTER

The subject property is located within the Pedley Village Center which includes specific design guidelines for residential development projects as outlined in the enclosed Pedley Village Center Design Guidelines (PVCDG), see Attachment 5. There are several policies within the PVCDG which include:

1. New residential developments should be designed to connect streets, walkways and trails with existing adjacent neighborhoods and should not prevent vehicular circulation with existing adjacent neighborhoods.
   a. Circulation and connectivity: While Planning staff encouraged the Applicant to provide connectivity from 59th Street to Hudson Street, the portion of property located between the end of the proposed cul-de-sac and Hudson Street is privately owned by both the Jurupa Unified School District and the property owner to the immediate east of the subject site as shown on Exhibit 5.

   EXHIBIT 5: PORTION OF LAND BETWEEN CUL-DE-SAC & HUDSON ST.

   Engineering staff further explained that the Applicant would have to acquire land from both owners of this portion of land and have it dedicated as right-of-way to the City. The Engineering Department ultimately recommended the cul-de-sac at the terminus of 59th Street not extend through to Hudson Street, citing that the General Plan did not identify 59th Street going through and connecting to Hudson Street.
With proposed “B” Street and 60th Street extending to Hudson Street, both the Planning and Engineering Departments deemed that the map provides the recommended circulation and connectivity to satisfy the General Plan Mobility Element and the PVCDG goals.

While the map provides landscaped parkways and streetscapes that are pedestrian friendly and which promote neighborhood safety and interaction, connectivity is essential. In addition to vehicular connectivity, pedestrian connectivity and access is crucial, particularly with the safe route for school children as identified in the PVCDG, which also promotes the health, safety and welfare of existing and future residents.

In an effort to promote a direct and safe route for school children to and from this proposed subdivision and Pedley Elementary school, the Engineering Department has recommended the following conditions after discussions with both the Planning Department and the Jurupa Unified School District (JUSD):

3.8 Signing and striping plans for the project shall show appropriate school zone signage and striping; including, but not limited to, crosswalk across Street “B” at Hudson Street intersection or as approved by the City Engineer.

3.12 The applicant shall make every effort and shall provide good-faith proof of working with the school district to provide connectivity from 59th Street cul-de-sac to Hudson Street, in compliance with the Pedley Village Design Guidelines (PVCDG) and the City’s Mobility Element within the General Plan.

   3.12.1.1 The improvements will be within the school district’s property; applicant shall be responsible for obtaining any and all required permissions for work within their property.

   3.12.1.2 Design shall be per the School District’s guidelines and comply with minimum ADA standards.

   3.12.1.3 Applicant shall coordinate with the School District and present proposed maintenance plan of improvements, to the City’s Engineer satisfaction.

2. In compliance with the Pedley Village Center Design Guidelines (PVCDG), future development of the residential development shall highly conform to the provisions of these guidelines.

   a. Neighborhood Design: Traditional neighborhood design with high quality architectural design including varying styles such as Craftsman, Victorian, California Bungalow, American Farmhouse and California Ranch as shown on the City’s Architectural Residential Style sheets, see Attachment 6.

   b. Edges: Carefully design the edges of the project to provide generous landscaping, connectivity and compatibility with adjoining land uses.

Since the project incorporates landscaped parkways adjacent to curb and gutter, sidewalks will not be adjacent to splitface perimeter walls along Lots 8, 9, 16, 17, 20 and 28. In compliance with the PVCDG, the project has incorporated landscape buffers between sidewalk and split face walls along these lots.

   c. Generous landscaping.
The project provides for attractive landscaping and perimeter walls, fencing and gates as shown on Attachment 10 (Conceptual Landscape and Wall/Fence Plan).

COUNTYWIDE DESIGN GUIDELINES

In addition to the PVDG, subdivisions are required to comply with the Riverside County Design Guidelines, including the Second District Guidelines.

The map will be conditioned to require a Site Development Permit for review and approval of future residential development prior to the issuance of any building permits. Such Site Development Plan shall include, but not be limited to, site plan, floor plan, elevations, landscape plan and a wall and fence plan. The plans must be in substantial conformance with the R-1 (One Family Dwellings) Development Standards, with the PVDG and the County of Riverside's Design Guidelines, including those within the Second District.

ZONING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

R-1 ZONE (ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS)

The subject property is located within the R-1 zone and is subject to Section 9.55.020 (Development Standards), which states that the lot area of any parcel/lot shall not be less than 7,200 square feet with a minimum average lot width of 60 feet and a minimum average lot depth of 100 feet. Additionally, the minimum frontage of a lot shall be 60 feet, except that lots fronting on knuckles or cul-de-sac may have a minimum frontage of 35 feet.

All 28 lots exceed the required 7,200 square-foot lot area, with lots averaging 7,793 square feet, and all comply with the average lot width of 60 feet and average lot depth of 100 feet, see Tables 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3: LOT SUMMARY TABLE (NET AREA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOT NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVERAGE LOT = 7,793.70 s.f.
AVERAGE PAD = 7,326 s.f.
AVERAGE WIDTH = 65.66 Ft.
AVERAGE DEPTH = 118.68 Ft.
Table 4 provides a comparison of the subdivision proposal and required development standards, which show that the project complies with the R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>DOES PROJECT COMPLY WITH STANDARDS?</th>
<th>SUPPORTING INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum lot size: 7,200 square feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tentative Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum average lot width: 60 feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tentative Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum average lot depth: 100 feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tentative Map</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS**

**TENTATIVE TRACT MAP**

Subdivisions are regulated by Title 7 (Subdivisions) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. This project is a Schedule “A” subdivision per Section 7.30.040, defined as: “Any division of land into 5 or more parcels, where any parcel is less than 18,000 square feet in net area.”

The proposed subdivision is consistent with the requirements of Title 7 (Subdivisions) – Chapter 7.15. - Tentative Maps. With approval of General Plan Amendment No. 16005, the project complies with all applicable development standards. The proposed General Plan Land Use designation of MDR (Medium Density Residential) permits up to 36 dwelling units per acre. The project proposes 28 residential dwelling units at a density of 3.8 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density.

As noted in Exhibit 4, there are several housing tracts within the immediate vicinity with average lot sizes of 7,200 square feet within the R-1 zone.

**Dedication and Public Right-Of-Way Improvements**

Hudson Street is an existing Local Road. Applicant is required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements for Street “B” and Hudson Street intersection. 59th Street is a Local Road with a right-of-way width of 60 feet. Right-of-way dedication to provide parkway improvements and cul-de-sac improvements at road terminus is required. The Applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on 59th Street along the project's frontage. The improvements include, but are not limited to, cul-de-sac curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaped parkway and signing and striping.

60th Street is a Local Road with a right-of-way width of 60 feet. Right-of-way dedication to provide 30 feet half ultimate-width from centerline to the property line is required. Street “A” and Street "B" shall be dedicated as public road and improved as Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 40 feet road on a 60-foot right-of-way; curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping.

The project will be conditioned to annex into a Community Facilities District (CFD) in order to collect fees for the continual maintenance of the landscaping and lighting services within the tract, as well as maintenance to Lots A through E. The parkway will also be developed per Title 7 (Subdivisions) and underground utilities will be provided within the dedicated right-of-way.

Drainage Lots 29 and 30 will be maintained by a Homeowner's Association (HOA).
**Drainage Improvements**

Drainage will flow from the interior streets where it will be captured in the water quality basin located on Lot 30 along the south side of proposed Street B where it intersects with Hudson Street.

**Sewer and Water Improvements**

As required by the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD), 8-inch sewer lines will be constructed in 60th Street, proposed Street A and proposed Street B to connect to existing facilities. Additionally, 8-inch water lines will be constructed in 60th Street, proposed Street A, and proposed Street B to connect to existing facilities.

**EXHIBIT 6: PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY SECTIONS**

**Map Distribution**

The Subdivision Map Act requires a local agency to circulate proposed subdivision maps to the service providers (Fire, Sheriff, School District, etc.) and utility companies. This allows each entity the opportunity to review the proposal and determine the impacts of the subdivision relative to their services. Staff circulated the TTM to abovementioned agencies and internal departments such as Engineering, Building and Safety, Public Works and Code Enforcement. Staff received comments and recommended conditions from several external and internal agencies. Comments from these agencies have been considered and incorporated as modifications and/or conditions to this project as deemed necessary by Planning staff.

**FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL OF GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT**

The proposed General Plan amendment from LDR to MDR is consistent with the existing land use development, which is primarily single-family housing tracts developed under the R-1 zone development standards of 7,200 square foot minimum lot area, 60 foot minimum average lot width and 100 foot minimum average lot depth.
The General Plan Amendment (GPA) to MDR would therefore not be detrimental to the surrounding land uses which consist of similar 7,200 square foot housing tract developments.

As the subject site is located adjacent to several housing tracts which have been developed within the R-1 development standards, a change of land use to MDR, which allows a density of 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre, appears appropriate within the entire R-1 zoned area. Additionally, the subject site and general R-1 zoned area is within the Pedley Village Center (PVC) and the GPA to MDR is consistent with the General Principles within the PVC. Furthermore, the GPA is consistent with all other policies within the General Plan, including the Economic Sustainability Element, Housing goals and policies as follows:

*While tax base development focuses on commerce, including retail, dining, entertainment, services, and industrial, it is interactive with the housing market. The quality and diversity of residential neighborhoods create the basis for the local job market. To attract higher paying jobs to Jurupa Valley, residential neighborhoods that meet the needs and preferences of skilled and professional labor must be available in the community. This leads to increasing median income and, in turn, attracts the diversity of commercial and industrial development that benefits the entire community and builds tax base which help fund local government services.*

Ultimately, the City will need to change to General Plan Land Use designation for all the parcels currently zoned R-1 in this neighborhood to MDR inasmuch as they are already developed per the MDR land use designation and the R-1 zoning standards. The R-1 neighborhood is bounded by 58th Street to the north, Felspar Street to the west, 61st and Main Streets to the south and Van Buren Blvd. to the east, see Exhibit 2 (zoning map).

**FINDINGS FOR TENTATIVE LAND DIVISION MAPS (SECTION 7.15.180)**

Pursuant to Title 7 (Subdivisions) – Chapter 7.15. - Tentative Maps, Section 7.15.180, a tentative tract map shall be denied if it does not meet all requirements of this title, or if any of the following findings are made:

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

   With approval of GPA16005, the proposed map is consistent with the requirements of the General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) which permits up to five (5) dwelling units per acre. The map will facilitate the future construction of 28 single family homes at a density of 3.8 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density. Furthermore, the map complies with Title 7 (Subdivisions) and Title 9 (Planning and Zoning).

B. **That the design or improvement of the proposed land division is not consistent with applicable General and Specific Plans.**

   With approval of GPA16005, the proposed layout of the 28 parcels is consistent with the City’s General Plan and with the R-1 (One (1) Family Dwelling) zone, including meeting the following development standards: 1) 7,200 square foot minimum lot size; 2) minimum average lot width of 60 feet; and 3) minimum average lot depth of 100 feet.

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

   The 7.25 acre site is physically suitable as it is a relatively flat, undeveloped, vacant lot adjacent to other single-family residential land uses. The site is physically suitable to accommodate the subdivision and future development of 28 single family residential
homes as there is adequate water and sewer connections and public services are available to the site.

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

With approval of GPA16005, the project is physically suitable for the proposed density of the development in that it proposes 28 single family residential dwelling units at a density of 3.8 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density under the General Plan designation.

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 is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially injure fish or wildlife of their habitat, in that the site is highly disturbed and occupied by ruderal flora and bare ground. Because of the existing degraded site condition, the absence of special-status plant communities, and overall low potential for most special-status species to utilize or reside on-site, the proposed project would not be expected to directly impact federal or state-listed threatened or endangered species.

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

An Initial Study was prepared that evaluated potential effects with respect to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry 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 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 mitigation measures have been required or revisions in the Project have been made or agreed to by the Applicant.

Furthermore a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) report prepared for this project did not reveal evidence of a recognized environmental condition in connection with this project site. The Initial Study determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. As such, the project will not 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 alternate easements for access or for use will be provided and that they will be substantially equivalent to ones previously acquired by the public.

There are no on-site easements within the subject site and therefore the project does not conflict with any on-site easements. Sewer and water lines will constructed in 60th Street, proposed Street A, and proposed Street B to connect to existing facilities and all proposed utilities will be required to be undergrounded.

Staff has found the subdivision to be in conformance with above findings and in conformance with the City’s Zoning Code, General Plan Land Use designation, with approval of GPA16005, and Title 7 (Subdivisions). The land division is physically suitable for the type of the
development and the proposed density. The design of the project will not cause substantial environmental damage, harm any wildlife, nor cause serious public health problems.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

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. Staff has implemented a condition which requires that all mitigation measures of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) be incorporated into the Conditions of Approval.

Public Review Period. The public review period for the environmental document began on November 8, 2018 and will end on November 27, 2018. To date, the City has not received any comments.

PUBLIC NOTICING

As required by the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, staff provided adequate noticing of the public hearing notice to property owners within the required 1,000-foot radius, see Attachment 7.

CONCLUSION

With approval of GPA16005, the proposed subdivision is in conformance with the General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) and the R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) zone and development standards. The project also conforms to Schedule “A” map requirements of Title 7 (Subdivisions) and with other applicable provisions of the Subdivision Map Act. The project will not be a detriment to the public health, safety and welfare and is conditionally compatible with the present and future logical development of the area. Furthermore, the addition of 28 residential units complies with the City’s Housing Element Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) inventory.

The new single family residential development will serve to revitalize the underutilized parcel and visually improve the surrounding neighborhood, and provide much needed housing to the community as well as foster an increase in property values.

All required findings for approval have been affirmatively determined and staff therefore recommends that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 2018-11-28-03 and Resolution No. 2018-11-28-04.

Prepared by: Rocio Lopez
Senior Planner

Submitted by: Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director
ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution No. 2018-11-28-03
2. Resolution No. 2018-11-28-04
   a. Exhibit A: Recommended Conditions of Approval
   b. Exhibit B: Mitigated Negative Declaration with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
3. General Plan Exhibit
4. SANS-53 & JCSD Will Serve Letters
5. Pedley Village Center Design Guidelines
6. City’s Residential Architectural Style Sheets
7. 1,000 Foot Radius Map
8. JUSD Letter
9. Tentative Tract Map No. 37052
10. Conceptual Landscape Plans (Wall/Fence Plan included)
ATTACHMENT NO. 4

Excerpt of the 11-28-18 PC Minutes
EXEMPLARY OF THE NOVEMBER 28, 2018 MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE JURUPA VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS

6.3 MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 16146: TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 37052 AND GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NO. 16005: REQUEST TO SUBDIVIDE A 7.25 ACRE-PARCEL INTO 28 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS AND AMEND THE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION FROM LDR (LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL – COUNTRY NEIGHBORHOOD) TO MDR (MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL) ON A VACANT PARCEL LOCATED WEST OF HUDSON STREET BETWEEN 60TH AND 59TH STREETS (APN: 165-100-027) APPLICANTS: ANDREW SHORES AND PAUL TALANIAN

Ms. Rocio Lopez, Senior Planner, provided a PowerPoint presentation that included an overview of the proposed project. The applicants, Mr. Andrew Shores and Mr. Paul Talanian, have submitted an application for a General Plan Amendment to change the existing land use designation from Low Density Residential (LDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and a Tentative Tract Map to allow the subdivision of 7.25 acres into 28 single-family residential lots with average lot sizes of 7,793 square feet; two water retention basins; three lettered street lots (A-C) and the construction of associated infrastructure. Ms. Lopez noted the proposed subdivision is in conformance with the General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential and the R-1 zone development standards.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Ms. Carol Ninemire, resident, expressed concerns for flooding and water runoff.

Ms. Joy Paulson, resident, expressed concerns for flooding and retaining walls and traffic concerns.

Ms. Vicky Goedhart, resident, expressed flooding and traffic concerns.

Ms. Vivian Reyes, resident, spoke on behalf of her mother and requested that the hearing be postponed.

Mr. Marty Ocheltree, resident, expressed privacy concerns and prefers single story homes.

Mr. Steve Loriso, City Engineer, clarified the function of the water retention basins.

Mr. Ernie Perea, CEQA Staff, clarified the environmental concerns requested by the residents.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

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

Commissioner Moore moved, and Commissioner Silva seconded, a motion to recommend that the City Council: 1) adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, 2) approve General Plan Amendment
No. 16005 3) adopt revised Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-11-28-03 and 4) adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-11-28-04, adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approving Tentative Tact Map No. 37052. The motion was approved 4:0.

Ayes: Ruiz, Moore, Pruitt, Silva

Noes: None

Abstained: None

Absent: None
ATTACHMENT NO. 5

GPA Exhibit
TRACT 37052
CHANGE OF LAND USE GPA EXHIBIT
TO MDR (MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)

LEGEND:
- LDR-RC (CURRENT)
- MDR (PROPOSED)
- OPEN SPACE RECREATION
- MEDIUM HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
- COMMERCIAL RETAIL
- PUBLIC FACILITIES
ATTACHMENT NO. 7

Tentative Tract Map No. 37052
ATTACHMENT NO. 8
Conceptual Landscape Plan
STAFF REPORT

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER
STEVE R. LORISO, CITY ENGINEER/PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 12.C

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AN AMENDMENT TO THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) ANNUAL ACTION PLAN FOR 2018-2019

RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-05, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING A SUBSTANTIAL AMENDMENT TO THE 2018-2019 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) ANNUAL ACTION PLAN

BACKGROUND

On June 7, 2018, the City Council adopted the City’s first Consolidated Plan, Annual Action Plan, and Citizen’s Participation Plan for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding program. The passage of these planning documents was required by the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to become an “Entitlement City” and administer CDBG funds independently. Previously, the City’s CDBG efforts were administered by the County of Riverside.

The City must inform the public and allow for public comment on all major funding decisions made by the City with regard to CDBG funds. The original Annual Action Plan approved by the City Council on June 7, 2018 included $897,339 for ADA Improvements. These improvements were to include various curb ramp and parking stall upgrades along Mission Boulevard as well as a sidewalk connection project on Camino Real.
ANALYSIS

Upon further review and consultation with the City’s CDBG consultants, GRC Associates, Inc., City Staff are recommending the reallocation of the funds originally slated for the sidewalk connection project to the pavement rehabilitation project on Rubidoux Boulevard. As identified by the City’s 2018-19 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), the Rubidoux Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation project will grind and overlay asphalt on Rubidoux Boulevard from Mission Boulevard to 29th Street. The Rubidoux Pavement Rehabilitation Project is more consistent with the funding objectives of HUD as it specifically benefits low to moderate income areas based on existing Census tract data.

Municipalities are given discretion by HUD to fund infrastructure projects that fall within various administrative guidelines. Upon further research and review, it is clear to City Staff that reducing gaps in sidewalk sections not located in low to moderate income areas of the City, such as the sidewalk portion on Camino Real, may come under increased scrutiny by HUD officials. While reducing gaps in sidewalk sections is a productive infrastructure cause, the administrative guidelines of the CDBG program have funding objectives that specifically emphasize infrastructure construction in low to moderate income areas.

A notification of the 30-day comment period required to approve this amendment was published on December 18, 2018. Copies of the Amendment were available for public review at the Louis Robidoux Library, Glen Avon Library, City Hall, and the City’s website. A copy of the amended 2018-19 CDBG Annual Action Plan with changes highlighted in yellow is provided as Attachment B.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

None. Consistent with the original Annual Action Plan adopted on June 7, 2018, the City will still spend $897,339 on infrastructure, which is part of our $1,189,419 total allocation from HUD for the 2018-2019 program year.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Not adopt Resolution No. 2019-05 approving a substantial amendment to the 2018-19 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Annual Action Plan at this time.

2. Provide alternate direction to Staff
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Attachments:

A. Resolution No. 2019-05

RESOLUTION NO. 2019-05

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING A SUBSTANTIAL AMENDMENT TO THE 2018-2019 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) ANNUAL ACTION PLAN

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Recitals. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that:

A. The City Council adopted the 2018-2019 Community Development Block Grant (“CDBG”) Annual Action Plan on June 7, 2018; and

B. The Code of Federal Regulations requires the City to approve a substantial amendment to its approved CDBG Annual Action Plan whenever the City seeks to carry out an activity that was not previously described in that plan; and

C. The City Council has considered the community needs, priorities, and strategies set forth in the City’s 2018-2022 CDBG Consolidated Plan and concludes that the reallocation of CDBG funding from the ADA Improvements Project to the Rubidoux Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation Project (the “Substantial Amendment”) is warranted based on the Rubidoux Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation Project’s anticipated benefits to low and moderate income persons within the City of Jurupa Valley; and

D. Public notice of the Substantial Amendment was published in the Press-Enterprise and posted at Jurupa Valley City Hall on December 18, 2018; and

E. Copies of the Substantial Amendment were available for public review at the Louis Rubidoux Library, Glen Avon Library, City Hall, and the City’s website; and

F. The City Council held a duly noticed public hearing on the Substantial Amendment on January 17, 2019.

Section 2. Approval and Submission. The City Council hereby approves the Substantial Amendment as set forth in Exhibit “A”, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference. The City Council authorizes the City Manager, or his designee, to submit the Substantial Amendment to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development and to take any other necessary steps to implement the Substantial Amendment.

Section 3. Certification. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 17th day of January, 2019.
Brian Berkson  
Mayor

ATTEST:

Victoria Wasko, CMC  
City Clerk
CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  )
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE    ) ss.
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY  )

I, Victoria Wasko, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-05 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 17th day of January, 2019 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, on the 17th day of January, 2019.

________________________________
Victoria Wasko, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
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Attachments

Attachment 1: Public Notice and Summary of Public Comments
An amendment to the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan is being undertaken to add an activity previously not identified in the 2018-2019 Annual Action Plan (a component of the Consolidated Plan). A total of $690,000 in CDBG funding will be reallocated from ADA Street Improvements to the new Activity - Rubidoux Pavement Rehabilitation. Amendments to the original Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan are highlighted in yellow and in italics.

Executive Summary

ES-05 Executive Summary - 24 CFR 91.200(c), 91.220(b)

1. Introduction

The City of Jurupa Valley (City) under the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), has developed a five-year strategic plan, also known as the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan (“ConPlan”), that identifies and prioritizes the future use of the City’s Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds.

In preparing its ConPlan, the City used several methods to analyze its housing and community development needs, surveying community residents, stakeholders and; analyzing U.S. Census, American Community Survey (ACS) and other demographic data; and using information from City and Riverside County planning documents. The City hosted a community workshop and contacted organizations in an effort to reach out to and encourage participation by all residents, particularly low- and moderate-income residents, the elderly and persons with disabilities. The purpose for contacting residents was to inform the community about the ConPlan process, which identifies opportunities to improve collaborative efforts, eliminates service delivery gaps and develops and sustains decent and affordable housing, suitable living environments and expanded community and economic opportunities.

To receive its entitlement funding from HUD, the City is required to approve an Action Plan for each fiscal year. The Action Plan must describe how the City intends to invest its CDBG funds to meet the ConPlan’s priorities to address housing and community development needs. The City’s FY 2018/19 Action Plan has been allocated approximately $1.2 million of entitlement CDBG funds.

Future funding is based on two assumptions: 1) the City will continue to receive CDBG funding, but at a five percent decline per year over the next five years, and 2) the City’s Community Development Department’s entitlement funding distribution formulas, or the number of communities eligible to receive entitlement grants, will remain constant. If any of the conditions change, projected activities and accomplishments are subject to change.

The City’s goals for projects over the next five years are designed to meet the community’s needs and the national objectives for HUD funding.
This ConPlan is divided into five major parts: 1) Process, which summarizes the City’s efforts to engage Jurupa Valley residents/stakeholders and determine the community’s priorities; 2) the Needs Assessment, which identifies the City’s priority needs related to affordable housing and community development; 3) the Market Analysis, which sets forth the environment in which the City will implement its programs; 4) the Strategic Plan, which establishes goals, policies and actions for addressing the needs of the community; and 5) the City’s Action Plan for FY 2018/19.

2. Summary of the objectives and outcomes identified in the Plan Needs Assessment Overview

The Needs Assessment summarizes the City’s needs related to affordable housing, special needs housing, community development, and homelessness. The Needs Assessment includes the following sections:

- Housing Needs Assessment
- Disproportionately Greater Need
- Public Housing
- Homeless Needs Assessment
- Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment
- Non-Housing Community Development Needs

The Needs Assessment identified those needs with the highest priority, which form the basis for the Strategic Plan section and the programs and projects to be administered. The City’s overall objective for the CDBG program, as specified in the Strategic Plan section, mirrors HUD’s overall objective for the program: to create a viable community by providing decent housing, a suitable living environment, and economic opportunities, principally for persons of low- and moderate-income. To accomplish this objective in Jurupa Valley, the following Consolidated Plan goals have been identified based on the input of residents and other community stakeholders:

- Conserve the existing supply of affordable housing by supporting the provision of federal rental assistance vouchers and certificates administered by the Housing Authority of Riverside County.
- Assist with the preservation of the City’s owner-occupied single-family housing stock.
- Support housing and services for the homeless and those at risk of becoming homeless.
- Support community social services benefitting low- and moderate-income persons and those with special needs.
- Provide needed public infrastructure and facility improvements benefitting low- and moderate-income persons and those with special needs.
- Ensure quality, professional administration of federal funds, including the provision of fair housing services to address discriminatory actions that impede access to housing.

All planned programs and projects are subject to availability of funds and the approval of the City Council.
January 2019 Amendment

On January 17, 2019, the Jurupa Valley City Council will consider approval of an amendment to the 2018-2019 Annual Action Plan that will reallocate $690,000 in CDBG funding for the Rubidoux Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation project. Funds will be reallocated from the ADA Improvement project identified in the original 2018-2019 Annual Action Plan.

3. Evaluation of past performance

The 2018-2022 Consolidated, and its 2018-2019 Annual Action Plan, are the first prepared by the City of Jurupa Valley; therefore, there are no past performances to be reported. CDBG funding previously benefiting the City was administered by the County of Riverside.

4. Summary of citizen participation process and consultation process

The City of Jurupa Valley took several steps to obtain the input of community residents and stakeholders to develop the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan and the 2018-2019 Annual Action Plan. Consultation efforts included dissemination of a community needs survey and a community workshop. The City also consulted with state and regional agencies and local service providers. Additionally, the City utilized its internet webpage, social media, and the local community newspaper to notify residents of the opportunity to review and comment on the draft 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan and 2018-2019 Annual Action Plan. Actions taken by the City are consistent with the City’s Citizen Participation Plan.

January 2019 Amendment

On January 17, 2019, the Jurupa Valley City Council will consider an amendment to the 2018-2019 Annual Action Plan that will reallocated $690,000 in CDBG funding for the Rubidoux Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation project. As stipulated in the City’s Citizen Participation Plan, a 30-day public review and comment period will be held by the City to obtain public input regarding the proposed amendment. Additionally, a public hearing will be held by the City Council on January 17, 2019 to obtain additional public input and to approve the amendment (see Attachment 1).

5. Summary of public comments

Comments received through the community outreach effort included:

- ConPlan Survey (October to November 2017). According to the results of the ConPlan Survey, the top five overall housing and community needs were: 1) Parks and recreational facilities; 2) Youth centers; 3) Health care facilities; 4) Neighborhood/community centers; and 5) Street improvements.
- Community Workshop (October 18, 2017). The key issue raised at the workshop was the need for homeless services.
- Draft ConPlan’s 30-Day Public Review. No comments.

Public Hearing. No comments
January 2019 Amendment
To be updated at the end of the public comment period and public hearing.

6. Summary of comments or views not accepted and the reasons for not accepting them

There were no comments or views that were not accepted.

January 2019 Amendment
To be updated at the end of the public comment period and public hearing.

7. Summary

The City of Jurupa Valley is committed to providing every resident and public service provider the opportunity to participate in the ConPlan process. During the development of the ConPlan, the City conducted a workshop and an online community survey to receive direct input on housing and community needs. In addition, the ConPlan examined the ACS and CHAS data and information from local and regional public service agencies to highlight and understand the housing and non-housing community needs of various population groups, and identified the current resources available in the City. The ConPlan, through its Strategic Plan, identified the programs and projects the City will undertake or consider during the five-year ConPlan cycle to attain the following goals:

- Conserve the existing supply of affordable housing by supporting the provision of federal rental assistance vouchers and certificates administered by the Housing Authority of Riverside County.
- Assist with the preservation of the City’s owner-occupied single-family housing stock.
- Support housing and services for the homeless and those at risk of becoming homeless.
- Support community social services benefitting low- and moderate-income persons and those with special needs.
- Provide needed public infrastructure and facility improvements benefitting low- and moderate-income persons and those with special needs.
- Ensure quality, professional administration of federal funds, including the provision of fair housing services to address discriminatory actions that impede access to housing.

The ConPlan’s identified programs and projects will be implemented through the investment of approximately $1.19 million of CDBG funds for the first year (FY 2018) of the five-year ConPlan. The CDBG fund allocation for FY 2018 is:

- Public Infrastructure Improvements: $897,399
- Homeless Services: $75,000
- Fair Housing Services: $25,000
- Program Administration: $192,020
January 2019 Amendment
On January 17, 2019, the Jurupa Valley City Council will consider an amendment to the 2018-2019 Annual Action Plan that will reallocate $690,000 in CDBG funding for the Rubidoux Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation project. The balance of FY 2018 funds allocated for Public Infrastructure Improvements ($207,399) will fund ADA Improvements as originally planned.
The Process

PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies 24 CFR 91.200(b)

1. Describe agency/entity responsible for preparing the Consolidated Plan and those responsible for administration of each grant program and funding source

The following are the agencies/entities responsible for preparing the Consolidated Plan and those responsible for administration of each grant program and funding source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department/Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDBG Administrator</td>
<td>JURUPA VALLEY</td>
<td>City Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Responsible Agencies

Narrative

The City Development Services Department is primarily responsible for the preparation of the Consolidated Plan and for administration of CDBG funds.

Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information

Mr. Sean McGovern, Senior Management Analyst

Phone: (951) 332-6464 X249 / Fax: (951) 332-6995 / smcgovern@jurupavalley.org
PR-10 Consultation - 91.100, 91.200(b), 91.215(l)

1. Introduction

The City of Jurupa Valley took several steps to obtain the input of community residents and stakeholders to develop the Consolidated Plan and the 2018-2019 Annual Action Plan. Consultation efforts included dissemination of a community needs survey and a community workshop. The City also consulted with state and regional agencies and local service providers. Additionally, the City utilized its internet webpage, social media, and the local community newspaper to notify residents of the opportunity to review and comment on the draft 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan and 2018-2019 Annual Action Plan. Actions taken by the City are consistent with the City’s Citizen Participation Plan which is incorporated into the Consolidated Plan as Attachment 1.

Provide a concise summary of the jurisdiction’s activities to enhance coordination between public and assisted housing providers and private and governmental health, mental health and service agencies (91.215(l)).

Jurupa Valley’s recently updated Housing Element emphasizes incentives rather regulations, "as a means to facilitate the production of housing for all income levels." Implementation of incentive programs will require significant coordination with housing developers and housing providers. Among assisted housing providers, Jurupa Valley partners with the Housing Authority of the County of Riverside (HACR), which assists renter households with HUD-funded housing assistance vouchers and certificates.

With respect to service agencies, the City actively reached out to local homeless service providers to explore partnership and funding opportunities. Due to the protracted federal budget approval process and delays in HUD providing the Consolidated Plan template and data tables, the City was unable to secure agreements with service providers to coincide with the beginning of the 2018 program year; nonetheless, the City worked closely with local service providers to identify current service resources and service gaps in order to develop a long-term strategy to meet community needs.

Describe coordination with the Continuum of Care and efforts to address the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans, and unaccompanied youth) and persons at risk of homelessness

As a “Participating City” in the Urban County CDBG program, Jurupa Valley contributed to the Riverside County Continuum of Care (RC-CoC) planning process through the County of Riverside. As a direct CDBG grantee, the City will continue to participate in the RC-CoC by contributing to the regional CoC planning process. Additionally, the City initiated the process to build relationships with local CoC service providers in order to address the needs of the City’s homeless. In future years, the City will also explore options to link resources with providers that address the needs of special need populations such as the frail elderly, victims of domestic violence, and individuals with disabilities.
Describe consultation with the Continuum(s) of Care that serves the jurisdiction’s area in determining how to allocate ESG funds, develop performance standards and evaluate outcomes, and develop funding, policies and procedures for the administration of HMIS.

The City is not a recipient of Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funds; therefore, it does not assist the RC-CoC with the determination of ESG allocations or evaluating outcomes, and developing policies and procedures for the administration of the regional Homeless Management Information System (HMIS).

2. Describe Agencies, groups, organizations and others who participated in the process and describe the jurisdictions consultations with housing, social service agencies and other entities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Agency/Group/Organization</strong></th>
<th><strong>Agency/Group/Organization Type</strong></th>
<th><strong>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</strong></th>
<th><strong>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fair Housing Council of Riverside County, Inc.</td>
<td>Service - Fair Housing</td>
<td>Impediments to Fair Housing Strategy</td>
<td>Agency provided data and information that helped identify the needs of households requiring fair housing services. Also provided input regarding the region’s strategy to address impediments to fair housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>County of Riverside Department of Public Social Services - Homeless Programs Unit</td>
<td>Services - homeless Regional organization</td>
<td>Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)</td>
<td>Regional Continuum of Care coordinator and HMIS administrator. Provided significant information regarding regional and City homeless population and resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>Other government - State</td>
<td>Lead-based Paint Strategy Economic Development Market Analysis Demographics</td>
<td>Various State departments and agencies were consulted to obtain information regarding employment, demographics, and lead poisoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HOUSING AUTHORITY OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY</td>
<td>PHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency/Group/Organization Type</td>
<td>JURUPA VALLEY</td>
<td>RIVERSIDE COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</strong></td>
<td>Housing Need Assessment</td>
<td>Lead-based Paint Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homelessness Strategy</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</strong></td>
<td>Provided information regarding number and type of households receiving rental assistance and the number of households requesting housing assistance.</td>
<td>Various county departments and agencies were consulted to obtain information regarding employment and demographics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Group/Organization</th>
<th>JURUPA VALLEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency/Group/Organization Type</strong></td>
<td>Other government - Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</strong></td>
<td>Housing Need Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homelessness Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</strong></td>
<td>City departments and City Council provided data and information, identified priorities, and recommendations for the allocation of HUD funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Group/Organization</th>
<th>Council on Aging Southern California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency/Group/Organization Type</strong></td>
<td>Services-Elderly Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</strong></td>
<td>Non-Homeless Special Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</strong></td>
<td>Agency helped identify needs of senior and frail elderly persons and households.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Group/Organization</th>
<th>211 Community Connect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency/Group/Organization Type</strong></td>
<td>Regional organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?

| 9 | Agency/Group/Organization | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9 |
| 9 | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Other government - Federal |
| 9 | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | HazMat Planning |
| 9 | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | Agency developed a Community Involvement Plan to encourage and facilitate community engagement throughout the Stringfellow Superfund Site cleanup |

### Identify any Agency Types not consulted and provide rationale for not consulting

The City had an open consultation process; no agency was prevented or excluded from participating.

### Other local/regional/state/federal planning efforts considered when preparing the Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Plan</th>
<th>Lead Organization</th>
<th>How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuum of Care</td>
<td>County of Riverside Department of Public Social Services</td>
<td>Regional and local Point-In-Time Survey (including Plan to End Homelessness and discharge planning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley Draft 2017 General Plan</td>
<td>City of Jurupa Valley</td>
<td>Housing priorities and program goals, and natural hazards resilience planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Jurupa Valley Capital Improvement Plan</td>
<td>City of Jurupa Valley</td>
<td>Multi-year capital improvement plan helped identify priority capital projects that may be CDBG-eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Yr &amp; 1 Yr PHA Plan</td>
<td>Housing Authority of the County of Riverside (HACR)</td>
<td>Resources to address housing needs of lower income renter householders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Housing Impediments Study</td>
<td>County of Riverside</td>
<td>Multi-jurisdictional document identified fair housing impediments within participating cities and outlined plan to address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3 – Other local / regional / federal planning efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Plan</th>
<th>Lead Organization</th>
<th>How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stringfellow Superfund Site Community Involvement</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency Region 9</td>
<td>Community involvement plan to encourage and facilitate community engagement throughout the Stringfellow Superfund Site cleanup process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe cooperation and coordination with other public entities, including the State and any adjacent units of general local government, in the implementation of the Consolidated Plan (91.215(I))

State agencies were consulted to obtain updated housing and population information. The County of Riverside was contacted to obtain an array of data including information regarding children with elevated lead blood levels, the number of households receiving rental assistance, homeless count, and other regional plans. Local governments also assisted the City with the preparation of the Consolidated Plan. The City also consulted with several local nonprofit agencies regarding issues related to senior services and housing, fair housing, and homelessness. Information and data obtained through the consultation process was utilized.

Narrative (optional):
PR-15 Citizen Participation

1. Summary of citizen participation process/Efforts made to broaden citizen participation

Summarize citizen participation process and how it impacted goal-setting

The City implemented the following efforts to obtain a broad range of resident input during the preparation of the Consolidated Plan and 2018-19 Annual Action Plan:

ConPlan Survey: An electronic (Survey Monkey) and hard copy survey instrument were utilized to obtain public input regarding priority housing and community needs. The survey was publicized and accessible via social media (e.g., Facebook) and the City’s website. Hard copies of the survey were also available at City Hall. A summary of survey results is incorporated into the Consolidated Plan as Attachment 2.

Community Workshop: A community workshop was held by the City on October 18, 2017. The purpose of the meeting was to provide information regarding the CDBG program and the Consolidated Plan and to obtain public input regarding priority needs. (See meeting notice - Citizen Participation Comments attachments.)

Notices/Website: Notices for all public meetings, including the required public hearing, were published in a local newspaper of general circulation (The Press-Enterprise). Additionally, the draft Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan were posted on the City’s website for public review and comment, and hard copies were made available during the required 30-day public comment period. (See notice - Citizen Participation Comments attachments.)

Public Hearings: Consistent with HUD’s regulations, the City Council held a public hearing at a regularly noticed and scheduled meeting (June 7, 2018) to obtain public input regarding the draft Consolidated Plan and the proposed use of 2018-2019 CDBG funds, and to authorize staff to submit the document to HUD. (See meeting notice - Citizen Participation Comments attachments.)

January 2019 Amendment

A notice for the required public hearing, was published in a local newspaper of general circulation (The Press-Enterprise). Additionally, the draft amended 2018-2019 Annual Action Plan (a component of the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan) was posted on the City’s website for public review and comment. Copies of the amended document were available during the required 30-day public comment period at City Hall and local libraries.
A public hearing will be held by the City Council on January 17, 2019 to obtain additional public input and to approve the amendment (see Attachment 1).

Citizen Participation Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort Order</th>
<th>Mode of Outreach</th>
<th>Target of Outreach</th>
<th>Summary of response/attendance</th>
<th>Summary of comments received</th>
<th>Summary of comments not accepted and reasons</th>
<th>URL (If applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
<td>Non-targeted/broad community</td>
<td>Residents, local service providers, city staff and community development consultants</td>
<td>Input regarding needs of homeless and city residents</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Newspaper Ad</td>
<td>Non-targeted/broad community</td>
<td>30-day public comment period and public hearing notice</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td>Non-targeted/broad community</td>
<td>6/7/18 public hearing to approve 2018-2022 Con Plan and 2018-19 Action Plan and to authorize submission of the plans to HUD</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Newspaper Ad</td>
<td>Non-targeted/broad community</td>
<td>30-day public comment period and public hearing notice</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort Order</td>
<td>Mode of Outreach</td>
<td>Target of Outreach</td>
<td>Summary of response/attendance</td>
<td>Summary of comments received</td>
<td>Summary of comments not accepted and reasons</td>
<td>URL (If applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td>Non-targeted/broad community</td>
<td>1/17/19 public hearing to approve Amendment to the 2018-2022 Con Plan and 2018-19 Action Plan and to authorize submission of the plans to HUD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 – Citizen Participation Outreach
Needs Assessment

NA-05 Overview

Needs Assessment Overview

The Needs Assessment provides a summary of the City’s needs related to affordable housing, special needs housing, community development, and homelessness. The Needs Assessment includes the following sections:

- Housing Needs Assessment
- Disproportionately Greater Need
- Public Housing
- Homeless Needs Assessment
- Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment
- Non-Housing Community Development Needs

The Needs Assessment identifies those needs with the highest priority, which forms the basis for the Strategic Plan section and the programs and projects to be administered. Most of the data tables in this section are populated with default Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data developed by the Census Bureau for HUD based on 2009-2013 American Community Survey (ACS) data. Other sources are noted throughout the Plan.
Summary of Housing Needs

The City of Jurupa Valley, which was incorporated in 2011, currently has an estimated population of about 101,000 residents. (DOF E-5 2017). According to U.S. Census Bureau data presented in Table 5, Housing Needs Assessment Demographics below, the City’s estimated population grew by 21.3 percent between 2000 and 2013 to a population total of 97,725 residents in 2013. However, this is slower than the population growth of 42.7 percent experienced countywide during the same 13-year period. Household growth in the City has not grown as quickly as population, with only 11.6 percent growth from 2000 to 2013. As a result, Jurupa Valley’s average household size grew from 3.61 persons in 2000 to 3.91 persons in 2013.

Jurupa Valley’s 2013 median household income was $55,429, which was slightly lower than the countywide median household income of $56,529. As shown in Table 6, Total Households below, approximately 11,500 households — 46.0 percent of all households in the city — had incomes that exceeded the HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI) for Riverside County. Nonetheless, Jurupa Valley has a significant number of lower-income households. A total of 11,000 households — about 44.0 percent of all households in the City — had incomes less than or equal to 80 percent HAMFI.

Seniors have a significant presence in the City’s households; more than 10,000 households, or about 40.0 percent of all households, had at least one person age 62 or older. Incomes in these households were lower than in the City as a whole, with 36.2 percent having an income below 80 percent HAMFI. Lower income levels were more pronounced in households including at least one person age 75 or older, as 59.0 percent of these households had income below 80 percent HAMFI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Base Year: 2000</th>
<th>Most Recent Year: 2013</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>97,725</td>
<td>97,725</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>25,016</td>
<td>25,016</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$55,429.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 - Housing Needs Assessment Demographics

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2009-2013 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Number of Households Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-30% HAMFI</th>
<th>&gt;30-50% HAMFI</th>
<th>&gt;50-80% HAMFI</th>
<th>&gt;80-100% HAMFI</th>
<th>&gt;100% HAMFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>4,725</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>11,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Family Households</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>5,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Family Households</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age</td>
<td>0-30% HAMFI</td>
<td>&gt;30-50% HAMFI</td>
<td>&gt;50-80% HAMFI</td>
<td>&gt;80-100% HAMFI</td>
<td>&gt;100% HAMFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household contains at least one person age 75 or older</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>1,845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6 - Total Households Table**

Data Source: 2009-2013 CHAS
Housing Needs Summary Tables

1. Housing Problems (Households with one of the listed needs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-30% AMI</th>
<th>&gt;30-50% AMI</th>
<th>&gt;50-80% AMI</th>
<th>&gt;80-100% AMI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded -</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With &gt;1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded -</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burden greater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than 50% of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income (and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above problems)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing cost</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burden greater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than 30% of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income (and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above problems)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero/negative</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above problems)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7 – Housing Problems Table**

Data Source: 2009-2013 CHAS
2. Housing Problems 2 (Households with one or more Severe Housing Problems: Lacks kitchen or complete plumbing, severe overcrowding, severe cost burden)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;30-50% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;50-80% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;80-100% AMI</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0-30% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;30-50% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;50-80% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;80-100% AMI</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having 1 or more of four housing problems</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3,645</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3,240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having none of four housing problems</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>3,695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8 – Housing Problems 2**

Data Source: 2009-2013 CHAS

3. Cost Burden > 30%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;30-50% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;50-80% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;80-100% AMI</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0-30% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;30-50% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;50-80% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;80-100% AMI</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Related</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Related</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total need by income</td>
<td>1,449</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>4,473</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9 – Cost Burden > 30%**

Data Source: 2009-2013 CHAS
4. Cost Burden > 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th></th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td>&gt;30-50%AMI</td>
<td>&gt;50-80%AMI</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Related</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Related</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total need by income</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>2,499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 – Cost Burden > 50%

Data Source: 2009-2013 CHAS

5. Crowding (More than one person per room)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th></th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td>&gt;30-50%AMI</td>
<td>&gt;50-80%AMI</td>
<td>&gt;80-100%AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family households</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple, unrelated family households</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, non-family households</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total need by income</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 – Crowding Information – 1/2

Data Source: 2009-2013 CHAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th></th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30%AMI</td>
<td>&gt;30-50%AMI</td>
<td>&gt;50-80%AMI</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children Present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 – Crowding Information – 2/2

Data Source Comments:
Describe the number and type of single person households in need of housing assistance.

Per the 2009-2013 ACS estimate, there were a total of 25,016 households in Jurupa Valley, of which 15.1 percent (3,778) were single-person households (Table ACS B11016). Of the estimated 26,400 total housing units, 11.3 percent of units (2,994 units) were studios and one-bedroom, with the remaining almost 90 percent of housing units containing two or more bedrooms (Table ACS DP04). This disparity of 784 single person households in excess of the number of studio and one-bedroom units may indicate that a significant number of individuals are unable to access the limited supply of housing units typically occupied by individuals living alone -- either renting out larger units at a cost burden or living with unrelated roommates and reporting themselves as single-person households despite the presence of others in the same unit.

Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance who are disabled or victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking.

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates (Table ACS B23024), there were a total of 1,478 individuals with a disability in Jurupa Valley with household income below the federal poverty level.

Based on the U.S. Center for Disease Control’s National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (Average 2010-2012), in California 34.9 percent of women and 31.1 percent of men have been victimized by rape, physical violence, and/or stalking by an intimate partner. In Jurupa Valley, where the 2013 population of 97,725 is made up of 49,211 females and 48,514 males (Table ACS DP05), these proportions equate to approximately 17,175 women and 15,088 men. Particularly for women, being victims of domestic violence can make them vulnerable to homelessness and affordable or emergency housing options can mean the difference between staying in an abusive relationship and getting out.

What are the most common housing problems?

The most prevalent housing problem facing households in the city was overpayment on housing cost. The definition of affordable housing is where the cost of shelter does not exceed 30 percent of the household’s gross monthly income. According to Table 9, Cost Burden >30% and Table 10, Cost Burden >50%, 7,883 households (31.5% of the city’s total households) spend over 30 percent of their income on housing and 4,614 households (18.4% of the total households) spend over 50 percent of their income on housing. The largest portion of the total households facing a cost burden of over 30 percent were small-related households at 38.9 percent.

A related but less common problem is overcrowding, as large households and extended or multiple families may occupy the same housing unit. According to Table 11, Crowding Information, households considered to be overcrowded (in excess of one person per room), comprised 11.6 percent of total households in the city.
Housing that is in substandard condition is also considered a housing problem. Jurupa Valley identified approximately 1,300 housing units or five percent of the city’s housing stock is considered substandard in the city. Substandard housing conditions refer to the ability of various systems in a house to meet adopted building codes for health and safety, including plumbing, heating, electrical, and structural systems. Housing conditions are considered substandard when one or more systems are found to be below the minimum standards required by Section 1001 of the Uniform Housing Code. Households living in substandard conditions are considered to be in need of housing assistance, even if they are not seeking alternative housing arrangements, due to the threat to residents’ health and safety that substandard housing poses.

**Are any populations/household types more affected than others by these problems?**

Housing tenure is affected markedly different in the case of both overpayment and overcrowding, as renter households are more affected than owner households. According to the 2009-2013 ACS, Jurupa Valley’s total occupied housing units of 24,839 is divided by tenure, with 35.0 percent renter-occupied and 65.0 percent owner-occupied units. (Table ACS DP04). Referring again to **Table 9, Cost Burden > 30%**, 35.8 percent of renter households experience a cost burden of greater than 30 percent of income, compared to only 27.3 percent of owner households. According to **Table 11, Crowding Information**, 6.7 percent of all renter households and 4.9 percent of owner households experience overcrowding.

**Describe the characteristics and needs of Low-income individuals and families with children (especially extremely low-income) who are currently housed but are at imminent risk of either residing in shelters or becoming unsheltered 91.205(c)/91.305(c)). Also discuss the needs of formerly homeless families and individuals who are receiving rapid re-housing assistance and are nearing the termination of that assistance**

Poverty is often associated with a high risk of becoming homeless. Households that depend on public assistance programs such as Social Security, SSI, CalFresh (food stamps), and CalWORKs (temporary assistance for needy families) are especially susceptible to homelessness. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (American Community Survey 2012-2016), approximately 6,688 Jurupa Valley residents live in acute poverty (i.e., household income less than 50% of the federal poverty level). The Census Bureau also estimates that 3,071 disabled Jurupa Valley residents live in poverty – 1,377 of these disabled individuals are age 65 or older. Additionally, the Census Bureau reports 2,361 Jurupa Valley families with children lived in poverty.

Another variable to consider is the number of households requesting rental assistance. Based on consultation with HARC staff, as of February 2018, 1,742 Jurupa Valley households are on the waitlist for federal rental assistance. Of these households, 292 are senior households, 409 are disabled households, and 282 are self-identified as “homeless” Jurupa Valley households.
Program Year 2018 will be the City’s first year as a CDBG Entitlement Community. Prior to receiving this status, the City was a Participating Jurisdiction in the Urban County Program, therefore the City has not tracked rapid re-housing programs and participants exiting these programs.

If a jurisdiction provides estimates of the at-risk population(s), it should also include a description of the operational definition of the at-risk group and the methodology used to generate the estimates:

Jurupa Valley does not have specific estimates of the at-risk population beyond those available through the Census, American Community Survey, and information provided by HARC.

Specify particular housing characteristics that have been linked with instability and an increased risk of homelessness

As outlined above, “at-risk” populations have been identified as households living in poverty, including seniors, individuals with disabilities, and families with children. The HARC has indicated that over 1,700 Jurupa Valley households are currently on the waitlist for rental assistance – over 40 percent of these households are senior or disabled households, and 282 have indicated they are homeless.

Discussion

The key findings of this section include:

- The most prevalent housing problem facing households in the city was overpayment on housing costs -- almost one-third (31.5%) of the city’s total households spend over 30 percent of their income on housing and almost one-fifth (18.4%) of the total households spend over 50 percent of their income on housing.
- The largest portion of the total households facing a cost burden of over 30 percent were small-related households at 38.9 percent
- Housing that is in a substandard condition is also considered a housing problem -- approximately 1,300 housing units, five percent of the city’s housing stock is considered substandard.
- Over one-third (35.8%) of renter households experience a cost burden of greater than 30 percent of income, compared to about one-quarter (27.3%) of owner households.
NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems – 91.205 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

A disproportionately greater need exists when the members of racial or ethnic group at a given income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (10 percentage points or more) than the income level as a whole. For example, if 60 percent of all low-income households within a jurisdiction have a housing problem and 70 percent or more of low-income Hispanic households have a housing problem, then low-income Hispanic households have a disproportionately greater need.

As defined by HUD, the four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities;
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities;
3. More than one person per room; and
4. Cost burden greater than 30 percent.

The following tables identify the number and extent of housing problems by income level and by race/ethnicity.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Problems</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The four housing problems are: 1. Lacks kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%
### 30%-50% of Area Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Problems</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 14 - Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI**

*The four housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%*

### 50%-80% of Area Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Problems</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 15 - Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI**

*The four housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%*
80%-100% of Area Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Problems</th>
<th>Has one or more of the four housing problems</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 16 - Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI**

Data Source: 2009-2013 CHAS

*The four housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

**Discussion**

A disproportionately greater need exists when the members of a racial or ethnic group at a given income level experience housing problems at a rate at least 10 percentage points greater than the income level as a whole.

**Table 13 Disproportionally Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI**, shows that in the 0-30 percent income category, 100 percent of American Indian/Alaska Native households reported having one or more of the four housing problems, compared to only 81.5 percent of the income category as a whole. Also, in this income category, 100 percent of Pacific Islander households reported no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems, compared to only 7.0 percent of the income category as a whole.

**Table 14 Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI**, shows that in the 30-50 percent income category, 100 percent of American Indian/Alaska Native households reported having one or more of the four housing problems, compared to only 82.9 percent of the income category as a whole.

**Table 15 Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI**, shows that in the 50-80 percent income category, 92.1 percent of Black/African American households reported having one or more of the four housing problems, compared to only 74.3 percent of the income category as a whole.

**Table 16 Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI**, shows that in the 80-100 percent income category, 82.6 percent of Asian households reported having one or more of the four housing problems, compared to only 57.3 percent of the income category as a whole.
In all other racial/ethnic groups in all other income categories, no disproportionately greater need was observed; i.e., the incidence of housing problems among the racial/ethnic group did not exceed that of the income level as a whole by at least 10 percentage points.
NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems – 91.205 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

A disproportionately greater need exists when the members of a racial or ethnic group at a given income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (10 percentage points or more) than the income level as a whole. For example, if 60 percent of all low-income households within a jurisdiction have a housing problem and 70 percent or more of low-income Hispanic households have a housing problem, then low-income Hispanic households have a disproportionately greater need.

As defined by HUD, the four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities;
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities;
3. More than 1.5 person per room; and
4. Cost burden greater than 50 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%-30% of Area Median Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Severe Housing Problems</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2009-2013 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%
### 30%-50% of Area Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severe Housing Problems*</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 18 – Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI**

*The four severe housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%*

### 50%-80% of Area Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severe Housing Problems*</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>2,905</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 19 – Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI**

*The four severe housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%*
80%-100% of Area Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severe Housing Problems*</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 – Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2009-2013 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

Discussion

A disproportionately greater need exists when the members of a racial or ethnic group at a given income level experience severe housing problems at a rate at least 10 percentage points greater than the income level as a whole.

Table 17 Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI, shows that in the 0-30 percent income category, 100 percent of American Indian/Alaska Native households reported having one or more severe housing problems, compared to only 76.0 percent of the income category as a whole. Also, in this income category, 100 percent of Pacific Islander households reported no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems, compared to only 7.0 percent of the income category as a whole.

Table 18 Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI, shows that in the 30-50 percent income category, 76.9 percent of Black/African American households and 100 percent of American Indian/Alaska Native households reported having one or more severe housing problems, compared to only 64.9 percent of the income category as a whole.

Table 19 Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI, shows that in the 80-100 percent income category, none of the racial/ethnic households reported having one or more severe housing problems that was 10 percent higher than compared to 38.5 percent of the income category as a whole.

Table 20 Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI, shows that in the 80-100 percent income category, 39.1 percent of Asian households reported having one or more severe housing problems, compared to only 27.3 percent of the income category as a whole.
In all other racial/ethnic groups in all other income categories, no disproportionately greater need was observed; i.e., the incidence of severe housing problems among the racial/ethnic group did not exceed that of the income level as a whole by at least 10 percentage points.
NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens – 91.205 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

**Introduction:**

Housing cost burden is when a household’s cost of housing (including utility costs) exceeds 30 percent of the household gross income, and severe cost burden is when it exceeds 50 percent of the household gross income.

**Housing Cost Burden**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Cost Burden</th>
<th>&lt;=30%</th>
<th>30-50%</th>
<th>&gt;50%</th>
<th>No / negative income (not computed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>13,455</td>
<td>6,185</td>
<td>5,130</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4,970</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7,325</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 21 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI**

Data Source: 2009-2013 CHAS

**Discussion:**

A disproportionately greater need exists when the members of a racial or ethnic group experience a housing cost burden at a rate at least 10 percentage points greater than the income level as a whole.

Table 21 *Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI*, shows that 67.3 percent of American Indian/Alaska Native households had a cost burden of more than 50 percent, compared to only 20.7 percent of total households. Additionally, 18.8 percent of Pacific American households reported no/negative income, compared to one percent of total households.

In all other racial/ethnic groups no disproportionately greater need was observed; i.e., the incidence of a housing cost burden among the racial/ethnic group did not exceed that of the City as a whole by at least 10 percentage points.
NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion – 91.205(b)(2)

Are there any Income categories in which a racial or ethnic group has disproportionately greater need than the needs of that income category as a whole?

Please see discussions provided below under specific needs by income group. In summary, the following disproportionately greater needs exist:

**Housing Problems**

0-30 percent AMI:
- American Indian/Alaska Native households -- one or more housing problems
- Pacific Islander households -- no/negative income

30-50 percent AMI:
- American Indian/Alaska Native households -- one or more housing problems.

50-80 percent AMI:
- Black/African American households -- one or more housing problems
- Pacific Islander households -- one or more housing problems

80-100 percent AMI:
- Asian households -- one or more housing problems.

**Severe Housing Problems**

0-30 percent AMI:
- American Indian/Alaska Native households -- one or more housing problems
- Pacific Islander households -- no/negative income

30-50 percent AMI:
- Black/African American households -- one or more housing problems
- American Indian/Alaska Native households -- one or more housing problems.

80-100 percent AMI:
- Asian households -- one or more housing problems.

**Housing Cost Burden**

>50 percent cost burden:
• American Indian/Alaska Native households
• Pacific Islander Households -- no/negative income

If they have needs not identified above, what are those needs?

No other housing needs were identified through agency consultations. Single-family housing rehabilitation was identified as a need through the public participation process, but was not specific to a particular racial/ethnic group.

Are any of those racial or ethnic groups located in specific areas or neighborhoods in your community?

See Attachment of maps illustrating the racial/ethnic concentrations within the city.
NA-35 Public Housing – 91.205(b)

Introduction

The city of Jurupa Valley does not have a housing authority. The Housing Authority of the County of Riverside (HACR) oversees public housing programs for Jurupa Valley and other participating jurisdictions. The Housing Authority of the County of Riverside (HACR) is a public agency chartered by the State of California to administer public housing programs for Jurupa Valley and other participating jurisdictions within the county. According to Table 22, Public Housing by Program Type below, there are a total of 456 public housing units and 8,748 vouchers in the HACR area. In order to qualify for these programs, residents must have an annual gross income at or below 80 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI), or be seniors or persons with disabilities.

Totals in Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Mod-Rehab</th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Vouchers</th>
<th>Project-based</th>
<th>Tenant-based</th>
<th>Special Purpose Voucher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Veterans Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Unification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)
## Characteristics of Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Mod-Rehab</th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Vouchers</th>
<th>Project-based</th>
<th>Tenant-based</th>
<th>Special Purpose Voucher</th>
<th>Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing</th>
<th>Family Unification Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,664</td>
<td>13,261</td>
<td>13,870</td>
<td>10,805</td>
<td>13,850</td>
<td>13,465</td>
<td>14,983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of stay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household size</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Homeless at admission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Elderly Program Participants (&gt;62)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3,249</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,211</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Disabled Families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2,587</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Families requesting accessibility features</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>8,748</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8,364</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of HIV/AIDS program participants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of DV victims</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 23 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type*

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)
### Race of Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Mod-Rehab</th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Project-based</th>
<th>Tenant-based</th>
<th>Special Purpose Voucher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Veterans Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Unification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>5,469</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2,967</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

**Table 24 – Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type**

**Data Source:** PIC (PIH Information Center)

### Ethnicity of Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Mod-Rehab</th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Vouchers</th>
<th>Project-based</th>
<th>Tenant-based</th>
<th>Special Purpose Voucher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Veterans Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Unification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2,318</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>6,430</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6,144</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

**Table 25 – Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type**

**Data Source:** PIC (PIH Information Center)
Section 504 Needs Assessment: Describe the needs of public housing tenants and applicants on the waiting list for accessible units:

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act protects all eligible residents from discrimination in HUD-funded programs. For those that qualify for a HUD program, no one can be denied the right to participate or benefit from it on the basis of disability.

Public Housing. In relation to Section 504, Table 24, Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type, shows that of the 456 public housing units, 70 are disable families, and all 456 families requested accessibility features. According to the City’s Housing Element, as of October 2015, 38 Jurupa Valley households were living in public housing units managed by the HACR, and there were 1,443 Jurupa Valley households on the waiting list for public housing.

Vouchers. The Housing Authority of the County of Riverside provides rental assistance through its Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher (HCV). HACR administers the HCV program and provides decent and safe rental housing for eligible low-income families, the elderly, and persons with disabilities. Table 24, Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type, shows that of the total 8,728 vouchers, 2,587 disabled families (29.6%) participate in the voucher program and 100 percent of the participant families requested accessibility features. It also shows that 19 are special purpose vouchers for the disabled (includes non-elderly disabled, mainstream one-year, mainstream five-year, and nursing home transition). The most recent information from the County of Riverside Economic Development Agency (EDA) estimates that 344 Jurupa Valley households currently receive rental assistance. There are 270 households that are seniors, 181 that are disabled, 17 veterans, and no homeless currently receiving assistance. This information may be duplicated where some seniors are also disabled and some disabled are also seniors. There is also a waiting list of 1,742 Jurupa Valley households. Of those on the waiting list, 292 households are identified as seniors, 409 as disabled, 46 as veterans, and 282 as homeless.

Most immediate needs of residents of Public Housing and Housing Choice voucher holders

Public Housing. As shown in Table 22, Public Housing by Program Type, according to the most recently available information from the PIH Information Center, there were 456 households in public housing in Jurupa Valley. Table 24, Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type, shows that 331 households or 72.6 percent were homeless at admission, and 15.4 percent had a member with a disability. One hundred percent of households requested accessibility features. In addition, householders who were elderly (>62 years) accounted for 8.3 percent of the total households in public housing. No households reported participating in the HIV/AIDS program or a domestic violence victim.

Race/ethnicity of public housing residents is not reported exclusively; residents can identify with more than one race/ethnicity. According to PIH data and as shown in Table 25, Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type, Whites formed the largest racial group among public housing residents, with 318 residents or 69.7 percent of participants. Over one-quarter (27.6%) of participants identify as Black/African American, two percent as Asian, and less than one percent as American Indian/Alaska
Native and Pacific Islander. As shown in Table 26, Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type, 55.2 percent of all participants identify as Hispanic.

Average annual income of public housing tenants was $13,261.

Immediate needs of public housing residents:
- Affordable housing
- Homeless services
- Housing for persons with disabilities

**Vouchers.** As shown in Table 22, Public Housing by Program Type, there were 8,748 total households in the HACR area receiving Housing Choice voucher assistance. As presented in Table 24, Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type, 37.1 percent of the voucher users in the City have householders who are elderly (>62) and 29.6 percent include persons with disabilities. One hundred percent of households requested accessibility features. The majority of these vouchers are tenant based (8,364). The average annual income for these voucher holders is $13,870 and the average length of stay is six years.

Race/ethnicity of voucher holders is not reported exclusively; voucher holders can identify with more than one race/ethnicity. According to PIH data and as shown in Table 25, Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type, 62.5 percent of voucher holders identify as White. One-third of the voucher holder identify as Black/African American and 2.4 percent identify as Asian. As shown in Table 26, Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type, about one-quarter (26.5%) of voucher holders identify as being of Hispanic origin.

Average annual income of voucher households was $13,870.

Immediate needs of public housing residents:
- Affordable housing
- Housing for seniors
- Housing for persons with disabilities

**How do these needs compare to the housing needs of the population at large**

The racial composition of public housing residents and voucher recipients in the HACR programs in general did not match the population at large of the Black/African American group. According to Table 25, Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type, the Black/African American racial group represented 27.6 percent of the total public housing residents and 33.9 percent of the total voucher residents. In comparison, this same racial group citywide represented only 3.6 percent. This difference indicates a disproportionate representation of Black/African American residents in the public housing/voucher programs relative to the population at large. A comparison of the Hispanic/Non-Hispanic differences is presented in Table 26, Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type. It
shows that while Hispanic residents represented 54.8 percent of the total public housing and 26.5 percent of the total voucher residents, the countywide population of Hispanic residents was 68.5 percent. This difference indicates that Hispanics are underrepresented in the public housing program and especially in the voucher programs.

Discussion

Please see discussion about public housing and vouchers above.
NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment – 91.205(c)

Introduction:

Homeless researchers typically use one of two methods to measure homelessness. One method attempts to count all persons that are literally homeless on a given day/week (point-in-time counts). The second, examines the number of people who are homeless over a given period - period prevalence counts. The Riverside County Continuum of Care (RC-CoC) uses the first method for its biennial enumeration of the region’s homeless.

The most recent Point-In-Time (PIT) homeless count of the region’s homeless was conducted on January 23, 2018. The 2018 PIT includes information regarding the number of unsheltered homeless in Jurupa Valley and general demographic information regarding the region’s homeless population. On a county-wide basis, the 2018 PIT identified 2,310 homeless individuals (625 sheltered and 1,685 unsheltered). Specifically, the PIT identifies 148 unsheltered homeless in Jurupa Valley – 8.8 percent of the County’s unsheltered homeless population. Unfortunately, the PIT provides limited information regarding Jurupa Valley’s homeless. To address some of the required narratives below, estimates will be based on the assumption that the City’s homeless population mirrors the region’s.

Homeless Needs Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night</th>
<th>Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year</th>
<th>Estimate the # becoming homeless each year</th>
<th>Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year</th>
<th>Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered</td>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in Households with Only Children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in Households with Only Adults</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless Individuals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless Families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population | Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night | Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year | Estimate the # becoming homeless each year | Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year | Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness
---|---|---|---|---|---
Veterans | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0
Unaccompanied Child | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0
Persons with HIV | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0

Table 26 - Homeless Needs Assessment

Alternate Data Source Name:
2018 Riverside County Point-In-Time Homeless Count

Data Source Comments:

Indicate if the homeless population is: Has No Rural Homeless

If data is not available for the categories "number of persons becoming and exiting homelessness each year," and "number of days that persons experience homelessness," describe these categories for each homeless population type (including chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth):

As indicated above, the 2018 PIT identified 148 homeless individuals in Jurupa Valley – 8.8 percent of the County's total unsheltered homeless population – the second highest number of homeless persons among incorporated and unincorporated areas in Riverside County.

**Chronic Homeless:** A chronically homeless individual/family is typically defined as an unaccompanied individual or family living in an emergency shelter or is unsheltered, with a disabling condition, who has been continuously homeless for a year or more or has had at least four episodes of homelessness in the past 3 years. The 2018 PIT estimates there are 30 chronic unsheltered homeless individuals in Jurupa Valley.
Families with Children: The 2018 PIT identified one homeless family in its survey of the region’s homeless; however, the HARC reports there are 282 Jurupa Valley homeless households on the waitlist for rental assistance.

Veterans & their Families: The County’s 2018 PIT reports seven Jurupa Valley homeless are veterans – no information is provided regarding veterans and their families. The HARC reports 46 Jurupa Valley veterans are on the waitlist for rental assistance.

Unaccompanied Youth: The 2018 PIT identified 19 unaccompanied youth (i.e., persons under the age of 24) among Jurupa Valley’s homeless population.


Other characteristics or sub-populations of Jurupa Valley homeless identified in the 2018 PIT include the following:

- Approximately 27.0 percent are identified as drug users and 13.5 percent as alcohol users.
- Approximately 16.2 percent have a physical disability, 11.5 percent have a mental health condition, and 8.1 percent suffer from PTSD.
- Two individuals were identified as victims of domestic abuse.
Nature and Extent of Homelessness: (Optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race:</th>
<th>Sheltered:</th>
<th>Unsheltered (optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity:</th>
<th>Sheltered:</th>
<th>Unsheltered (optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternate Data Source Name: 2018 Riverside County Point-In-Time Homeless Count
Data Source Comments: A notable percentage of individuals did not respond to race/ethnicity. *

Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance for families with children and the families of veterans.

As outlined previously, the 2018 PIT identified one unsheltered homeless household with children and seven unsheltered veteran households among Jurupa Valley’s unsheltered homeless population. The HARC reports that 282 homeless households and 46 veteran households are on the waitlist for housing assistance. Unfortunately, the HARC information does not provide household detail in order to determine if the respective “households” include families with minor children.


The Riverside County 2018 PIT does not provide racial or ethnic data regarding the region’s homeless; however, the 2017 PIT does. Assuming Jurupa Valley’s homeless population is reflective of the region’s homeless, 56.6 percent are White, 11.4 percent are Black/African American, and 5.4 percent are American Indian/Alaska Native. (Note: Over 28 percent of those counted refused to identify themselves by race or skipped the question.) With respect to ethnicity, 59 percent are identified as non-Hispanic/Latino, 28 percent as Hispanic/Latino, and 12 percent did not respond.

Describe the Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness.

As previously noted, the 2018 PITS identified 148 unsheltered homeless in Jurupa Valley.

The regional 2018 PIT did not report sheltered homeless by city of last residence. Sheltered homeless were reported as a cumulative. A majority of the region’s 2,310 homeless individuals were unsheltered (approximately 79%). A total of 625 homeless were sheltered at the time the 2018 PIT was undertaken.
Discussion:

The 2018 Point-In-Time count for Riverside County identified 148 unsheltered homeless in Jurupa Valley. Thirty of these individuals are identified as chronic homeless, seven are identified as veterans, and 19 are under the age of 24. The PIT identified one homeless family with children; however, the HARC has reported that over 280 homeless households are waiting for rental assistance. Additionally, 46 veteran households are waiting for rental assistance.
NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment - 91.205 (b,d)

Introduction:

Certain segments of the population experience conditions that make it difficult for them to access affordable housing. Physical or medical conditions, particular space or supportive service requirements, incomes, or other factors may impede a household’s ability to obtain decent and affordable housing. This section briefly describes the characteristics of the special needs populations in Jurupa Valley. Special needs groups include, but are not limited to, the elderly, persons with mental, physical, and/or developmental disabilities, persons with HIV/AIDS, and domestic violence.

Describe the characteristics of special needs populations in your community:

Elderly/Frail Elderly. According to 2009-13 ACS data, Jurupa Valley had 7,593 people who were age 65 and over, accounting for 7.8 percent of the total population. Characteristics of this special needs population includes limited mobility, increased medical attention due to health complications, and restricted fixed income, such as Social Security, pension programs and retirement income. The 2009-13 ACS data estimates that 16.0 percent of the Jurupa Valley’s elderly had at least one disability and 24.9 percent had two or more disabilities.

Persons with mental, physical, and/or developmental disabilities. Based on the 2009-13 ACS data, the number of Jurupa Valley residents age five and older with some type of disability totaled 10,057, which was 11.3 percent of the City’s total civilian non-institutionalized population age five and older. The top three disabilities among persons age five and older with disability include those with ambulatory difficulty (6.1%), independent living difficulty (4.3%), and cognitive difficulty (4.2%). Having a disability negatively impacts a person’s ability to work and earn money. Approximately one-quarter (25.1%) of persons with disabilities age 18 to 64 in Jurupa Valley had incomes below the federal poverty level. This compares with 12.5 percent for persons with no disability in the same age group. (2009-13 ACS).

Persons with alcohol or other drug addiction. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services conducts the annual National Surveys on Drug Use and Health (2015-2016) for the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The survey estimated that approximately 2.6 million California residents or 8.8 percent of the state’s 18 years and older population had a substance use disorder. Substance use disorder is defined as meeting criteria for illicit drug or alcohol dependence or abuse. Alcohol dependence or abuse affected 6.8 percent, while illicit drug dependence or abuse affected 3.2 percent of Californians 18 and over.

Persons with HIV/AIDS and their families. The California Department of Public Health’s California HIV Surveillance Report for 2016 estimates that there were approximately 8,100 people living with a diagnosed HIV infection in Riverside County. This represent 6.1 percent of HIV-diagnosed residents statewide in 2016. Persons with HIV/AIDS face an array of barriers to obtaining and maintaining affordable, stable housing. For persons living with HIV/AIDS, the persistent shortage of stable housing can be the primary barrier to consistent medical care and treatment. In addition, persons with HIV/AIDS
may be targets of hate crimes and discrimination, including illegal eviction from their homes when their illness is exposed.

The City of Riverside is the Grantee of the HOPWA formula funding for both Riverside and San Bernardino County.

**Victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.** Victims of domestic violence are typically women and/or youth. Both groups become victims to crimes such as rape, battery or assault. Moreover, those with below moderate income levels are at greater risk as well. As reported previously, it is estimated that in California, 34.9 percent of women and 31.1 percent of men have been victimized by rape, physical violence, and/or stalking by an intimate partner. If these rates are applied to the Jurupa Valley’s population, the resulting estimate would be approximately 17,200 women and 15,100 men residing in the city who have suffered at one point or another from domestic/dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

**What are the housing and supportive service needs of these populations and how are these needs determined?**

**Elderly/Frail Elderly.** As people age, their dependency on Social Security and pension programs increases as these become their income sources. In the report titled *Aging California’s Retirement Crisis: State and Local Indicators*, commissioned by the California Retirement Security for All in 2015, 57% of individuals age 65 and older depend on Social Security/SSI for 80% or more of their income statewide. Nearly one out of three seniors (31%) do not have enough income to meet basic needs. Therefore, Social Security might only cover part of the total cost of a mortgage or rent and assisted-living facilities generally cost more than the typical housing in the community, which could make it increasingly difficult for this group to afford housing without aid. In addition to housing costs, there is also the need for elderly services that include public transportation, home delivery services, and at-home medical care.

**Persons with mental, physical, and/or developmental disabilities.** Having a disability negatively impacts a person’s ability to work and earn money. Approximately one-fifth of persons with disabilities in Jurupa Valley age 18 years and over, lived in households with incomes below the federal poverty level. (2009-2013 ACS Table C18130). Access and availability to affordable housing is a key housing issue among persons with disabilities. In addition, other needs include: group living supportive care housing; in-home social, educational, and medical support; housing designed to accommodate persons with physical disabilities; and proximity to services and transit.

**Persons with alcohol or other drug addiction.** Persons with alcohol and drug addiction have difficulty securing a job and maintaining their housing situation. As previous mentioned, for the 2015-2016 period, an estimated 2.6 million California residents or 8.8% of the state’s 18 years and older had a substance use disorder. According to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (an agency of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services), there are at least 18 facilities within a 10-mile radius of Jurupa Valley that treat substance abuse or have detoxification programs available to
the public. Most of these facilities (13 of 18) are located in the City of Riverside. None are located within Jurupa Valley city limits.

**Persons with HIV/AIDS and their families.** Persons with HIV/AIDS face an array of barriers to obtaining and maintaining affordable, stable housing. For many, the persistent shortage of stable housing can be the primary barrier to consistent medical care and treatment. Based on average housing costs, persons with HIV/AIDS could be forced to pay a large portion of their income that might otherwise go toward monthly rent or mortgage for health care.

The California Department of Public Health’s California HIV Surveillance Report for 2016 estimates that there were approximately 8,100 people living with a diagnoses HIV infection in Riverside County. This represents 6.1 percent of HIV-diagnosed residents statewide in 2016.

**Victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.** At the state level, an estimated 34.9% of women and 31.1% of men have been victimized by rape, physical violence, and/or stalking by an intimate partner. For Jurupa Valley, these statewide proportions equate to approximately 17,175 women and 15,088 men.

Victims of domestic violence are typically women and/or youth. These groups commonly need either proper placement in temporary foster homes or additional financial support; legal services or counseling to deal with domestic violence.

**Discuss the size and characteristics of the population with HIV/AIDS and their families within the Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area:**

The California Department of Public Health’s California HIV Surveillance Report for 2016 estimates that there were approximately 8,100 people living with diagnoses HIV infection in Riverside County.

**Discussion:**

The key housing and supportive service needs of on the non-homeless special needs population include:

- The elderly have a high dependency on Social Security/SSI and many do not have enough income to meet basic needs including housing costs. This group also needs common elderly services that include public transportation, home delivery services, at-home medical care, and public programs to expose seniors to new activities.
- Persons with mental, physical, and/or developmental disabilities need access and availability to affordable housing is a key housing. This issue among persons with disabilities. Other needs include: group living supportive care housing; in-home social, educational, and medical support; housing designed to accommodate persons with physical disabilities; and proximity to services and transit.
• Persons with alcohol and drug addiction have difficulty securing a job and maintaining their housing situation. Providing vouchers or other financial assistance could aid this special needs group in gaining improved access to treatment and housing.

• Persons with HIV/AIDS face an array of barriers to obtaining and maintaining affordable, stable housing. For many, the persistent shortage of stable housing can be the primary barrier to consistent medical care and treatment.

Victims of domestic violence are typically women and/or youth. These groups commonly need either proper placement in temporary foster homes or additional financial support, legal services or counseling to deal with domestic violence.
NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs – 91.215 (f)

Describe the jurisdiction’s need for Public Facilities:

Community Facilities. The results of the ConPlan survey shows that Parks and Recreational Facilities and Youth Centers are the two most important community facilities needs within the city. These two needs were also ranked one and two in importance of all topics in the survey, including public infrastructure, social and public services, economic development, and housing supply/improvements/services. Parks and Recreational Facilities and Youth Centers are closely related because many of the younger aged residents of the City would benefit the most from these public facilities. According to 2009-2013 ACS Table DP05 data, about 29 percent of the residents of Jurupa Valley are children and youth under the age of 18. Youth facilities give young people an alternative to delinquency and provide them a safe haven where they can socialize without the threat of criminal or violent activity. Several children/youth centers and programs in the City that need to continue include:

- YMCA Youth Center
- Rubidoux Youth Opportunity Center
- Youth Center of Jurupa Valley
- Youth Skills Center
- Jurupa Valley Adopt a Family
- Various religious organizations offering youth programs (i.e., Islamic Center of Jurupa Valley)
- City of Jurupa Valley Department of Park and Recreations (parks and recreational facilities providing youth programs)

How were these needs determined?

Community facilities needs were determined based on results from the ConPlan survey, ACS data regarding the population under the age of 18.

Describe the jurisdiction’s need for Public Improvements:

The results from ConPlan survey indicate that Street Improvements, Street Lights, and ADA Curbs/Sidewalks/Gutters were important needs of the City. Public improvements are identified in the City Public Works and Engineering Department’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) each year. According to the adopted Fiscal Year 2017-2018 CIP, approximately $10.67 million is budgeted for capital improvements within the city. Approximately $7.53 million is carried over from the previous FY 2016-2017 and $3.14 million is budgeted for new projects. New projects include: pavement management and maintenance; street widening; interchange improvements; grade separation; horse crossing signal; traffic signal installation; ADA curb, ramp, and sidewalk upgrades; parks; and drainage improvements.

As previously mentioned, approximately eight percent of the city’s total population are elderly (65 years and over) and 41 percent of the elderly have at least one or more types of disability. In addition, 11
percent of the city’s total civilian non-institutionalized population five years and older also have some type of disability. Therefore, ADA curbs, ramps, sidewalk, and roadway upgrades are a priority public infrastructure improvement need.

**How were these needs determined?**

ADA curbs, ramps, and sidewalk upgrades were identified as a need based on the City Public Works and Engineering Department’s CIP, results from the ConPlan survey, and information derived from the ACS data regarding the elderly and persons with disabilities.

**Describe the jurisdiction’s need for Public Services:**

The ConPlan survey indicated that Crime Prevention Programs and Graffiti Removal were ranked one and two as the top needs under the Public Service category.

The Riverside County Sheriff’s Department provides police services in Jurupa Valley. According to the General Plan, the Jurupa Valley Sheriff’s Station responds to approximately 35,000 total calls per year.

The Jurupa Valley Sheriff’s Department actively engages in Community-Oriented Policing, which brings together law enforcement professionals with the community in a variety of outreach efforts to reduce crime. In addition, the Department assists the City incorporate Crime Prevention through Environmental Design, or CPTED, techniques in new development. CPTED is a concept supported by law enforcement officers, city planners, designers, and other professionals to design the physical environment in ways that discourage criminal activity and increase safety. The concept is based on three principles: natural surveillance, territoriality, and access control. When incorporated into development projects, these principles serve to eliminate hiding places and enhance visibility so that law-abiding people can easily watch over the physical environment and discourage criminal activities.

The Sheriff’s Department and the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) regularly patrol the City for graffiti to enable quick eradication and limit its proliferation. Jurupa Valley residents are encouraged to report graffiti vandalism. The City contracts with the JCSD and the Riverside County Economic Development Agency to paint out graffiti in the City. The Sheriff’s Department also actively pursues conviction of graffiti vandals in accordance with local and state laws.

According to the Jurupa Valley General Plan Land Use Element, the city’s population growth is projected to increase, under buildout conditions, by 35 to 50 percent by the year 2035. This level of growth would increase the city’s total population to about 133,000 to 148,000 residents in 2035. With a continued population, housing, and economic growth projected for Jurupa Valley, more police staffing/patrols and crime prevention programs will be required in the city.
How were these needs determined?

Needs were based on growth projection in the City’s General Plan and from the results of the ConPlan Survey.
Housing Market Analysis

MA-05 Overview

Housing Market Analysis Overview:

The purpose of the Market Analysis is to provide a clear picture of the environment in which the City will administer its CDBG programs over the term of the Plan. The Market Analysis includes the following sections:

- Number of Housing Units, Cost of Housing, Condition of Housing
- Public and Assisted Housing
- Homeless Facilities and Services
- Special Needs Facilities and Services
- Barriers to Affordable Housing
- Non-Housing Community Development Assets
- Needs and Market Analysis Discussion

In conjunction with the Needs Assessment, the Market Analysis provides the basis for the Strategic Plan and the programs and projects to be administered. Most of the data tables in this section are populated with default Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data developed by the Census Bureau for HUD based on 2009-2013 American Community Survey (ACS) data. Other sources are noted throughout the Plan.
MA-10 Number of Housing Units – 91.210(a)&(b)(2)

Introduction

The City’s housing stock as of the 2009-2013 ACS consisted of 26,696 total residential units, 77 percent of which were single-family detached homes (Residential Properties by Unit Number Table). The 2009-2013 ACS data is automatically provided by HUD; according to more recent data from the California Department of Finance (2012 E-5 estimate), the City’s housing stock grew to 27,546 units by 2017. About 3 percent of units are in small multi-family structures of 2-4 units, while another 16 percent are in larger structures of 5 units or more. As presented in the Unit Size by Tenure Table, owner and renter occupied units totaled 25,016 units. Of these, about 65 percent were owner-occupied and 35 percent were renter-occupied. The vast majority of owner-occupied units -- 84 percent -- had three or more bedrooms, while about 57 percent of renter-occupied units had two bedrooms or fewer.

All residential properties by number of units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-unit detached structure</td>
<td>20,427</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached structure</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 units</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-19 units</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26,696</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27 – Residential Properties by Unit Number

Data Source: 2009-2013 ACS

Unit Size by Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Owners</th>
<th>Renters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No bedroom</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedrooms</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more bedrooms</td>
<td>13,632</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16,320</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28 – Unit Size by Tenure

Data Source: 2009-2013 ACS
Describe the number and targeting (income level/type of family served) of units assisted with federal, state, and local programs.

There are a total of 382 units of affordable housing in Jurupa Valley. These housing developments utilizing federal, state, and/or local programs, including state and local bond programs, Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), density bonus, or direct assistance programs, are often restricted for use as low-income housing and provide another source of affordable housing for a jurisdiction. Regarding future affordable housing unit development, according the database of Tax Credit projects in Jurupa Valley, there is one project that has received an allocation of 9% tax credits – the 39-unit, Vista Rio Apartments, located at 3901 Briggs Street. Of the total 39 units, 38 units or 97 percent are low-income units. This rental housing development is expected to provide affordable housing to large families.

Provide an assessment of units expected to be lost from the affordable housing inventory for any reason, such as expiration of Section 8 contracts.

State law requires that the City identify rental units that are eligible to convert to non-low-income housing uses due to termination of subsidy contract, mortgage prepayment, or expiring use restrictions during the next 10 years. According to data from the City’s Housing Element, within the at-risk analysis period of 10 years, only one project is considered to be at-risk of converting to market-rate housing, the 54-unit Mission Villas senior housing, funded with Section 202 financing and Section 8 project-based rent subsidies. The Section 8 contract for Mission Villas was due to expire on January 31, 2018. This project has a low risk of converting to market-rate housing because HUD has prioritized funding for Section 8 renewals for senior projects.

Does the availability of housing units meet the needs of the population?

As discussed in the Needs Assessment section, just under 32 percent of all households (7,883 total) spend at least 30 percent of their income on housing, considered the threshold for overpayment. Thus, the supply of affordable housing for lower income households is a high priority goal. The need is further substantiated by the waiting list (as of October 2015) maintained by the Riverside County Housing Authority, which provides rental subsidies to low-income families that spend more than 30 percent of their gross income on housing costs. As of February 2018, the number of Jurupa Valley households on the waiting list was 1,742 residents, according to the Housing Authority. This illustrates the need for affordable housing in the City.

In addition, the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for the City of Jurupa Valley, as determined by SCAG allocated the regional “fair share” of housing needs to the City of Jurupa Valley for the 2014-2021 period. According to the RHNA, Jurupa Valley must be able to accommodate 1,712 housing units during the subject period. Of this total, Jurupa Valley must be able to accommodate at least 409 units (24%) for very low and low-income households during the 2014-2021 period.
Describe the need for specific types of housing:

The City analyzed its ability to meet Regional Housing Needs. The results of this analysis shows that the City's land inventory, including projects approved and the potential development of vacant and underutilized parcels, exceeds the net remaining RHNA for the planning period in all income categories except for the Extremely Low/Very Low categories. In those categories, there is an unmet need of 438 dwelling units. To accommodate the remaining need for Extremely Low and Very Low income housing, the City is committed to working with the Riverside Housing Authority, housing non-profits, and housing developers to identify specific sites for developing housing suitable for extremely low and very-low income households, including seniors, disabled persons, veterans, farm workers and the homeless.

The City has a pronounced need for rental housing affordable to households making 0-50 percent of AMI, as a large number of renter households in these categories experience severe cost burdens (more than 50 percent of income spent on housing). In addition, the proportion of rental units with three or more bedrooms (43%) is low compared to owner-occupied units (84%). Combined with the disproportionately high incidence of severe overcrowding (greater than 1.5 persons per room) among lower-income households, this indicates the City has a need for more rental units with three or more bedrooms.

To increase the City's affordable housing stock, the City proposes various incentives to allow housing to be built at a density of up to 25 dwelling units per acre. Other incentives may include permit “fast tracking,” housing grants, inclusionary housing program (IHP) and development assistance.

Discussion

The City’s housing stock is primarily single family detached homes (77%), with most residents owning their homes (65%). For a City of over 26,000 housing units, there are only 382 units of affordable housing. In the City, approximately a third of all households (7,883 total) overpay for housing, which is defined as spending at least 30 percent of their income on housing. The City is working with the Riverside Housing Authority, housing non-profits, and housing developers to identify specific sites for developing housing suitable for targeting extremely low and very-low income households, including seniors, disabled persons, veterans, farm workers and the homeless.
MA-15 Housing Market Analysis: Cost of Housing - 91.210(a)

Introduction

According to data from the 2009-2013 ACS automatically provided by HUD, Jurupa Valley’s median home value in 2013 was $218,800. According to 2009-2013 ACS data, the majority (54.9%) of Jurupa Valley’s renter households paid at least $500 but less than $1000 in monthly rent while only about 45 percent paid $1000 or more. The 2009-2013 ACS shows that median contract rent in 2011 was $973. (Jurupa Valley is one of the youngest cities in California, incorporated in 2011, and for this reason there is no baseline data from the year 2000.)

Cost of Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base Year: 2000</th>
<th>Most Recent Year: 2013</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Home Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>218,800</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Contract Rent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29 – Cost of Housing

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2009-2013 ACS (Most Recent Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent Paid</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $500</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500-$999</td>
<td>3,969</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000-$1,499</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500-$1,999</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000 or more</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,696</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30 - Rent Paid

Data Source: 2009-2013 ACS

Housing Affordability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Units affordable to Households earning</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30% HAMFI</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% HAMFI</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>1,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% HAMFI</td>
<td>3,939</td>
<td>2,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% HAMFI</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,897</td>
<td>9,005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31 – Housing Affordability

Data Source: 2009-2013 CHAS
Is there sufficient housing for households at all income levels?

According to the limited data available, there is not sufficient housing for households at lower income levels in Jurupa Valley. According to 2009-2013 CHAS data from HUD, there were 2,851 renter households making 30 percent HAMFI or less, but only 284 units affordable to a household at the 30 percent level (Housing Affordability Table). Also according to CHAS data, there were 3,460 households making between 30 and 50 percent HAMFI, but only 674 units affordable to a household at the 50 percent level. Additionally, the fact that a housing unit is affordable to a particular income level does not necessarily mean that it is occupied by a household at that income level, meaning that the affordability mismatch is very likely more severe than reported in the data.

How is affordability of housing likely to change considering changes to home values and/or rents?

The early 2010s drop in home values may have made a small additional percentage of for-sale homes affordable to lower-income households; however, this trend is far outweighed by the significant rise in rents over the same time period. Since the vast majority of housing units affordable to lower-income households are rental units, it is likely that the number of units affordable for lower-income households will decrease going forward.

How do HOME rents / Fair Market Rent compare to Area Median Rent? How might this impact your strategy to produce or preserve affordable housing?

HUD provided HOME rents and fair market rent for 2017 for the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario MSA, and they are listed above (see Table 36):

The rents at the smaller housing units (efficiency and 1-bedroom unit) are similar at the Fair Market and High Home rent levels. Across all housing units, the Low HOME rent levels are significantly below Fair Market and High HOME rent levels. And, at the larger housing units (units with three and four bedrooms) the difference between Fair Market and both HOME levels varies significantly. What the data shows is that it will be very difficult to produce and preserve affordable housing because the incentives or profits for building market rate housing are great. Concurrently, the level of subsidies that
will be needed to provide to a developer to build affordable housing will be high, and given the level of limited resources, less units will be able to either be built or preserved in the future at affordable housing levels.

**Discussion**

Increasing housing prices have had the effect of pricing out lower income household’s ability to purchase homes. There is not sufficient housing for households at lower income levels in Jurupa Valley. Also, there has been a significant rise in rents recently. Since the vast majority of housing units affordable to lower-income households are rental units, it appears that there will be a decreasing number of units at this price level, given increased demand, without concurrent supply of new affordable housing units. Also, it will be very difficult to produce and preserve affordable housing because incentives for building market rate housing are great.
MA-20 Housing Market Analysis: Condition of Housing – 91.210(a)

Introduction

The U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey (ACS) defines a “selected Condition” as one of four types of housing problems, similar to those used in the Needs Assessment: 1) lacks complete plumbing facilities, 2) lacks complete kitchen facilities, 3) more than one person per room, and 4) cost burden greater than 30 percent. Table 37 calculates the total number of owner- and renter-occupied units exhibiting different numbers of selected conditions, and the percentage of all units falling into each of these categories.

Based on these categories, more than one-half (52 percent) of all households have none of the selected conditions, while 48 percent have either one or two conditions, and a small number (less than one percent) have three or four conditions. However, renter households are more likely to experience problems. In all, 52 percent of all renter-occupied households have at least one condition, compared to only 43 percent of owner-occupied households.

Definitions

Jurupa Valley identified that 1,300 housing units, less than 0.5% of the City’s housing stock may be considered substandard in the City. Substandard housing conditions refer to the inability of various systems in a house to meet adopted building codes for health and safety, including plumbing, heating, electrical, and structural systems. Housing conditions are considered substandard when one or more systems are found to be below the minimum standards required by Section 1001 of the Uniform Housing Code. Households living in substandard conditions are considered to be in need of housing assistance, even if they are not seeking alternative housing arrangements, due to the threat to residents’ health and safety that substandard housing poses. In addition to structural deficiencies and standards, the lack of infrastructure and utilities often serves as an indicator for substandard conditions. In addition, data from the 2009-2013 ACS table identifies 765 owner-occupied units and 1,298 units with two or more selected conditions.

Condition of Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition of Units</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With one selected Condition</td>
<td>7,054</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With two selected Conditions</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With three selected Conditions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With four selected Conditions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No selected Conditions</td>
<td>8,501</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: 2009-2013 ACS
Year Unit Built

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Unit Built</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 or later</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1999</td>
<td>5,995</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1979</td>
<td>7,421</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1950</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: 2009-2013 CHAS

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Units Built Before 1980</td>
<td>8,529</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units build before 1980 with children present</td>
<td>3,025</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: 2009-2013 ACS (Total Units) 2009-2013 CHAS (Units with Children present)

Vacant Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suitable for Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Not Suitable for Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned Vacant Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REO Properties</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned REO Properties</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

Need for Owner and Rental Rehabilitation

The City of Jurupa Valley has identified the need to provide its residents with a housing rehabilitation program. There are approximately 1,300 housing units in need of repairs. In addition, data from the 2009-2013 ACS table identified over 2,000 units with two or more conditions that may be addressed by housing rehabilitation programs. The City is working to develop a housing rehabilitation program using CDBG funds for the near future.

Estimated Number of Housing Units Occupied by Low or Moderate Income Families with LBP Hazards

Although lead was banned from residential paint in 1978, more than three-fourths of homes constructed prior to 1978 (national average) may contain lead based paint (LBP). And, local data have
confirmed that the percentage of units containing LBP increases with the age of the structure. The use of lead was widespread in older homes, which often cost less and are therefore more likely to be occupied by lower-income families -- posing an increased risk to this income group.

The age of housing units is the key variable for estimating the number of units with LBP hazards. According to 2009-2013 CHAS data, there were a total of 13,830, or 55% of total units built prior to 1980. If 75 percent of these properties can be assumed to have LBP, the number of units with LBP is estimated to be 10,373. According to the Needs Assessment of this Plan, approximately 54 percent of all households in the City were low- or moderate-income (defined here as less than or equal to 100 percent HAMFI). Assuming that this percentage holds true for the estimated 10,373 units with LBP, the number of lower-income households potentially exposed to LBP hazards is estimated to be 5,601. As stated earlier, the lower cost of older units makes them more likely to be occupied by lower-income households, meaning that this estimate could be low.

**Discussion**

Approximately 48% of owner households have one or two housing substandard conditions; renter households have worse housing conditions. Data indicates approximately 1,300 housing units need repairs and Census data showed that over 2,000 housing units had two or more substandard conditions that may be addressed via housing rehabilitation. Also, a significant number of housing units have lead based paint and many households that are exposed to lead are lower income. The City plans on implementing a housing rehabilitation program using CDBG funds in future years to address such issues.

**Digital Divide:** Providing a broadband infrastructure has become increasingly important in order to provide residents with reliable connectivity for services such as online banking and purchasing goods and services. A 2017 UC Berkeley Institute for Government Studies survey, conducted in partnership with the California Emerging Technology Fund, reported that approximately 76% of Inland Empire households have broadband connectivity. This connectivity rate is below the statewide average of 82%; however, the rate is comparable with Los Angeles County (77%).

Two broadband providers serve the City; both providers offer reduced price internet access for lower income households. Spectrum offers a $14.99 package for high-speed internet access. To qualify for this low-cost package, one household member must qualify for the free or reduced school lunch program or must be over 65 years old and receive supplemental social security income. AT&T offers internet connections for $5 to $10 per month. Installation and equipment fees are waived. To be eligible, at least one household member must receive food stamps.

**Natural Hazard Risks:** The City is required to assess if low- and moderate-income residents are at risk of natural hazards, including those that may increase due to climate change. The 2017 General Plan specifically addressed climate change and identifies policies and programs to address the issue.
A major emphasis of the City’s Environmental Justice Element is ensuring that people have a healthy home environment. This element indicates low-income and minority populations may be disproportionately affected by home health hazards, as their limited incomes reduce housing choices and their options for home repairs. Housing-related environmental hazards include indoor air pollution, lead-based paint, asbestos, and mold. Ensuring that all residents have access to healthy homes is an important way to achieve environmental justice.

The Air Quality, Land Use, and Conservation and Open Space Elements identify actions to be taken by the City to improve air quality and minimize the effects of climate change to protect the health, safety, and quality of life of all residents. Identified measures included:

- Working with local special districts to help meet the City’s water needs without substantial harm to the environment.
- Increasing use of sustainable energy sources such as solar and wind to reduce reliance on non-sustainable energy sources.
- Support mixed-use land use patterns which promote affordable housing and efficient modes of travel which reduces automobile emissions.
- Preserve natural floodways, floodplains, and wetlands, and avoid actions that adversely affect waterways or that increase flood hazards.

The Stringfellow Acid Pits, located within the City, are listed as an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Superfund site. Site cleanup is subject to an abatement plan administered by the State; however, the City, State, and EPA have worked together to ensure the community is aware of site cleanup efforts. The City has designated this area as Open Space – Mineral Resources, which does not allow for residential uses.
MA-25 Public and Assisted Housing – 91.210(b)

Introduction

There are a small number of public housing units in the City of Jurupa Valley. Most housing assistance is provided in the form of vouchers. There is not a housing authority in the City, although there is good coordination with the County Housing Authority to provide services to some residents of Jurupa Valley.

Totals Number of Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Mod-Rehab</th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Vouchers</th>
<th>Special Purpose Voucher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project-based</td>
<td>Tenant-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of units vouchers available</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>8,681</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of accessible units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

Table 37 – Total Number of Units by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Describe the supply of public housing developments:

Describe the number and physical condition of public housing units in the jurisdiction, including those that are participating in an approved Public Housing Agency Plan:

According to PIH Information Center data, there are 469 public housing units in Jurupa Valley. Of these, none have been inspected in 2012 or later by HUD’s Real Estate Assessment Center (REAC).
Public Housing Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Housing Development</th>
<th>Average Inspection Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38 - Public Housing Condition

Describe the restoration and revitalization needs of public housing units in the jurisdiction:

This information was not available.

Describe the public housing agency's strategy for improving the living environment of low- and moderate-income families residing in public housing:

Jurupa Valley does not have a public housing agency or authority.

Discussion:

Though the City does not have, and is not affiliated with, a housing authority, the City's goals are to continue working with the County Housing Authority, in order to provide housing services to its residents.
MA-30 Homeless Facilities and Services – 91.210(c)

Introduction

The County of Riverside is responsible for the oversight and coordination of the region’s homeless system of care. This system of care is known as a Continuum of Care. The Riverside County Continuum of Care (RC-CoC) is designed to quickly rehouse homeless individuals and families to minimize the trauma and displacement caused to homeless individuals and families by homelessness. The RC-CoC promotes access to mainstream programs so homeless individuals and families can achieve self-sufficiency. The RC-CoC is also responsible for conducting a regional Point-In-Time (PIT) of the homeless. The PIT identified 148 unsheltered homeless in Jurupa Valley at the time it was conducted in January 2018. Based on the 2018 regional homeless count, Jurupa Valley has the second highest number of homeless persons among incorporated and unincorporated areas in Riverside County.

Facilities and Housing Targeted to Homeless Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emergency Shelter Beds</th>
<th>Transitional Housing Beds</th>
<th>Permanent Supportive Housing Beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year Round Beds</td>
<td>Voucher / Seasonal / Overflow Beds</td>
<td>Current &amp; New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Only Adults</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless Households</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccompanied Youth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39 - Facilities and Housing Targeted to Homeless Households

Alternate Data Source Name: 2018 Riverside County Point-In-Time Homeless Count
Data Source Comments:
Describe mainstream services, such as health, mental health, and employment services to the extent those services are use to complement services targeted to homeless persons

The City of Jurupa Valley does not provide direct services to the homeless; however, the City is in compliance with California Senate Bill 2, which requires the City to identify zones within the City that allow homeless shelters without discretionary review. Additionally, the City’s Housing Element calls for the City to, “actively work with neighboring jurisdictions to achieve regional cooperation to reduce homelessness.” To this end, City staff initiated discussions with local service agencies to ascertain service gaps and to explore future partnership opportunities. Due to the delay in 2018 federal funding and official assurance of receiving CDBG funding, the City was unable to fully develop partnership/funding details; however, these efforts will continue with the goal of identifying one or more service providers that may be able to provide services for the City’s homeless. Part of the City funding evaluation will include an assessment of the level and quality of service provided by local agencies, including the experience of case managers linking clients with appropriate mainstream services and resources. Examples of mainstream services available for the City’s homeless include veterans housing vouchers, veteran medical services, MediCal, SSI, and CalWORKS. Please refer to Section NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment.

List and describe services and facilities that meet the needs of homeless persons, particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth. If the services and facilities are listed on screen SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure or screen MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services, describe how these facilities and services specifically address the needs of these populations.

As indicated in Table 43, there are no homeless shelter beds situated in the City of Jurupa Valley; however, the City has initiated actions to established relationships with various local service providers in an effort to link the City’s homeless population with appropriate housing and support services.
MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services – 91.210(d)

Introduction

Certain segments of the population experience conditions that make it difficult for them to access affordable housing. Physical or medical conditions, particular space or supportive service requirements, incomes, or other factors may impede a household’s ability to obtain decent and affordable housing. This section briefly describes the characteristics of the special needs populations in Jurupa Valley. Special needs groups include, but not limited to, the elderly, persons with mental, physical, and/or developmental disabilities, persons with HIV/AIDS, and domestic violence.

Including the elderly, frail elderly, persons with disabilities (mental, physical, developmental), persons with alcohol or other drug addictions, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, public housing residents and any other categories the jurisdiction may specify, and describe their supportive housing needs

Elderly/Frail Elderly. According to 2009-2013 ACS data, Jurupa Valley had 7,593 people who were age 65 and over, accounting for 7.8 percent of the total population. Some of the characteristics of the special needs residents included having limited mobility, increased medical attention due to health complications and restricted fixed income. The 2009-2013 ACS data (ACS Table C18108) estimates that 16.0 percent of the Jurupa Valley’s elderly had at least one disability and 24.9 percent had two or more disabilities.

Persons with mental, physical, and/or developmental disabilities. Based on the 2009-2013 ACS S1810 data, the number of Jurupa Valley residents age five and older with some type of disability totaled 10,057, which was 11.3 percent of the City’s total civilian non-institutionalized population age five and older. The top three disabilities among persons age five and older with disability include those with ambulatory difficulty (6.1%), independent living difficulty (4.3%), and cognitive difficulty (4.2%). Approximately one-quarter (25.1%) of persons with disabilities age 18 to 64 in Jurupa Valley had incomes below the federal poverty level. This compares with 12.5 percent for persons with no disability in the same age group. (2009-2013 ACS C18130).

Persons with alcohol or other drug addiction. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services conducts the annual National Surveys on Drug Use and Health (2015-2016) for the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The survey estimated that approximately 2.6 million California residents or 8.8 percent of the state’s 18 years and older population had a substance use disorder. Alcohol dependence or abuse affected 6.8 percent, while illicit drug dependence or abuse affected 3.2 percent of Californians 18 and over. In addition, the survey found that about 2.5 million residents or 8.4 percent of residents 18 and over that needed help did not receive treatment at a specialty facility for substance use.

Persons with HIV/AIDS and their families. The California Department of Public Health’s California HIV Surveillance Report for 2016 estimates that there were approximately 8,100 people living with a diagnoses HIV infection in Riverside County. This represents 6.1 percent of HIV-diagnosed residents.

**Victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.** Victims of domestic violence are typically women and/or youth. As stated in section NA-10, it is estimated that in California, 34.9 percent of women and 31.1 percent of men have been victimized by rape, physical violence, and/or stalking by an intimate partner. If these rates are applied to the Jurupa Valley’s population, the resulting estimate would be approximately 17,200 women and 15,100 men residing in the city who have suffered at one point or another from domestic/dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

Describe programs for ensuring that persons returning from mental and physical health institutions receive appropriate supportive housing

One of the programs that can assist persons with mental and physical health issues to receive housing is the SOAR program. The SOAR (SSI/SSDI Outreach, Access and Recovery) Project is designed to expedite access to Social Security Disability benefits for people who are homeless and have serious mental illness and/or co-occurring substance use disorders. With these benefits, people who are homeless or at-risk have a reliable source of income that makes it easier to access housing and supportive services. This can lead to long-term self-sufficiency and recovery, and help to end homelessness for many in the community.

Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 91.215(e) with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. 91.315(e)

The City plans to allocate CDBG funds in the near future to serve people with special needs. HUD-funded grant recipients are required under various laws not to discriminate in housing or services directly or indirectly on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, familial status, or disability. Under the Consolidated Plan, HUD funded recipients are required to: (1) examine and attempt to alleviate housing discrimination within their jurisdiction; (2) promote fair housing choice for all persons; (3) provide opportunities for all persons to reside in any given housing development, regardless of race, color, religion, sex, disability, familial status, or national origin; (4) promote housing that is accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities; (5) and comply with the non-discrimination requirements of the Fair Housing Act. The City plans to continue to fund a fair housing service provider to address complaints and violations, including those of special needs residents.

For entitlement/consortia grantees: Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 91.215(e) with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. (91.220(2))

Please refer to the discussion above.
MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing – 91.210(e)

Negative Effects of Public Policies on Affordable Housing and Residential Investment

The City has little control over market variables that impact the cost of housing, e.g., cost of land, and cost of construction supplies, materials and labor. The City’s Housing Element has identified governmental constraints that may have a negative impact to creating affordable housing opportunities.

**Prevailing Wage Requirements:** SB 975, passed in 2002, dramatically expanded the range of projects that require the payment of State prevailing wages. The requirements apply to projects involving almost any sort of public subsidy. Notably, affordable apartment projects that receive federal or state low-income housing tax credits are exempt from State prevailing wage requirements; however, federal prevailing wages may be applicable.

According to the California Association for Local Economic Development, SB 975 has had an overall negative impact on the structure of economic development in California. Some experts estimate federal prevailing wage regulations increase construction costs 10 percent to 30 percent.

**Environmental Review:** The California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act require environmental review of proposed discretionary projects; e.g., subdivision maps, zone changes, etc. Costs and delays resulting from the environmental review process are added to the cost of developing housing.

**Planning and Development Fees:** Fees charged by local governments also contribute to the cost of housing. Based on recent development applications in the City, development impact fees are in the order of $15,500 per unit for a market-rate single-family home and $12,000 per unit for market-rate multi-family apartment projects, according to the 2017 Housing Element.

**Permit and Processing Procedures:** The processing time required to obtain approval of development entitlements and building permits is often cited as contributing to construction costs. In development parlance, “time is money” and developers can incur significant holding costs during a delay. Building permit applications for new single-family houses typically take 3 to 6 months to complete the building permit plan check process, sometimes longer depending upon the size of the project. Processing multi-family development applications, which often require general plan amendments, rezoning, and CEQA review, typically requires 6 months to 1 year to complete discretionary planning review. The City’s permit procedures expedite planning and building approvals where possible and are not likely to unduly constrain housing development.

**Land Use Controls:** In terms of land use controls, the General Plan is of paramount concern. This policy document not only establishes the location and amount of land that will be allocated to residential development, but also establishes the intensity of development in terms of unit densities and total number of units, that will be permitted. While nearly all components or elements of the General Plan contain goals and policies that influence residential development, it is the Land Use Element that has
the most direct influence. Jurupa Valley’s development standards do not contain any unduly restrictive provisions. Building height, setbacks, lot areas, and parking are generally within the range of other cities in the State. The City’s processing and permit procedures are consistent with state planning and zoning law and are not considered to be an unreasonable constraint on the cost or supply of housing. The City will consider an amendment to the Zoning Code to eliminate the requirement for discretionary review for multi-family development in multi-family residential zones to expedite permit processing for projects that conform to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance development standards.
MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets – 91.215 (f)

Introduction

According to the 2009-2013 ACS, Jurupa Valley had 47,832 working-age adults in the labor force and an unemployment rate of 18.86 percent. More recent data from the California Employment Development Department shows that by March 2018, there was an estimated labor force in Jurupa Valley of 47,200, and the unemployment rate has significantly decreased to just 4.0 percent. This was approximately the same as the 4.2 percent unemployment rate recorded for all of Riverside County.

Certain employment sectors may have mismatches between the number of jobs and the number of workers available, resulting in high unemployment in those sectors. The Business Activity table below compares the number of workers in each sector as recorded in 2009-2013 ACS data with the number of jobs in the same sector as recorded by the Census Bureau’s Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics program. In the City of Jurupa Valley, the largest shortage of jobs was observed in the Education and Health Care Services sector, with enough jobs for only 2,002 workers out of a number of 4,698 workers. On the other hand, there were more than three times the transportation sector jobs than workers in Jurupa Valley.

Economic Development Market Analysis

Business Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business by Sector</th>
<th>Number of Workers</th>
<th>Number of Jobs</th>
<th>Share of Workers %</th>
<th>Share of Jobs %</th>
<th>Jobs less workers %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Mining, Oil &amp; Gas Extraction</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations</td>
<td>3,829</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3,265</td>
<td>2,496</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Health Care Services</td>
<td>4,698</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>4,073</td>
<td>2,739</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, Management</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>4,578</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td>7,113</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31,108</td>
<td>22,916</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 40 - Business Activity*

Data Source: 2009-2013 ACS (Workers), 2013 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (Jobs)
Labor Force

| Total Population in the Civilian Labor Force | 47,832 |
| Civilian Employed Population 16 years and over | 38,811 |
| Unemployment Rate | 18.86 |
| Unemployment Rate for Ages 16-24 | 39.63 |
| Unemployment Rate for Ages 25-65 | 12.32 |

Table 41 - Labor Force

Data Source: 2009-2013 ACS

Occupations by Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number of People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management, business and financial</td>
<td>4,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations</td>
<td>1,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>4,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office</td>
<td>9,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair</td>
<td>5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation and material moving</td>
<td>3,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42 – Occupations by Sector

Data Source: 2009-2013 ACS

Travel Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 Minutes</td>
<td>21,336</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-59 Minutes</td>
<td>10,211</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or More Minutes</td>
<td>5,266</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,813</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43 - Travel Time

Data Source: 2009-2013 ACS

Education:

Educational Attainment by Employment Status (Population 16 and Older)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>In Labor Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civilian Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school graduate</td>
<td>9,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>9,216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>In Labor Force</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civilian Employed</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Not in Labor Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or Associate's degree</td>
<td>9,365</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>2,705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree or higher</td>
<td>3,869</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 44 - Educational Attainment by Employment Status**

Data Source: 2009-2013 ACS

Educational Attainment by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18–24 yrs</th>
<th>25–34 yrs</th>
<th>35–44 yrs</th>
<th>45–65 yrs</th>
<th>65+ yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>2,661</td>
<td>4,849</td>
<td>1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th grade, no diploma</td>
<td>2,237</td>
<td>2,143</td>
<td>2,964</td>
<td>2,443</td>
<td>1,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate, GED, or alternative</td>
<td>4,821</td>
<td>4,217</td>
<td>3,610</td>
<td>6,520</td>
<td>2,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>3,752</td>
<td>3,439</td>
<td>2,251</td>
<td>5,635</td>
<td>1,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's degree</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 45 - Educational Attainment by Age**

Data Source: 2009-2013 ACS

Educational Attainment – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school graduate</td>
<td>21,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>30,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or Associate's degree</td>
<td>32,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>50,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>53,359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 46 – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months**

Data Source: 2009-2013 ACS

Based on the Business Activity table above, what are the major employment sectors within your jurisdiction?

With 15 percent of the City's workers and 9 percent of the jobs, Education and Health Care Services forms the single largest employment sector in Jurupa Valley. “Manufacturing” and “Arts and Entertainment” form the second and third largest sectors, with about 13 percent and 12 percent, respectively, of the City’s workers.
Describe the workforce and infrastructure needs of the business community:

Economic studies indicate that a significant portion of Jurupa Valley’s workforce is low skilled and low paid, partly as a result of the prevalence of low education levels, low-paying jobs, and low cost housing in the region. A key need of the business community of Jurupa Valley is workforce development, which is an economic development strategy aimed at developing a supply of trained employees that in turn can help attract quality industrial and commercial jobs to the area. Having vibrant industrial and commercial sectors in Jurupa Valley has the beneficial effect of keeping young people in the community and raising the standard of living (wages and benefits) for Jurupa Valley residents.

Higher economic activity would also result in higher revenues to the City of Jurupa Valley, which could then be used to improve the City’s infrastructure and other needs. The City recognizes the need to enhance the unique visual qualities of its commercial areas in the different communities throughout the City and improve infrastructure improvements, as resources allows, per the General Plan.

Jurupa Valley is also working to attract a new point-of-sale fulfillment center, given the ideal location of the City to serve surrounding cities. The City is located near major highways and urban centers that serves as a major logistics shipping and receiving center for Southern California. Along with that regional role comes significant commercial truck traffic using highway off-ramps and City streets. This has been part of an important economic stimulus in Jurupa Valley, but has also resulted in significant traffic congestion in certain areas and increased wear and damage to City streets, particularly in areas where logistics and other warehouse and industrial uses are concentrated. Most commercial truck traffic is concentrated in the northwestern and northeastern areas of the City, near the SR 60 corridor.

The efficient movement of goods is vital to Jurupa Valley and also the Inland Empire’s economy and transportation system safety. The ability of Jurupa Valley to compete domestically and internationally on an economic basis requires an efficient and cost-effective method for distributing and receiving products. The City is working to accomplish its economic / transportation goals by proper planning, design, construction, and maintenance of the regional and local street and highway system. The City's industrial and commercial sectors depend on safe and efficient goods movement. Investment in, preservation of and expansion of the existing freeway and street network is critical to the provision of a viable transportation system necessary to sustain a healthy local economy.

Describe any major changes that may have an economic impact, such as planned local or regional public or private sector investments or initiatives that have affected or may affect job and business growth opportunities during the planning period. Describe any needs for workforce development, business support or infrastructure these changes may create.

Jurupa Valley is a city of 97,725 people, 25,016 households with a median income of $55,429 (2009-2013 ACS data) that is characterized by its small-town feeling, natural beauty, and distinctive communities; whose citizens are enjoying a prosperous economy with an unemployment rate of just 4.0
percent (California Employment Development Department, March 2018). Jurupa Valley’s economy is driven by a younger, largely Hispanic, and blue collar local population.

Key goals of Jurupa Valley revolve around building and maintaining the current thriving local economy by expanding employment and business opportunities, providing needed products and services, increasing median income and property values, preserving and enhancing Jurupa Valley’s quality of life. Specifically, City employment is concentrated within transportation, warehousing, retail trade, and manufacturing services. The City performs below average relative to neighboring jurisdictions in terms of taxable retail sales and capture of resident and non-resident spending. Higher performing retail categories include grocery, electronics and appliances, and miscellaneous retail sales, while lower performing retail categories include apparel, restaurants and bars, and sporting goods. Based on these and other findings, the City is exploring the use of alternative economic tools to retain and attract businesses that meet local demand, improve the tax base, and create a potential for public-private cooperation.

**How do the skills and education of the current workforce correspond to employment opportunities in the jurisdiction?**

Please refer to the previous section regarding the education level needs of the Jurupa Valley labor force.

**Describe any current workforce training initiatives, including those supported by Workforce Investment Boards, community colleges and other organizations. Describe how these efforts will support the jurisdiction's Consolidated Plan.**

The Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs), community colleges and universities are working to ensure that more of the local workforce is trained so that they can effectively compete for higher paying jobs, and help move residents out of poverty. Jurupa Valley residents have the resources available from the Riverside County Workforce Development Board (WDB), which provides oversight for the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) programs in the county. The WDB acts as a catalyst to provide seamless services among various workforce programs, and provides community leadership around workforce issues. There are five key ways that the WDB carries out its role:

- **CONVENER** - Bringing together business, labor, education, and economic development to focus on community workforce issues,
- **WORKFORCE ANALYST** - Developing, disseminating and understanding current labor market and economic information and trends,
- **BROKER** - Bring together systems to solve common problems, or broker new relationships with businesses and workers,
- **COMMUNITY VOICE** - Advocating for the importance of workforce policy, providing perspective about the need for skilled workers,
- **CAPACITY BUILDER** - Enhancing the region's ability to meet the workforce needs of local employers.
These tasks are accomplished through America’s Job Centers of California better known as the Riverside County Workforce Development Centers (WDCs). The WDCs are the hub of the county-wide service delivery vehicle for workforce, education and business services. WDCs are located in six nearby cities; and there are also another six Youth Opportunity Centers (YOCs) located nearby. Workforce funds allocated to the WDB support job training, placement, and business services delivered at these locations.

Regarding educational facilities, there are currently no institutions of higher education in Jurupa Valley. The closest facilities within Riverside County are Norco College, Riverside City College, and the University of California, Riverside. The GPAC stated a strong desire to build a satellite college campus and/or trade school in Jurupa Valley, and to provide other venues offering adult education.

**Does your jurisdiction participate in a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS)?**

No

**If so, what economic development initiatives are you undertaking that may be coordinated with the Consolidated Plan? If not, describe other local/regional plans or initiatives that impact economic growth.**

The General Plan of Jurupa Valley identifies the need of the City to implement a comprehensive economic strategy that would expand its industrial and commercial base that, in turn, would benefit City residents, property owners, and businesses. To enhance the local economy, Jurupa Valley is targeting its efforts on six specific areas of the city. These specific areas are given the designation of “Opportunity Areas” where private commercial and industrial development could significantly and positively affect the City’s fiscal revenue by creating new jobs.

**Discussion**

The City of Jurupa Valley has approximately 48,000 working-age adults in the labor force that primarily consists of a younger, largely Hispanic, and blue collar local population. The current unemployment rate is just 4.0 percent. The largest employment sectors include Education and Health Care Services, Manufacturing and Arts and Entertainment. The City is planning on implementing an economic strategy that would target six specific areas of the City. In addition, the plans include improving infrastructure improvements, in order to attract new business and retain/help expand current ones.
MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion

Are there areas where households with multiple housing problems are concentrated? (include a definition of "concentration")

This ConPlan did not include an analysis of areas of concentration of households with multiple housing problems. In general, the lowest-income households have the most problems due to the high cost of housing in relation to income, which can lead to deferred maintenance and other physical issues as well as more immediately cost-related problems such as overpayment and overcrowding. As detailed below, the lowest-income households are concentrated in some of the central and eastern sections of the City, implying a high likelihood that households with the highest cost burden are also experiencing physical problems in older dwellings with more maintenance issues.

Are there any areas in the jurisdiction where racial or ethnic minorities or low-income families are concentrated? (include a definition of "concentration")

Attachment 3 shows maps, which include the locations / concentrations of residents who are Hispanic—the largest ethnic minority group in Jurupa Valley and other racial / ethnic groups. (Hispanic population in Jurupa Valley is 69 percent, with Black and Asian populations being 2.9 percent of total.) Hispanic concentration was defined as a census tract with the Hispanic population representing more than 50 percent of total population of the census tract. Hispanic residents generally reside in central and eastern sections of the City. These maps were generated using HUD’s CPD e-GIS mapping tool, which uses 2009-2013 ACS and CHAS data.

What are the characteristics of the market in these areas/neighborhoods?

The main characteristic of Jurupa Valley neighborhoods is single family residential homes. There are areas that are rural, and others that have commercial and industrial concentrations.

Are there any community assets in these areas/neighborhoods?

After reviewing the neighborhoods and corresponding maps, the following are located in these areas/neighborhoods: City Hall and other public services are located near the central area of the City that has a high concentration of the Hispanic population.

Are there other strategic opportunities in any of these areas?

To enhance the local economy, Jurupa Valley is targeting its efforts on six specific areas of the City. These specific areas are given the designation of “Opportunity Areas” where private commercial and industrial development could significantly and positively affect the City’s fiscal revenue by creating new jobs.
Strategic Plan

SP-05 Overview

Strategic Plan Overview

The Strategic Plan is the centerpiece of the City of Jurupa Valley’s 2018–2022 Consolidated Plan. The Strategic Plan identifies the programs and projects the City will undertake or consider during the five-year Consolidated Plan cycle. In addition to identifying resources, objectives and goals to implement housing and community development activities, the Strategic Plan includes several sub-strategies including the development of institutional structures, coordination with housing and community partners, the reduction of lead based-paint hazards, addressing homeless issues, addressing barriers to affordable housing, and program/project monitoring.

The City’s overall objective for the CDBG program mirrors HUD’s overall objective for the program: to create a viable community by providing decent housing, a suitable living environment, and economic opportunities, principally for persons of low- and moderate-income. To accomplish this objective in Jurupa Valley, the following Consolidated Plan goals have been identified based on the input of residents and other community stakeholders:

- Conserve the existing supply of affordable housing by supporting the provision of federal rental assistance vouchers and certificates administered by the Housing Authority of Riverside County.
- Assist with the preservation of the City’s owner-occupied single-family housing stock.
- Support housing and services for the homeless and those at risk of becoming homeless.
- Support community social services benefitting low- and moderate-income persons and those with special needs.
- Provide needed public infrastructure and facility improvements benefitting low- and moderate-income persons and those with special needs.
- Ensure quality, professional administration of federal funds, including the provision of fair housing services to address discriminatory actions that impede access to housing.

All programs and projects are subject to availability of funds and the approval of the City Council.
## SP-10 Geographic Priorities – 91.215 (a)(1)

### Geographic Area

**Table 47 - Geographic Priority Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area Name:</th>
<th>CDBG-Eligible Block Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Area Type:</td>
<td>Local CDBG-eligible Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Target Area Description:</td>
<td>Local CDBG-eligible Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HUD Approval Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Low/ Mod:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revital Type:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Revital Description:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.</td>
<td>Boundaries are based on Census Tract Block Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify the needs in this target area.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area Name:</th>
<th>Citywide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Area Type:</td>
<td>Citywide Program or Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Target Area Description:</td>
<td>Citywide Program or Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HUD Approval Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Low/ Mod:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revital Type:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Revital Description:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.</td>
<td>Boundaries are established by the City Limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?   NA
Identify the needs in this target area.   NA
What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?  NA
Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?  NA

General Allocation Priorities

Describe the basis for allocating investments geographically within the jurisdiction (or within the EMSA for HOPWA)

To determine which activities will receive CDBG funding during the Consolidated Plan cycle of 2018-2022, the City utilized a simple priority ranking system:

- **High Priority**: Activities that address a high priority need will be funded by the City during the five-year period provided adequate resources are available.

- **Low Priority**: The City may or may not fund low priority need activities during the five-year period.

In general, CDBG funds will be allocated on a citywide basis for activities that are limited-clientele in nature (i.e., beneficiaries are CDBG-eligible). Other activities such as public improvements may be limited to eligible areas (see map in Attachment 3), except for ADA related improvements which may be carried out on a much wider basis.

The City does not receive HUD Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) funds.
### Priority Needs

#### Table 48 – Priority Needs Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Priority Need Name</th>
<th>Priority Level</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Geographic Areas Affected</th>
<th>Associated Goals</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Basis for Relative Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Improvements</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>Local CDBG-eligible Area</td>
<td>Public Facility Improvements</td>
<td>Installation of new or rehabilitation of existing public infrastructure and public facility improvements</td>
<td>Needs Analysis, City department consultation, and public input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Citywide Program or Activity</td>
<td>Public Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>Citywide Program or Activity</td>
<td>Single Family Housing Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Rehabilitation or preservation of residential properties to address housing and building code deficiencies and deferred property improvements</td>
<td>Based on housing needs analysis, housing market analysis and public input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Citywide Program or Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Population                          | Extremely Low  
| Low                                |  
| Moderate                           |  
| Chronic Homelessness               |  
| Individuals                        |  
| Families with Children             |  
| veterans                           |  
| Victims of Domestic Violence       |  
| Unaccompanied Youth                |  
| Elderly                            |  
| Victims of Domestic Violence       |  
| Other                              |  
| **Geographic Areas Affected**      | Citywide Program or Activity |
| **Associated Goals**               | Homeless Services  
|                                    | Public Services |
| **Description**                    | Social service programs that provide services to low and moderate-income residents including homeless and individuals at risk of homelessness – may also include fair housing services |
| **Basis for Relative Priority**    | Needs Assessment, service providers input, public input. |

| 4 | Priority Need Name | Administration |
|   | Priority Level    | High |
|   | Population        | Moderate |
|   | Other             |
|   | **Geographic Areas Affected** | Citywide Program or Activity |
|   | **Associated Goals** | Fair Housing Services  
|   |                     | Program Administration |
|   | **Description**    | Program oversight and coordination, including fair housing services |
|   | **Basis for Relative Priority** | HUD required. |
**Narrative (Optional)**

**Impediments to Fair Housing:** HUD-funded grant recipients are required under various laws not to discriminate in housing or services directly or indirectly on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, familial status, or disability. Under the Consolidated Plan, HUD funded recipients are required to: (1) examine and attempt to alleviate housing discrimination within their jurisdiction; (2) promote fair housing choices for all persons; (3) provide opportunities for all persons to reside in any given housing development, regardless of race, color, religion, sex, disability, familial status, or national origin; (4) promote housing that is accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities; (5) and comply with the non-discrimination requirements of the Fair Housing Act. HUD encourages jurisdictions to consult with one another and initiate metropolitan wide area fair housing planning. The *Analysis of Impediments (AI) to Fair Housing Choice* is the primary document utilized for this purpose.

The City of Jurupa Valley was a Participating City in the Urban County Program at the time Riverside County prepared its last AI in 2014. This document covers program years 2014 through 2018. The City will continue to implement the fair housing action plan delineated in the AI, including contracting with a qualified fair housing service provider to address fair housing complaints and violations. Fair housing impediments identified in the AI and action steps are summarized in *Attachment 4*. **NOTE: not all impediments identified in the AI may be present in Jurupa Valley.**
### SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions – 91.215 (b)

#### Influence of Market Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordable Housing Type</th>
<th>Market Characteristics that will influence the use of funds available for housing type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA)</td>
<td>NA – CDBG may not be used for this type of activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBRA for Non-Homeless Special Needs</td>
<td>NA – CDBG may not be used for this type of activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Unit Production</td>
<td>CDBG typically cannot be used for this type of activity; however, funds may be used for certain pre-development costs or off-site public improvements. The Needs Assessment and Housing Market Analysis indicate there is a shortage of housing units affordable to lower income households; however, it is not presently envisioned that CDBG funds will be used for this purpose. A substantial amendment to the Consolidated Plan may be necessary if future funding is allocated for such an activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Overall the City’s housing stock is in good condition; however, a significant number of housing units have been identified as substandard. Housing Market analysis data indicates many lower income homeowners are paying a significant amount of their income for housing (housing cost burden and severe housing cost burden). Housing rehabilitation assistance allows these homeowners to address deferred maintenance improvements on their primary residence without increasing the amount of income dedicated to housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition, including preservation</td>
<td>Housing Market analysis data indicates that there is a need for additional housing that is affordable to both renter and owner households. It is not presently envisioned that CDBG funds will be used for this purpose; however, this does not preclude the City from utilizing these resources as an incentive to create new housing opportunities. A substantial amendment to the Consolidated Plan may be necessary if future CDBG funding is allocated for such an activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 49 – Influence of Market Conditions
SP-35 Anticipated Resources - 91.215(a)(4), 91.220(c)(1,2)

Introduction

Ongoing reductions and fluctuations in CDBG funding make it difficult to estimate the amount that will be available over the five-year Consolidated Plan cycle. Housing voucher/certificate resources (via HARC) will be available to carry out activities that support the goals of the Consolidated Plan.

Anticipated Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Uses of Funds</th>
<th>Expected Amount Available Year 1</th>
<th>Narrative Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>public - federal</td>
<td>Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Public Improvements Services</td>
<td>1,189,419 0 0 1,189,419</td>
<td>Annual CDBG allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | | Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | 4,000,000 |

Table 50 - Anticipated Resources

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

Other resources that will be available to carry out activities that address the goals of the Consolidated Plan are limited:
• HARC reports that as of February 2018, 244 Jurupa Valley households received rental assistance. It is anticipated that a similar number of households will be assisted annually over the five-year period of the Consolidated Plan.

• Jurupa Valley intends to continue and update an existing Inclusionary Housing Program previously administered by the County of Riverside. This program requires that 1 out of every 25 new units (4%) be reserved for households at the 50% area median income level. Projects of six or more units are required to participate in the program. Affordable units must be provided on-site, off-site, or through the payment of an in-lieu fee.

CDBG does not require matching funds.

If appropriate, describe publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan

The City conducted a detailed inventory of potential housing sites as part of the 2017 General Plan process. This study evaluated specific parcels, development constraints, and potential development capacity. The analysis indicated that 902 vacant parcels (or 2,432 vacant acres) in the City appear to be developable for housing. Additionally, parts of 73 additional parcels appear to be developable. These parcels, which are classified as Partially Constrained Parcels, include approximately 677 acres of additional land that could be used to accommodate new residential development in the City. A comprehensive list of these parcels is found in the City’s General Plan Appendices.

Discussion

Funding resources to implement the City’s Consolidated Plan are limited. It is anticipated that CDBG funding will continue to be reduced. With respect to other resources, the City will continue to support HARC’s efforts to secure new rental assistance resources. As outlined above, an inventory of vacant land has been developed by the City. Additionally, the City’s Housing Element indicates the City will continue to implement an Inclusionary Housing Program, which will ensure the creation of affordable housing units and/or the accumulation of in-lieu-fees that can be used to assist with the development of affordable housing.
SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure – 91.215(k)

Explain the institutional structure through which the jurisdiction will carry out its consolidated plan including private industry, non-profit organizations, and public institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Entity</th>
<th>Responsible Entity Type</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Geographic Area Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of Riverside County</td>
<td>PHA</td>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Riverside Dept Of Public Social Services-Homeless Prgms</td>
<td>Continuum of care</td>
<td>Homelessness Planning</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Housing Council of Riverside County, Inc.,</td>
<td>Non-profit organizations</td>
<td>public services</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Jurupa Valley</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Economic Development Homelessness Non-homeless special needs Ownership Planning Rental neighborhood improvements public facilities public services</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 51 - Institutional Delivery Structure

Assess of Strengths and Gaps in the Institutional Delivery System

Geographically, the City covers an area of 44-square miles, encompassing several established communities and neighborhoods. The City is a mix of high and low-density residential development, rural farming/agricultural activities, and commercial, retail, and industrial land uses. The City has significant capacity for expansion of both residential and commercial development. The City’s Housing Element indicates the City will, “work with public, private and nonprofit housing entities to identify candidate sites for new construction of rental housing for seniors and other special housing needs, and take all actions necessary to expedite processing and approval of such projects.” To this end, an extensive list of parcels that may be suitable for housing development is identified in the City’s General Plan. This cooperative attitude is a strength and opens the door to expanding and building relationships with public, private and nonprofit institutions as a way to build the community.
Jurupa Valley was incorporated in July 2011. During the past eight years, the City has established its administrative infrastructure but continues to mature as a municipality. During this maturation process, it is not unexpected that several gaps exist in the City’s institutional structure. Throughout the process of developing the City’s Consolidated Plan, it was evident that many organizations and individuals were not familiar with Jurupa Valley as a municipality. Other issues include the isolation of important community data and information for the County. (For example, HUD Block Group low- and moderate-income data is still identified and connected to County data making it difficult to analyze data from systems such as CPDMaps.)

**Availability of services targeted to homeless persons and persons with HIV and mainstream services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homelessness Prevention Services</th>
<th>Available in the Community</th>
<th>Targeted to Homeless</th>
<th>Targeted to People with HIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homelessness Prevention Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Outreach Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Clinics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Street Outreach Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportive Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol &amp; Drug Abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Employment Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 52 - Homeless Prevention Services Summary
Describe how the service delivery system including, but not limited to, the services listed above meet the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth)

As previously outlined, the absence of an official notification from HUD regarding the City’s status as a CDBG Entitlement Community, and the delay of 2018 CDBG funding have prevented the City from aggressively pursuing partnerships with local service providers. The City has initiated discussions with providers and will make an effort to engage one or more providers to address homeless housing and service needs. It is envisioned that the service delivery system summarized in Table 57 will be expanded over the five-year Consolidated Plan cycle.

Describe the strengths and gaps of the service delivery system for special needs population and persons experiencing homelessness, including, but not limited to, the services listed above

As summarized above, gaps currently exist in the City’s service delivery system for special need populations and persons experiencing homelessness due to the relatively recent incorporation of the City. However, with clear direction from the City Council and executive management, City staff has begun the process of building relationships with local service providers. Aside from pursuing funding for homeless services in the first year of the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan cycle, the City intends to use Fiscal Year 2018-2019 to further engage local service providers and explore opportunities to close gaps in the City’s current service delivery system for other special need populations and lower income residents.

Provide a summary of the strategy for overcoming gaps in the institutional structure and service delivery system for carrying out a strategy to address priority needs

City staff will identify local service providers that can address various community needs. Aside from pursuing funding for homeless services in the first year of the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan cycle, the City intends to use Fiscal Year 2018-2019 to meet with local service providers and explore opportunities to address various housing and community service needs.
### SP-45 Goals Summary – 91.215(a)(4)

**Goals Summary Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort Order</th>
<th>Goal Name</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>End Year</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Geographic Area</th>
<th>Needs Addressed</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Goal Outcome Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG-Eligible Block Groups Citywide</td>
<td>Public Improvements</td>
<td>CDBG: $2,189,419</td>
<td>Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 15000 Persons Assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public Facility Improvements</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>CDBG-Eligible Block Groups Citywide</td>
<td>Public Improvements</td>
<td>CDBG: $250,000</td>
<td>Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 3000 Persons Assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Single Family Housing Rehabilitation</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>CDBG: $1,000,000</td>
<td>Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated: 20 Household Housing Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort Order</td>
<td>Goal Name</td>
<td>Start Year</td>
<td>End Year</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Geographic Area</td>
<td>Needs Addressed</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Goal Outcome Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Homeless Services</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>CDBG: $375,000</td>
<td>Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 150 Persons Assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 25 Households Assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless Person Overnight Shelter: 25 Persons Assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homelessness Prevention: 150 Persons Assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Non-Homeless</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>CDBG: $375,000</td>
<td>Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 1500 Persons Assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 1500 Persons Assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 1500 Persons Assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fair Housing</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>CDBG: $125,000</td>
<td>Other: 1000 Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other: 1000 Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>CDBG: $875,000</td>
<td>Other: 5 Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 53 – Goals Summary
## Goal Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goal Name</th>
<th>Goal Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>Improvements to roadways, streets, sidewalks, and other eligible public infrastructure that primarily benefit low- and moderate-income persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public Facility Improvements</td>
<td>Improvements to eligible public facilities and non-public facilities that primarily benefit low- and moderate-income residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Single Family Housing Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Loans or grants to assist qualified low- and moderate-income homeowners to improve primary residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Homeless Services</td>
<td>Homeless housing and support services, including homelessness prevention, outreach, shelter and rapid rehousing services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Support services for low- and moderate-income persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fair Housing Services</td>
<td>Services to address impediments to access fair housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>CDBG program oversight and coordination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimate the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families to whom the jurisdiction will provide affordable housing as defined by HOME 91.315(b)(2)

The City of Jurupa Valley is not a HOME Participating Jurisdiction.
SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement – 91.215(c)
Need to Increase the Number of Accessible Units (if Required by a Section 504 Voluntary Compliance Agreement)

The City does own or manage public housing.

Activities to Increase Resident Involvements

Not applicable

Is the public housing agency designated as troubled under 24 CFR part 902?

N/A

Plan to remove the ‘troubled’ designation

Not applicable
SP-55 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.215(h)

Barriers to Affordable Housing

The City has little control over market variables that impact the cost of housing, e.g., cost of land, and cost of construction supplies, materials and labor. The City’s Housing Element has identified governmental constraints that may have a negative impact to creating affordable housing opportunities.

**Prevailing Wage Requirements:** SB 975, passed in 2002, dramatically expanded the range of projects that require the payment of State prevailing wages. The requirements apply to projects involving almost any sort of public subsidy. Notably, affordable apartment projects that receive federal or state low-income housing tax credits are exempt from State prevailing wage requirements; however, federal prevailing wages may be applicable.

According to the California Association for Local Economic Development, SB 975 has had an overall negative impact on the structure of economic development in California. Some experts estimate federal prevailing wage regulations increase construction costs 10 percent to 30 percent.

**Environmental Review:** The California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act require environmental review of proposed discretionary projects; e.g., subdivision maps, zone changes, etc. Costs and delays resulting from the environmental review process are added to the cost of developing housing.

**Planning and Development Fees:** Fees charged by local governments also contribute to the cost of housing. Based on recent development applications in the City, development impact fees are in the order of $15,500 per unit for a market-rate single-family home and $12,000 per unit for market-rate multi-family apartment projects, according to the 2017 Housing Element.

**Permit and Processing Procedures:** The processing time required to obtain approval of development entitlements and building permits is often cited as contributing to construction costs. In development parlance, “time is money” and developers can incur significant holding costs during a delay. Building permit applications for new single-family houses typically take 3 to 6 months to complete the building permit plan check process, sometimes longer depending upon the size of the project. Processing multi-family development applications, which often require general plan amendments, rezoning, and CEQA review, typically requires 6 months to 1 year to complete discretionary planning review. The City’s permit procedures expedite planning and building approvals where possible and are not likely to unduly constrain housing development.

**Land Use Controls:** In terms of land use controls, the General Plan is of paramount concern. This policy document not only establishes the location and amount of land that will be allocated to residential development, but also establishes the intensity of development in terms of unit densities and total number of units, that will be permitted. While nearly all components or elements of the General Plan contain goals and policies that influence residential development, it is the Land Use Element that has
the most direct influence. Jurupa Valley’s development standards do not contain any unduly restrictive provisions. Building height, setbacks, lot areas, and parking are generally within the range of other cities in the State. The City’s processing and permit procedures are consistent with state planning and zoning law and are not considered to be an unreasonable constraint on the cost or supply of housing. The City will consider an amendment to the Zoning Code to eliminate the requirement for discretionary review for multi-family development in multi-family residential zones to expedite permit processing for projects that conform to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance development standards.

**Strategy to Remove or Ameliorate the Barriers to Affordable Housing**

The Jurupa Valley Housing Element states, “incentives are preferable to regulations as the means to facilitate the production of housing for all income levels.” To encourage the production of lower-cost housing the City has identified various incentives for property owners and developers to consider. Among these possible incentives are modifications to development standards, reduced development fees, expedited permit processing, and direct financial assistance from in-lieu Inclusionary Housing Program (IHP) fees.

Prior to the City’s incorporation, the IHP was previously administered by the County of Riverside. The City plans to continue and update the IHP. The IHP will help ensure that a portion of newly developed housing units is affordable to working-class residents with incomes up to 80% of the area-wide median income (AMI), which is about $65,000 per year in Riverside County in 2017. The program requires that one out of every 25 newly developed housing units (4%) be reserved for households at the 50% AMI income level. Housing projects of six or more units are required to participate in the program. Affordable units must be provided on-site, off-site, or through the payment of an in-lieu fee. These fees can be combined with other sources of funds to assist in providing additional affordable housing opportunities in the City.
SP-60 Homelessness Strategy – 91.215(d)

Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

As previously outlined, the City has initiated steps to partner with local homeless service providers that have experience assisting the region’s homeless population. These agencies typically have established outreach and assessment programs that engage the homeless and link them to appropriate housing and services. It is anticipated that the City will utilize CDBG funding during the Consolidated Plan cycle for such services.

Addressing the emergency and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

As Table 43 indicates, there are no homeless shelters located in the City; however, according to HUD’s 2017 Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Programs Housing Inventory Count Report, there are 634 emergency shelter beds in the Riverside County Continuum of Care (RC-CoC). Shelter beds are located throughout the county including Path of Life Ministries and Operation Safe House, which are situated in adjacent communities.

HUD data also indicates there 220 transitional shelter beds in the RC-CoC, with 35 beds located in the neighboring City of Riverside. In recent years HUD has encouraged regional continuums of care to move away from traditional transitional housing programs toward rapid rehousing. This housing first approach to housing the homeless provides short-term rental assistance and services, with services ending once rental assistance terminates. The goal is to help homeless households obtain housing quickly, increase self-sufficiency, and remain housed. HUD data reports in 2017 there were 277 rapid rehousing beds throughout the RC-CoC.

Jurupa Valley has initiated discussions with several local and regional service providers for the purpose of exploring partnership opportunities. It is anticipated that the City will utilize CDBG funding during the Consolidated Plan cycle for such services. Additionally, as a CDBG Entitlement Community, and consistent with the Housing Element, the City will participate in regional efforts to address homelessness.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again.

Pursuant to current HUD directives, the RC-CoC has established a coordinated entry system whereby a homeless individual or family, seeking shelter and services is directed to a streamlined system that
facilitates access to appropriate housing and services. The system screens applicants for eligibility for services, such as homelessness prevention, rapid rehousing, emergency shelter, affordable housing, permanent supportive housing, and other interventions. The needs and strengths of each household are assessed to determine which interventions will be most effective and appropriate, while also prioritizing people for assistance based on the severity of their needs. Most regional service providers participate in the coordinated entry process. Through the system, homeless households are placed in appropriate housing including rapid rehousing and permanent supportive housing.

**Help low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families who are likely to become homeless after being discharged from a publicly funded institution or system of care, or who are receiving assistance from public and private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education or youth needs**

The City will explore the use of CDBG resources to support agencies that provide a variety of safety net services aimed at preventing households from becoming homeless. Examples of these services include food banks and rent/utility assistance. It is anticipated that the City will utilize CDBG funding during the Consolidated Plan cycle for such services.
SP-65 Lead based paint Hazards – 91.215(i)

Actions to address LBP hazards and increase access to housing without LBP hazards

HUD regulations require a community to test for lead-based paint hazards for all housing units constructed prior to 1978 that are assisted with federal funds. According to data from the Housing Market Analysis, approximately 55% of the City’s housing stock was constructed before 1980.

HUD has produced informational material on the dangers of lead-based paint hazards in English and Spanish. The City will ensure these materials are available at public counters at City Hall and posted on the City’s website, to inform and educate residents about the lead poisoning.

If the City establishes a CDBG-funded housing rehabilitation program, program staff will ensure all assisted units are assessed for lead-based paint hazards. If lead hazards are identified, project funding may be allocated to mitigate or remove lead-based paint hazards.

How are the actions listed above related to the extent of lead poisoning and hazards?

The Housing Market Analysis indicates that a total of 13,830 housing units were built prior to 1980. Based on national statistics, three-fourths of housing units constructed prior to 1980 contain lead-based paint; accordingly, an estimated 10,373 housing units in the City may contain lead-based paint hazards.

Education is the initial step to mitigating a problem. By providing information regarding lead-based paint hazards, residents can take immediate action to ascertain their risk level and take corrective or preventive action. The Housing Market Analysis also found that over 3,000 housing units are in need of repair or rehabilitation. As the City considers the implementation of a housing rehabilitation program, program design considerations will be given to HUD’s lead-based paint testing and mitigation requirements.

How are the actions listed above integrated into housing policies and procedures?

Currently, the City does not offer housing rehabilitation assistance. It is envisioned that such a program may be implemented with CDBG funds in future years to address deferred property improvements and health and safety issues resulting from an aging housing stock. Housing rehabilitation program policies and procedures will require all properties constructed prior to 1978 to be tested for lead. If lead is found, it will be removed or encapsulated as required by current HUD regulations.
SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy – 91.215(j)

Jurisdiction Goals, Programs and Policies for reducing the number of Poverty-Level Families

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, 15.8% of the City’s population is living at or below the poverty level. The Census Bureau reports that 11.5% of Jurupa Valley residents age 65 and older are living in poverty as are 21.9% of residents age 18 years and younger. [1]

The City has identified several activities and services that can be implemented to reduce poverty:

- Support rental assistance programs provided by the Housing Authority of Riverside County for very low-income renters, especially senior and disabled households, and households with children.
- Support homeless prevention services for individuals presently housed but at risk of losing their residence. As resources permit, assist those already homeless in need of emergency shelter, transitional housing, rapid rehousing, and permanent supportive housing.
- Support public social services that provide a social safety net for lower income individuals.
- Explore implementation of housing rehabilitation programs for lower income homeowners, especially senior households.

[1] 2009-2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table #S1701

How are the Jurisdiction poverty reducing goals, programs, and policies coordinated with this affordable housing plan

The City’s anti-poverty strategy calls for assisting lower income households, especially for seniors, the disabled, and families with children. The support for HARC’s rental assistance programs for very low-income renters is consistent with the City’s affordable housing plan. Additionally, safety net programs (e.g., financial assistance and senior services) will assist households that may be at risk of becoming homeless by allowing them to redirect limited income toward maintaining housing.
SP-80 Monitoring – 91.230

Describe the standards and procedures that the jurisdiction will use to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan and will use to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements.

The City will establish a monitoring program to ensure compliance with CDBG program requirements.

As the City’s CDBG program develops, a monitoring program will be established for activities such as public services. For such services, subrecipients will be required to submit quarterly accomplishment reports to program staff. Providers will be required to provide information regarding the number of clients served and the overall progress of their programs. City staff will also conduct onsite monitoring to review subrecipient performance, quality of services, and grant administration abilities. If necessary, corrective actions will be recommended by the City to ensure compliance with applicable federal laws and regulations. Monitoring will be conducted annually, but for experienced service providers, the City may conduct onsite visits every other year. Agencies new to CDBG or that have administrative or programmatic issues will be monitored annually until grant management competence is proven.

For public facility and infrastructure improvement, project managers will be required to report project status on a quarterly basis. Quarterly reports will include a list of project milestones, target and actual completion dates, and planned and actual expenditures. Housing rehabilitation program activity will also be required to submit regular program accomplishment reports (quarterly or semi-annually).

All accomplishment report information will be input on a regular basis into IDIS. Year-end accomplishment information will be submitted to HUD as part of the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER).

With respect to minority and women-owned businesses, the City will solicit the interest of a wide variety of companies and firms to undertake HUD-funded activities including minority and women-owned businesses.
Expected Resources

AP-15 Expected Resources – 91.220(c)(1,2)

Introduction

Ongoing reductions and fluctuations in CDBG funding make it difficult to estimate the amount that will be available over the five-year Consolidated Plan cycle. Housing voucher/certificate resources (via HARC) will be available to carry out activities that support the goals of the Consolidated Plan.

Anticipated Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Uses of Funds</th>
<th>Expected Amount Available Year 1</th>
<th>Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan</th>
<th>Narrative Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>public - federal</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$1,189,419</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>Annual CDBG allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Admin and Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 54 - Expected Resources – Priority Table
Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

Other resources that will be available to carry out activities that address the goals of the Consolidated Plan are limited:

- HARC reports that as of February 2018, 244 Jurupa Valley households received rental assistance. It is anticipated that a similar number of households will be assisted annually over the five-year period of the Consolidated Plan.
- Jurupa Valley intends to continue and update an existing Inclusionary Housing Program previously administered by the County of Riverside. This program requires that 1 out of every 25 new units (4%) be reserved for households at the 50% area median income level. Projects of six or more units are required to participate in the program. Affordable units must be provided on-site, off-site, or through the payment of an in-lieu fee.

CDBG does not require matching funds.
If appropriate, describe publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan

The City conducted a detailed inventory of potential housing sites as part of the 2017 General Plan process. This study evaluated specific parcels, development constraints, and potential development capacity. The analysis indicated that 902 vacant parcels (or 2,432 vacant acres) in the City appear to be developable for housing. Additionally, parts of 73 additional parcels appear to be developable. These parcels, which are classified as Partially Constrained Parcels, include approximately 677 acres of additional land that could be used to accommodate new residential development in the City. A comprehensive list of these parcels is found in the City’s General Plan Appendices.

Discussion

Funding resources to implement the City’s Consolidated Plan are limited. It is anticipated that CDBG funding will continue to be reduced. With respect to other resources, the City will continue to support HARC’s efforts to secure new rental assistance resources. As outlined above, an inventory of vacant land has been developed by the City. Additionally, the City’s Housing Element indicates the City will continue to implement an Inclusionary Housing Program, which will ensure the creation of affordable housing units and/or the accumulation of in-lieu-fees that can be used to assist with the development of affordable housing.
## Annual Goals and Objectives

### AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives

#### Goals Summary Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort Order</th>
<th>Goal Name</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>End Year</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Geographic Area</th>
<th>Needs Addressed</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Goal Outcome Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Public Improvements</td>
<td>CDBG: $897,339</td>
<td>Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 3000 Persons Assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Homeless Services</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>CDBG: $75,000</td>
<td>Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 30 Persons Assisted Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 5 Households Assisted Homeless Person Overnight Shelter: 10 Persons Assisted Homelessness Prevention: 15 Persons Assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair Housing Services</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>CDBG: $25,000</td>
<td>Other: 200 Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>CDBG: $192,020</td>
<td>Other: 1 Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Goal Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goal Name</th>
<th>Goal Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>CDBG funds to install and upgrade public improvements to comply with ADA regulations <em>and improve public infrastructure</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Homeless Services</td>
<td>Homeless housing and support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair Housing Services</td>
<td>Outreach, education and enforcement services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>CDBG program oversight and coordination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projects

AP-35 Projects – 91.220(d)

Introduction

The following activities have been allocated CDBG funds for Fiscal Year (FY) 2018-2019.

Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ADA Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Homeless Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair Housing Council of Riverside County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CDBG Program Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rubidoux Blvd Pavement Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table S6 – Project Information

Describe the reasons for allocation priorities and any obstacles to addressing underserved needs

FY 2018-2019 is the first year the City will administer CDBG funds on its own. As a Cooperating City in the CDBG Urban County Program, the City worked with Riverside County staff to implement several Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) related projects, public facility improvement projects, and public services. The City will continue to utilize CDBG funds to construct ADA improvements throughout the City to improve accessibility and mobility for individuals with disabilities. Funding will also be utilized to improve lower income neighborhoods by investing in the infrastructure (i.e., street pavement rehabilitation). CDBG funding will also be allocated to address the needs of the homeless and those at risk of becoming homeless, especially burgeoning homeless populations such as seniors and families with children. Fair housing services will provide residents, landlords, and property managers with information and knowledge regarding fair housing laws with the goal of reducing or eliminating housing discrimination. This program will benefit all Jurupa Valley residents including protected classes such as individuals with disabilities and families with children.
## AP-38 Project Summary
### Project Summary Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>ADA Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target Area</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goals Supported</td>
<td>Public Infrastructure Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs Addressed</td>
<td>Public Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td><strong>CDBG: $207,399</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>CDBG funds to install and upgrade facility improvements to comply with ADA regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target Date</td>
<td>6/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities</td>
<td>An estimated 3,000 disabled Jurupa Valley residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location Description</td>
<td><strong>Mission Blvd between Valley and Crestmore</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planned Activities</td>
<td><strong>Install handicap accessible parking stalls on Mission Blvd</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Homeless Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target Area</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goals Supported</td>
<td>Homeless Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs Addressed</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>CDBG: $75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Homelessness prevention, outreach, shelter and rapid rehousing services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target Date</td>
<td>6/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities</td>
<td>60 individuals (30 outreach, 15 prevention, 10 interim shelter, and 5 rapid rehousing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location Description</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planned Activities</td>
<td>Homeless outreach and engagement in order to link individuals to rapid rehousing and support services. Funding also allocated to provide direct financial assistance to prevent the loss of housing and to assist those already homeless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Fair Housing Council of Riverside County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Area</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals Supported</td>
<td>Fair Housing Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Addressed</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>CDBG: $25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Fair housing outreach, education and enforcement services with the goal to reduce and eliminate impediments to the fair access of housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Date</td>
<td>6/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities</td>
<td>200 households</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Description</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Activities</td>
<td>Fair housing outreach, education and enforcement services including: landlord, tenant and property management fair housing training; community outreach and education; complaint investigation and enforcement services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>CDBG Program Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Area</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals Supported</td>
<td>Program Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Addressed</td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>CDBG: $192,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>CDBG program oversight and coordination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Date</td>
<td>6/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Description</td>
<td>8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Activities</td>
<td>Program oversight and coordination including management of public service grants, housing and commercial rehabilitation programs, and preparation of required applications and reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Rubidoux Blvd Street Pavement Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Area</td>
<td>CDBG-Eligible Block Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals Supported</td>
<td>Public Infrastructure Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Addressed</td>
<td>Public Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>CDBG: $690,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Improve roadway by rehabilitating deteriorated pavement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Date</td>
<td>06/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities</td>
<td>5,250 residents of which 3,520 are low and moderate-income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Description</td>
<td>Rubidoux Blvd between Mission Blvd and Frontage Road - Census Tract: 0401.01 Block Group: 2 and Census Tract: 0402.04 Block Groups: 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Activities</td>
<td>Rehabilitate approximately 200,000 SF of asphalt concrete by grinding and replacing roadway surface with new overlay. Repair or reconstruct roadway base as necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AP-50 Geographic Distribution – 91.220(f)

Description of the geographic areas of the entitlement (including areas of low-income and minority concentration) where assistance will be directed

All activities slated for CDBG-funding during FY 2018-2019 will be available on a citywide basis. These activities include ADA-related improvements, homeless services, fair housing services, and program administration. In future years, some activities may be limited to income-eligible program beneficiaries, or to specific areas of the City (i.e., Block Groups) where a significant percentage of residents meet HUD’s income limits. A map of the City’s CDBG Target Areas is provided in the Consolidated Plan Appendix (Please see map in Attachment 3: CDBG Eligible Areas Map).

Geographic Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Area</th>
<th>Percentage of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDBG-Eligible Block Groups</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 57 - Geographic Distribution

Rationale for the priorities for allocating investments geographically

For FY 2018-2019, funding is allocated on a citywide basis.

January 2019 Substantial Amendment

Based on evaluation of proposed ADA improvements, it was determined that one of the two locations identified for CDBG-funded improvements was not a strong candidate. Public Works staff was asked to identify an alternate project that will address a priority ConPlan need. Roadway improvements to Rubidoux Boulevard between Mission Boulevard and Frontage Road was identified as the alternate project. Based on current HUD data, an estimated 5,250 residents live within the three Block Groups that encompass the project service area; this project area is approximately 67 percent low and moderate-income.

Discussion

As indicated above, CDBG funds will be allocated to programs that serve Jurupa Valley residents regardless of where they live.
Affordable Housing

AP-55 Affordable Housing – 91.220(g)

Introduction

For FY 2018-2019, the City will not utilize CDBG resources to fund housing activities. This may change in future years as the City develops its CDBG program over the course of the Consolidated Plan cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One Year Goals for the Number of Households to be Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special-Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 58 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Requirement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One Year Goals for the Number of Households Supported Through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Production of New Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab of Existing Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of Existing Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 59 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Type*

Discussion

The City will not use CDBG funds for housing activities; however, the City will continue to support HARC’s implementation of the federal rental assistance voucher and certificate program. An estimated 340 Jurupa Valley households will benefit from this program during FY 2018-2019.
AP-60 Public Housing – 91.220(h)

Introduction

The City of does own or manage public housing.

Actions planned during the next year to address the needs to public housing

Not applicable

Actions to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership

Not applicable

If the PHA is designated as troubled, describe the manner in which financial assistance will be provided or other assistance

Not applicable

Discussion

The City of does own or manage public housing.
AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities – 91.220(i)

Introduction

As outlined in the Strategic Plan, the City will utilize a portion of CDBG funds during FY 2018-2019 to support agencies that provide homeless services.

Describe the jurisdictions one-year goals and actions for reducing and ending homelessness including

Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

The City of Jurupa Valley does not directly fund homeless outreach services; however, the City will support programs that work directly with both sheltered and unsheltered homeless populations. These regional homeless service providers have developed extensive outreach and assessment programs that engage the homeless and provide an entry point into the RC-CoC.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

There are no emergency or transitional housing beds in Jurupa Valley. As detailed in the Strategic Plan, HUD has encouraged service providers to move away from these traditional forms of shelter toward rapid rehousing. The City will seek out partnerships with service providers that offer traditional shelter and supportive services, and rapid rehousing for the City’s homeless population. CDBG funding may be allocated for these services.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again

HUD’s 2017 Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Programs Housing Inventory Count Report indicates there are 1,520 permanent supportive housing beds throughout the Riverside County Continuum of Care. The majority of these beds (890) are tied to the Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) rental housing voucher program that is administered by the HARC. The City will continue to support HARC and its efforts to secure additional VASH vouchers, Shelter Plus Care vouchers, and rental assistance vouchers and certificates.

Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: being discharged from publicly
funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); or, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs

According to HUD’s Strategies for Preventing Homelessness, “Homelessness prevention is an essential element of any effort to end homelessness either locally or nationwide.” This HUD report indicates it is less expensive and disruptive to keep a household housed in place. To this end, the City will explore the use of CDBG funds to support programs that provide direct assistance to households at risk of becoming homeless. The City will also participate in regional homeless planning efforts, including the RC-CoC’s Discharge Plan, which aims to prevent individuals leaving institutions, hospitals, etc., from becoming homeless.

Discussion

The City’s homeless strategy is to help prevent homelessness and to support local service providers as they engage and assess the City’s homeless. Funding may also be provided to support rapid rehousing programming efforts that help ensure homeless individuals obtain housing and the support services needed to achieve and maintain self-sufficiency.
AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.220(j)

Introduction:

Barriers to affordable housing and actions to overcome barriers are listed in the City’s Housing Element and have been discussed in the Strategic Plan.

Actions it planned to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment.

The Jurupa Valley Housing Element states, “incentives are preferable to regulations as the means to facilitate the production of housing for all income levels.” To encourage the production of lower-cost housing the City has identified various incentives for property owners and developers to consider. Among these possible incentives are modifications to development standards, reduced development fees, expedited permit processing, and direct financial assistance from in-lieu Inclusionary Housing Program (IHP) fees. No projects are currently underway that are utilizing these incentives.

Discussion:

The Housing Element and Consolidated Plan Housing Market Analysis identify several barriers to the creation of affordable housing opportunities. The Housing Element has also identified several actions the City can take to reduce the impact of these barriers on the development of affordable housing; however, no projects are currently under development that are using these incentives.
AP-85 Other Actions – 91.220(k)

Introduction:

Outlined below are the actions the City will implement during FY 2018-2019 to address the sub-strategies of the Strategic Plan.

Actions planned to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs

During FY 2018-2019, the City will encourage and support HARC’s efforts to obtain additional rental assistance funding, especially for senior, disabled, and low-income households. CDBG-funded public facility improvements to be undertaken during the year will provide barrier-free access to individuals with disabilities and mobility limitations. Finally, fair housing services will help ensure all households can secure safe and decent housing that they desire and can afford, without regard to their race, color, religion, gender, national origin, familial status, disability, age, source of income or other characteristics protected by laws.

Actions planned to foster and maintain affordable housing

As previously outlined, the City will not utilize CDBG funds to support any housing activities during FY 2018-2019. The City will continue to support HARC’s administration of HUD’s voucher and certificate rental assistance program.

Actions planned to reduce lead-based paint hazards

A significant percentage of the City’s housing stock was constructed before 1980 and may contain lead-based paint hazards. The City will ensure that information is available to community residents regarding the health impacts of lead-based hazards, especially for young children. As the City develops its housing rehabilitation program, it will ensure that HUD’s regulations regarding lead-based paint hazards are incorporated into program policies and procedures.

Actions planned to reduce the number of poverty-level families

As previously outlined, approximately 15.8% of the City’s population is living at or below the poverty level including 21.9% of children under the age of 18 and 11.5% of seniors (age 65 and older). During FY 2018-2019 the City will support several activities that aim to reduce the number of households living in poverty:

- Support HARC’s administration of rental assistance programs for very low-income renters.
- Support social service programs that assist households at risk of becoming homeless and those that are homeless.
- Support fair housing services to ensure households have access to safe and decent housing free of discrimination.
Actions planned to develop institutional structure

As the City prepared to become a CDBG grantee community, it initiated efforts to develop an institutional structure that will help identify and access resources to improve the community. The City solicited the input of local service providers by a community workshop to discuss community needs and future funding opportunities. The City will continue to assist the HARC to implement its Five-year Public Housing Authority (PHA) Plan for the provision of rental assistance vouchers and certificates. The City will also engage neighboring HUD-grantee communities to explore and participate in regional planning and program initiatives.

Actions planned to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies

The City of Jurupa Valley does not operate public housing. HARC provides rental assistance in the community. Federal legislation requires that the Housing Authority prepare five-year and one-year plans that highlight its mission, goals, and objectives as it relates to public and assisted housing programs. The City will review the Authority’s plans and will provide HARC the opportunity to review and consult with the City regarding its Consolidated Plan. The goal of this cross-consultation is to provide consistent and coordinated housing services for City residents.

As stated above, Jurupa Valley has developed working relationships with several local nonprofits. As the City expands its CDBG program to provide public service grant funding, it will coordinate efforts with nonprofit partners to promote the efficient and effective use of limited public resources.

Discussion:

As indicated in the Strategic Plan, the City’s current AI is summarized in the Attachment 4. Action steps to be taken during FY 2018-2019 are also found in Attachment 4.
Program Specific Requirements

AP-90 Program Specific Requirements – 91.220(l)(1,2,4)

Introduction:

Each HUD program that is covered by the Consolidated Plan regulations must address certain program-specific requirements. Below are the requirements for the CDBG program as prescribed by the Consolidated Plan template.

Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG)
Reference 24 CFR 91.220(l)(1)

Projects planned with all CDBG funds expected to be available during the year are identified in the Projects Table. The following identifies program income that is available for use that is included in projects to be carried out.

1. The total amount of program income that will have been received before the start of the next program year and that has not yet been reprogrammed 0
2. The amount of proceeds from section 108 loan guarantees that will be used during the year to address the priority needs and specific objectives identified in the grantee’s strategic plan. 0
3. The amount of surplus funds from urban renewal settlements 0
4. The amount of any grant funds returned to the line of credit for which the planned use has not been included in a prior statement or plan 0
5. The amount of income from float-funded activities 0
Total Program Income: 0

Other CDBG Requirements

1. The amount of urgent need activities 0

2. The estimated percentage of CDBG funds that will be used for activities that benefit persons of low and moderate income. Overall Benefit - A consecutive period of one, two or three years may be used to determine that a minimum overall benefit of 70% of CDBG funds is used to benefit persons of low and moderate income. Specify the years covered that include this Annual Action Plan. 100.00%
The City will meet the overall 70% benefit for low- and moderate-income requirement during the one-year 2018 Program Year.
Attachments
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Notice is hereby given that the City of Jurupa Valley is seeking public input regarding a proposed amendment to the City’s Annual Action Plan for Fiscal Year (FY) 2018-2019, a component of the 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan.

As a recipient of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the City Council approved the Consolidated Plan and FY 2018-2019 Annual Action Plan on June 7, 2018. The primary objective of the CDBG program is the development of viable urban communities by providing decent housing, a suitable living environment, and expanding economic opportunities principally for persons of low- and moderate-income (those earning 80 percent or less of Riverside County’s median income). The Consolidated Plan is a five-year strategic plan that identifies priority community needs, and projects/programs that may be implemented to meet these needs. The Annual Action Plan identifies the specific activities the City will undertake with CDBG funds to address priority needs during a fiscal year.

The City is proposing an amendment to the 2018-2019 Action Plan, specifically, the reallocation of $690,000 in CDBG funding originally allocated for ADA Improvements. Reallocated resources will be utilized to fund an activity previously not identified in the 2018-2019 Action Plan: Rubidoux Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation from Mission Boulevard to Frontage Road. Because the City is proposing to add an activity previously not identified in the 2018-2019 Action Plan, it is required to hold a 30-day public review and comment period and a public hearing regarding the proposed amendment.

The draft amended 2018-2019 Action Plan and 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan will be available for public review at City Hall, Louis Rubidoux and Glen Avon libraries, and on the City’s website (http://www.jurupavalley.org) beginning December 19, 2018 through 12:00 PM on January 17, 2019. Additional public input will be received at a public hearing. The details of the hearing are listed below. All interested persons are invited to attend the public hearing to discuss the proposed amendment. If you are unable to attend, written comments will be accepted prior to 12:00 PM on January 17, 2019, at the address below.

City Council Public Hearing
Date: Thursday, January 17, 2019
Time: 7:00 p.m. or soon after
Location: Jurupa Valley City Council Chamber, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509.

For further information, please contact Sean McGovern at smcgovern@jurupavalley.org. Written comments should be directed to the attention of Sean McGovern at 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you require a disability related accommodation to attend or participate in this meeting, please call the City Clerk at (951) 332-6464 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

Publish:
December 18, 2018
STAFF REPORT

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER

BY: STEVE R. LORISO, P.E.,
CITY ENGINEER/ DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 12.D

PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE ANNEXATION OF TERRITORY (ZONE 2-B – VALLEY SQUARE; SOUTHWEST CORNER OF MISSION BLVD AND PYRITE ST) TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO. 89-1-CONSOLIDATED (THE “DISTRICT”) AND THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF ASSESSMENTS WITHIN SUCH TERRITORY

RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-06, entitled:


BACKGROUND

The Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, being Part 2 of Division 15 of the California Streets and Highways Code (the “Act”) and Article XIII D of the California Constitution (“Proposition 218”), requires the City Council conduct proceedings to annex territory into an assessment district formed under the Act and to levy assessments within such territory.
In connection with the City’s incorporation in 2011, the Local Agency Formation Commission of Riverside County (LAFCO) adopted its Resolution No. 12-10 on July 22, 2010, to establish the Terms and Conditions of Incorporation, which require that the authority and responsibility for special assessment districts within the incorporated City associated with any County Landscape Maintenance District be transferred to the City upon its incorporation.

By its Resolution No. 2011-26, adopted on July 1, 2011, the City Council assumed all authority and responsibility for the special assessment districts within the incorporated City associated with any County Landscape Maintenance District and specifically assumed responsibility for any and all special assessments levied in connection with such districts.

The County’s Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated (the “County District”), established pursuant to the provisions of the Act includes various territories located both within the incorporated boundaries of the City (the “City Territory”) and outside the incorporated boundaries of the City (the “County Territory”). Pursuant to its Resolution No. 2016-01 adopted on February 4, 2016, the City declared that the City Territory is a district under the 1972 Act, which is separate and distinct from the County Territory, and designated such territory as the “Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated.”

At its November 15, 2018 meeting, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2018-68 initiating proceedings for the annexation of territory to the Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated (the “District”) as Zone 2-B and the levy and collection of assessments within such territory. Zone 2-B includes 3 assessable parcels within one legal lot, generally located at the southwest corner of Mission Blvd and Pyrite St.

Further, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2018-70 declaring its intention to annex territory to the District and to levy and collect assessments within such territory for fiscal year 2019-20. Resolution No. 2018-70 sets January 17, 2019 as the public hearing date for protests to the levy of annual assessments and the annexation.

Subsequent to the November 15, 2018 meeting and in accordance with the Act and Proposition 218, notice was mailed to the owners of the properties within the territory to be annexed, along with an assessment ballot for such owners to indicate support for, or opposition to, the proposed annexation. The notice indicated the amount of the proposed assessment for their respective parcels and the date, time and place of the public hearing.
ANALYSIS

It is proposed to include the additional parcels within the boundaries of the District and to levy assessments within such territory for fiscal year 2019-20. Such territory is shown on a map on file in the office of the City Clerk and is open to public inspection.

At the public hearing, the City Council must hear and consider all oral and written statements, protests, objections or other communications made or filed with respect to the annexation of territory to the District and the levy and collection of annual assessments within such territory.

The assessment ballots must be tabulated at the public hearing. A majority protest exists if ballots submitted in opposition to the assessment and annexation exceed the ballots submitted in favor of the assessment and annexation. In tabulating the ballots, the ballots shall be weighted according to the proportional financial obligation of the affected property. In the absence of a majority protest, the City Council may adopt a resolution ordering the annexation and levy and collection of assessments within the territory.

OTHER INFORMATION

- City Council initiated proceedings for the annexation on November 15, 2018.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The property owners are responsible for the annual payments of the special assessment. The City will file the special assessment with the County Auditor-Controller for collection via the annual property tax bills. The property owners have posted a deposit with their application to form Zone 2-B, in order to cover City costs incurred in connection with the annexation. Approval of this resolution does not in any way commit the City to any financial contribution or liability for the Zone 2-B. The City's cost to administer Zone 2-B annually will be reimbursed through the special assessment charged to property owners. The fiscal year 2019-20 (base year) maximum assessment for landscape maintenance and street lighting for each parcel is $85.15 and is subject to escalation beginning in FY 2020-21 to account for reasonable increase cost for maintenance and inflation.

The revenue from this special assessment will be deposited into City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-1-C and will be used to pay for the services provided in Zone 2-B. Both the revenue and expenses will be part of the City's FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget, and there is no anticipated impact to the General Fund.
CONCLUSION

It is recommended that the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-06 ordering annexation of territory to the District and the levy and collect assessments within such territory for fiscal year 2019-20.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Take no action.

2. Provide staff with further direction.

************************** SIGNATURES ON FOLLOWING PAGE ****************************
Prepared by:

Jennifer S. Garcia, E.I.T.
Assistant Engineer

Reviewed by:

Steve R. Lorisó, P.E.
City Engineer/Dir. of Public Works

Reviewed by:

George A. Wentz
Deputy City Manager

Submitted by:

Gary Thompson
City Manager

Reviewed by:

Peter M. Thorson
City Attorney

Reviewed by:

Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Attachments:

1. Resolution No. 2019-06; Ordering Annexation
2. Engineer's Report
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-06


THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY HEREBY FINDS, DETERMINES, RESOLVES AND ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Pursuant to the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, Part 2 of Division 15 of the California Streets and Highways Code (hereinafter referred to as the "Act"), the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley initiated proceedings for the annexation of territory to City of Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated (hereinafter referred to as the "District") and the levy and collection of assessments within such territory for the 2019-2020 fiscal year and caused to be prepared a written report (the "Engineer's Report") in accordance with the Act and Article XIII D of the California Constitution.

Section 2. Following notice duly given in accordance with law, the City Council has held a full and fair public hearing regarding the Engineer's Report, the annexation of territory to the District, and the levy and collection of the proposed assessment within such territory for fiscal year 2019-2020. All interested persons were afforded the opportunity to hear and be heard. The City Council considered all oral and written statements, protests and communications made or filed by interested persons and tabulated all ballots. The City Council hereby finds that a majority protest does not exist as defined in Section 4(e) of Article XIII D of the California Constitution. All protests and objections to the annexation of territory to the District and the levy and collection of the proposed assessment against lots or parcels of property within the annexed territory for fiscal year 2019-2020 are hereby overruled by the City Council.

Section 3. The City Council hereby orders the annexation of territory, which is described as Assessor’s Parcel Number 171-260-013, to the District. The District will continue to be designated as City of Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1- Consolidated.

-1-
Section 4. Based upon its review of the Engineer's Report and other reports and information, the City Council hereby finds and determines that (i) the land within the annexed territory will be benefited by the improvements as described in such Engineer’s Report, (ii) the annexed territory includes all of the lands so benefited, (iii) the net amount to be assessed upon the lands within the annexed territory for the 2019-2020 fiscal year, in accordance with the Engineer's Report, is apportioned by a formula and method which fairly distributes the net amount among all assessable lots or parcels in proportion to the estimated benefits to be received by each such lot or parcel from the improvements; and (iv) only special benefits are assessed and no assessment is imposed on any parcel which exceeds the reasonable cost of the proportional special benefit conferred on that parcel.

Section 5. The City Council hereby orders the proposed improvements to be made, which improvements are briefly described as follows: The installation and planting of landscaping, including trees, shrubs, grass and other ornamental vegetation; the installation or construction of public lighting facilities including but not limited to, street lights; the installation or construction of any facilities which are appurtenant to any of the foregoing, or which are necessary or convenient for the maintenance or servicing thereof, including, but not limited to, grading, clearing, removal of debris; the installation or construction of curbs, gutters, walls, sidewalks or paving, water irrigation, drainage or electrical facilities; and, the maintenance and/or servicing of any of the foregoing.

Section 6. Lots or parcels of land within the annexed territory that are owned or used by any county, city, city and county, special district or any other local governmental entity, the State of California, or the United States shall be assessed unless the City demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that such lots or parcels receive no special benefit from the proposed improvements.

Section 7. The City Council hereby confirms the diagram and assessment, with respect to the annexed parcels, as originally proposed in the Engineer's Report.

Section 8. The assessment is in compliance with the provisions of the Act and Article XIIID of the California Constitution.

Section 9. The assessment is levied without regard to property valuation.

Section 10. The assessment is levied for the purpose of paying the costs and expenses of the improvements described in Section 5 above for the fiscal year commencing on July 1, 2019 and ending on June 30, 2020.

Section 11. The adoption of this Resolution constitutes the levy of an assessment for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 2019 and ending June 30, 2020.

Section 12. The improvements shall be performed pursuant to law.

Section 13. The County Auditor of Riverside County shall enter on the County
Assessment Roll opposite each lot or parcel of land the amount of the assessment and such assessments shall then be collected at the same time and in the same manner as the County taxes are collected. After collection by the County, the net amount of the assessments shall be paid to the City Administrative Services Director.

Section 14. The Administrative Director shall deposit all moneys representing assessments collected by the County to the credit of a special fund known as "City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-I-C Zone 2-B," and such moneys shall be expended only for the improvements described in Section 5 above.

Section 15. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to file the diagram and assessment, or a certified copy of the diagram and assessment, with the County Auditor, together with a certified copy of this Resolution upon its adoption.

Section 16. A certified copy of the diagram and assessment shall be filed in the office of the City Engineer, with a duplicate copy on file in the office of the City Clerk and open for public inspection.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 17th day of January, 2019.

__________________________________
Brian Berkson
Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  )
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  ) ss.
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY  )

I, Victoria Wasko, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-06 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on January 17, 2019 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: 

NOES: 

ABSENT: 

ABSTAIN: 

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, on January 17, 2019.

________________________________
Victoria Wasko, City Clerk
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

ENGINEER’S REPORT FOR
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING
MAINTENANCE DISTRICT
NO. 89-1-CONSOLIDATED

ZONE 2-B
VALLEY SQUARE

November 2018

Prepared By:
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AGENCY: CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
SUBJECT: ANNEXATION OF PARCEL 36977 TO CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO.89-1-CONSOLIDATED ("CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY L&LMD NO.89-1-C") AS ZONE 2-B
TO: CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY CITY COUNCIL

Pursuant to the direction from the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley ("City Council"), California, this Engineer’s Report ("Report") is prepared and hereby submitted for the City of Jurupa Valley ("City") in compliance with the provisions of Section 22565 through 22574 of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 ("1972 Act"), said Act being Part 2 of Division 15 of the Streets and Highways Code of the State of California, Section 4 of Article XIII D of the California Constitution.

This Report provides for the annexation of Parcel Map 36977 to City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD No. 89-1-C as Zone 2-B and establishes the Maximum Assessment to be levied in the Fiscal Year commencing July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020 (2019-2020) and continuing in all subsequent Fiscal Years, for this area to be known and designated as:

CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY L&LMD NO. 89-1-C ZONE 2-B

Valley Square

I do hereby assess and apportion the total amount of the costs and expenses upon several parcels of land within said designated area liable therefor and benefited thereby, in proportion to the estimated benefits that each parcel receives, respectively, from said services.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, the appointed ENGINEER, acting on behalf of the City of Jurupa Valley, pursuant to the 1972 Act, do hereby submit the following:

Pursuant to the provisions of law, the costs and expenses of the Zone have been assessed upon the parcels of land in the Zone benefited thereby in direct proportion and relation to the estimated benefits to be received by each of said parcels. For particulars as to the identification of said parcels, reference is made to the Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map, a reduced copy of which is included herein.

As required by law, an Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map is filed herewith, showing the Zone, as well as the boundaries and dimensions of the respective parcels and subdivisions of land within said Zone as they exist, as of the date of this Report, each of which subdivisions of land or parcels or lots, respectively, have been assigned a parcel/lot number within a specific tract and indicated on said Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map and in the Assessment Roll contained herein.

The separate numbers given the subdivisions and parcels of land, as shown on said Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map and Assessment Roll, correspond with the numbers assigned to each parcel by the Riverside County Assessor. Reference is made to the County Assessor Roll for a description of the lots or parcels.
As of the date of this Report, there are no parcels or lots within Zone 2-B that are owned by a federal, state or other local governmental agency that will benefit from the services to be provided by the assessments to be collected.

November 15, 2018.

[Signature]

Steve Loriso, R.C.E.

[Stamp]
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the provisions of law, the costs and expenses of the Zone have been assessed upon the parcels of land in the Zone benefited thereby in direct proportion and relation to the estimated benefits to be received by each of said parcels. For particulars as to the identification of said parcels, reference is made to the Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map, a reduced copy of which is included herein. On this 15th day of November, 2018 the City Council, City of Jurupa Valley, State of California, ordering the preparation of the Report providing for the annexation of Parcel Map 36977 to L&LMD No. 89-1-C as Zone 2-B, pursuant to the provisions of the 1972 Act, being Division 15 of the Streets and Highways Code of the State of California, adopt Resolution No. 2018-XXXX for a special assessment district zone known and designated as:

ZONE 2-B
Valley Square

The annexation of Zone 2-B includes the parcel of land within the commercial subdivision known as Valley Square, also identified by the Assessor Parcel Number(s) 171-260-013 valid as of the date of this Report: November 15th, 2018. As required by law, an Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map is filed herewith, showing the Zone, as well as the boundaries and dimensions of the respective parcels and subdivisions of land within said Zone as they exist, as of the date of this Report, each of which subdivisions of land or parcels or lots, respectively, have been assigned a parcel/lot number within a specific tract and indicated on the Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map and in the Assessment Roll contained herein.

The following report presents the engineering analysis for the annexation of Zone 2-B and the establishment of the Maximum Assessment, based on Proposition 218 and the Act of 1972, to be levied and collected commencing Fiscal Year 2019-2020 and all subsequent fiscal years.

DEFINITIONS

Agency – Means the local government, City of Jurupa Valley.

Capital cost – Means the cost of acquisition, installation, construction, reconstruction, or replacement of a permanent public improvement by the Agency.

District – Means an area determined by the Agency to contain all parcels which will receive a special benefit from a proposed public improvement of property-related service.

Maintenance and operation expenses - Means the cost of rent, repair, replacement, rehabilitation, fuel, power, electrical current, care, and supervision necessary to properly operate and maintain a permanent public improvement.

Ad Valorem Reduction – The assessment reduction due to the general benefit value of the improvements.

Special benefit – Means a particular and distinct benefit over and above general benefits conferred on real property located in the district or to the public at large. General enhancement of property value does not constitute "special benefit."
PART I – BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT

LOCATION OF THE ASSESSMENT ZONE

Zone 2-B shall consist of a benefit zone encompassing the properties within the commercial development known as Valley Square, Parcel Map 36977. The proposed improvements described in this Report are based on current development and improvement plans provided as of the date of this Report.

Zone 2-B is generally located southwest corner of the intersection of Mission Boulevard and Pyrite Street, in the City of Jurupa Valley, in the County of Riverside, State of California. At the time of this assessment, the assessment zone consists of 1 assessable parcel and zero non-assessable lots. When Parcel Map 36977 subdivision is recorded, Zone 2-B will include 3 commercial parcels. Zone 2-B will consist of all lots/units, parcels, and subdivisions of land located in the following development area:

Valley Square – Assessor Parcel Number as of date of this Report: 171-260-013
PART II – PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
L&LMD NO. 89-1-C ZONE 2-B

The services to be funded by City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD No. 89-1-C Zone 2-B include the operating costs for two streetlights; one on Mission Boulevard and one on Pyrite Street. The proposed improvements, the associated costs, and assessments have been carefully reviewed, identified, and allocated based on special benefit. Zone 2-B was reviewed and specific areas of special benefit within the District were identified, based on:

a. Level of Service
b. Improvement Types
c. Proximity to Improvement
d. Levels of Special Benefit from Zone (on Public versus Private)

The 1972 Act permits the establishment of assessment districts by agencies for the purpose of providing certain public improvements, which include the construction, maintenance, and servicing of public lights, landscaping, dedicated easements for landscape use, and appurtenant facilities. The 1972 Act further provides that assessments may be apportioned upon all assessable lot(s) or parcel(s) of land within an assessment district in proportion to the estimated benefits to be received by each lot or parcel from the improvements rather than by assessed value.

It was determined that the improvements identified by this report will directly benefit the parcels to be assessed within Zone 2-B. The assessments and method of apportionment is based on the premise that the assessments will be used to construct and install lighting improvements within the existing district as well as provide for annual maintenance of those improvements and the assessment revenues generated by the Zone will be used solely for such purpose.

STREET LIGHTING IMPROVEMENTS

The assessment will provide for the operating energy cost of the street lights servicing the commercial development, Valley Square, as shown in the Street Lighting Improvement Plan by Transportation, Engineering, and Planning, Inc. dated April 22nd, 2018 prepared for the Valley Square commercial development.

The benefits associated with streetlight improvements include:

1. Enhanced deterrence of crime such as vandalism and other criminal activities which would reduce damage to improvements or property.
2. Improved visibility to assist police in the protection of property.
3. Improved visibility for egress from and ingress to the property.
PART III – FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION
The formula used for calculating assessments reflects the composition of the parcels and the improvements and services provided by the Zone to fairly apportion the costs based on the estimated benefit to each parcel.

The streetlight improvements within Zone 2-B provide direct and special benefit to the lots or parcels within the Zone. Therefore, the maintenance of these improvements also provides direct and special benefit by maintaining the functionality of the improvements and allowing the improvements to operate in a proper manner.

Because all benefiting properties consist of a uniform land use, it is determined that all commercial parcels benefit equally from the improvements and the costs and expenses for the maintenance and servicing of streetlights are apportioned on a per parcel basis.

The total benefit from the works of improvement is a combination of the special benefits to the parcels within the Zone and the general benefits to the public at large and to adjacent property owners. A portion of the total maintenance costs for the streetlights, if any, associated with general benefits will not be assessed to the parcels in the Zone, but will be paid from other City of Jurupa Valley funds.

No property is assessed in excess of the reasonable cost of the proportional special benefit conferred on that property. Additionally, because the benefiting parcels within the zone consist of a uniform land use (commercial), it is determined that each of the commercial parcels within the Zone benefit equally from the improvements. Therefore, the proportionate share of the costs and expenses for the provisions of streetlights, as well as costs and expenses for the maintenance of the streetlights apportioned equally on a per parcel basis.

MAXIMUM ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY
The following methodology was adopted by City Council in Resolution No. 2016-01 dated February 4, 2016. Such methodology has been maintained in preparation of this Report. The purpose of establishing a Maximum Assessment formula is to provide for reasonable increases and inflationary adjustments to annual assessments without requiring costly noticing and mailing procedures, which would add to the Zone 2-B costs and assessments.

The Maximum Assessment formula shall be applied to all assessable parcels of land within the Zone. For Zone 2-B, the initial Maximum Assessment(s) for Fiscal Year 2019-2020 are as follows:

1. The initial Total Maximum Assessment established within Zone 2-B (Parcel 36977) shall be $255.44.
2. The initial Maximum Assessment per assessable parcel/lot/unit established within Zone 2-B, after subdivision with three assessable parcels, is anticipated to be $85.14.

In compliance with California Constitution Article XIIIID (Proposition 218), the assessment established for Zone 2-B on this report, include an adjustment formula to account for reasonable increase in cost for maintenance and inflation. The initial Maximum Assessment shall be adjusted by the greater of two percent (2%) or the cumulative percentage increase in the CPI-U Index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor.

The Maximum Assessment is adjusted annually and is calculated independent of Zone 2-B's annual budget and proposed annual assessment. The proposed annual assessment (rate per assessable parcel) applied in any fiscal year is not considered to be an increased assessment if less than or equal to the Maximum Assessment amount. In no case shall the annual assessment exceed the Maximum Assessment.

Although the Maximum Assessment will increase each year, the actual Zone 2-B assessments may remain virtually unchanged. The Maximum Assessment adjustment is designed to establish reasonable limits on Zone 2-B assessments. The Maximum Assessment calculated each year does not require or facilitate an increase of the annual assessment and neither does it restrict assessments to the adjusted maximum amount. If the budget and assessments for the fiscal year require an increase and the increase is more than the adjusted Maximum Assessment, it is considered an increased assessment.

To impose an increase assessment, the City of Jurupa Valley must comply with the provisions of the California Constitution Article XIII D Section 4c, that requires a public hearing and certain protest procedures including mailed notice of the public hearing and property owner protest balloting. Property owner through the balloting process must approve the proposed assessment increase. If the proposed assessment is approved, then a new Maximum Assessment is established for Zone 2-B. If the proposed assessment is not approved, the City may not levy an assessment greater than the adjusted Maximum Assessment previously established for Zone 2-B.

**COST ESTIMATE**

The Ad Valorem reduction is the corresponding general benefit value of the improvements, and it is determined by identifying the general public benefit from the installation and upkeep of the improvements identified on this report. All proposed lighting improvements contained within this report are located directly in front of the assessed Zone and the construction and installation of the improvements were only necessary for the development of properties within the Zone. Therefore, it was determined that any public access or use of these local improvements by others is incidental and there is no measurable general benefit to properties outside the one or to the public at large. The Ad Valorem reduction for this assessment is zero.

The Assessment for each assessable parcel within Zone 2-B is calculated by dividing the total Annual Balance to Levy minus the Ad Valorem Reduction by the total number of assessable subdivided parcels within Zone 2-B to determine the Annual Assessment per assessable parcel.
Annual Balance to Levy – Ad Valorem Reduction = \( \frac{\text{Annual Assessment per assessable parcel}}{\text{Total number of assessable parcels}} \)

The Annual Balance to Levy is the Total Annual Landscaping Costs as seen in the following summary table:

### CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY L&LMD NO. 89-1-C ZONE 2-B

Valley Square  
FY 2019-2020

Total Assessable Parcels/Lots: 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Description</th>
<th>Total Cost for Zone 2-B</th>
<th>Cost per Parcel/Lot for Zone 2-B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Lighting:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Energy Charge of $102.61 per street light for 1</td>
<td>$102.61</td>
<td>$102.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Light – 100 Watt 9,500 Lumen LED Equivalent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Energy Charge of $112.95 per street light for 1</td>
<td>$112.95</td>
<td>$112.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Light – 200 Watt 22,000 Lumen LED Equivalent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration :</td>
<td>$18.32</td>
<td>$6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Reserve :</td>
<td>$21.56</td>
<td>$7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ANNUAL STREET LIGHTING COSTS:</strong></td>
<td>$255.44</td>
<td>$85.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INITIAL MAXIMUM ASSESSMENT PER ASSESSABLE LOT/UNIT OR PARCEL:** $85.15
PART IV – ASSESSMENT DIAGRAM

(See next page)
ASSESSMENT DIAGRAM/ BOUNDARY MAP
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO. 89-1- CONSOLIDATED
ZONE 2-B
TR 36977
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
T2S R6W SEC 12 PSEC

ASSessor's parcel number as of date of engineer's report

171-250-013

Subzone Boundary

VICINITY MAP

For details concerning the lines and dimensions of the applicable Assessor's Parcel Numbers, refer to the County Assessor's Map as of the date of the report.

HRGreen
PART V – ASSESSMENT ROLLS

Parcel identification for each lot/unit or parcel within Zone 2-B shall be the parcels as shown on the Riverside County Secured Roll for the year in which this Report is prepared and reflective of the Assessor’s Parcel Maps. Zone 2-B includes the following Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APNs) as of the date of this Report: 171-260-013.

The initial Maximum Assessment shall be adjusted annually by the greater of two percent (2%) or the cumulative percentage increase in the CPI-U for All Items Index published by the BLS.

When subdivided, the initial Maximum Assessments per assessable lot/unit or parcel for Zone 2-B are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel/ Lot No.</th>
<th>Maximum Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$85.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$85.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$85.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF REPORT

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER
BY: STEVE R. LORISO, P.E.,
CITY ENGINEER/ DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 12.E

PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE ANNEXATION OF TERRITORY (ZONE K – JURUPA ESTATES; LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF JURUPA ROAD AND PYRITE ST) TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO. 89-1-CONSOLIDATED (THE “DISTRICT”) AND THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF ASSESSMENTS WITHIN SUCH TERRITORY

RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-07, entitled:


BACKGROUND

The Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, being Part 2 of Division 15 of the California Streets and Highways Code (the “Act”) and Article XIII D of the California Constitution (“Proposition 218”), requires the City Council conduct proceedings to annex territory into an assessment district formed under the Act and to levy assessments within such territory.
In connection with the City’s incorporation in 2011, the Local Agency Formation Commission of Riverside County (LAFCO) adopted its Resolution No. 12-10 on July 22, 2010, to establish the Terms and Conditions of Incorporation, which require that the authority and responsibility for special assessment districts within the incorporated City associated with any County Landscape Maintenance District be transferred to the City upon its incorporation.

By its Resolution No. 2011-26, adopted on July 1, 2011, the City Council assumed all authority and responsibility for the special assessment districts within the incorporated City associated with any County Landscape Maintenance District and specifically assumed responsibility for any and all special assessments levied in connection with such districts.

The County’s Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated (the “County District”), established pursuant to the provisions of the Act includes various territories located both within the incorporated boundaries of the City (the “City Territory”) and outside the incorporated boundaries of the City (the “County Territory”). Pursuant to its Resolution No. 2016-01 adopted on February 4, 2016, the City declared that the City Territory is a district under the 1972 Act, which is separate and distinct from the County Territory, and designated such territory as the “Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated.”

At its November 15, 2018 meeting, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2018-71 initiating proceedings for the annexation of territory to the Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated (the “District”) as Zone K and the levy and collection of assessments within such territory. Zone K includes 25 assessable parcels within one legal lot, generally located northerly of Jurupa Road, southerly of Galena Street, easterly of Pyrite Street, and westerly of Tyrolite Street. Portions of Jurupa Estates and parkway area are located on Jurupa Road and Pyrite Street.

Further, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2018-73 declaring its intention to annex territory to the District and to levy and collect assessments within such territory for fiscal year 2019-20. Resolution No. 2018-73 set January 17, 2019 as the public hearing date for protests to the levy of annual assessments and the annexation.

Subsequent to the November 15, 2018 meeting and in accordance with the Act and Proposition 218, notice was mailed to the owners of the properties within the territory to be annexed, along with an assessment ballot for such owners to indicate support for, or opposition to, the proposed annexation. The notice indicated the amount of the proposed assessment for their respective parcels and the date, time and place of the public hearing.
ANALYSIS

It is proposed to include the additional parcels within the boundaries of the District and to levy assessments within such territory for fiscal year 2019-20. Such territory is shown on a map on file in the office of the City Clerk and is open to public inspection.

At the public hearing, the City Council must hear and consider all oral and written statements, protests, objections or other communications made or filed with respect to the annexation of territory to the District and the levy and collection of annual assessments within such territory.

The assessment ballots must be tabulated at the public hearing. A majority protest exists if ballots submitted in opposition to the assessment and annexation exceed the ballots submitted in favor of the assessment and annexation. In tabulating the ballots, the ballots shall be weighted according to the proportional financial obligation of the affected property. In the absence of a majority protest, the City Council may adopt a resolution ordering the annexation and levy and collection of assessments within the territory.

OTHER INFORMATION

- City Council initiated proceedings for the annexation on November 15, 2018.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The property owners are responsible for the annual payments of the special assessment. The City will file the special assessment with the County Auditor-Controller for collection via the annual property tax bills. The property owners have posted a deposit with their application to form Zone K, in order to cover City costs incurred in connection with the annexation. Approval of this resolution does not in any way commit the City to any financial contribution or liability for the Zone K. The City's cost to administer Zone K annually will be reimbursed through the special assessment charged to property owners. The fiscal year 2019-20 (base year) maximum assessment for landscape maintenance and street lighting for each parcel is $592.76 and is subject to escalation beginning in FY 2020-21 to account for reasonable increase cost for maintenance and inflation.

The revenue from this special assessment will be deposited into City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-1-C and will be used to pay for the services provided in Zone K. Both the revenue and expenses will be part of the City's FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget, and there is no anticipated impact to the General Fund.
CONCLUSION

It is recommended that the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-07 ordering annexation of territory to the District and the levy and collect assessments within such territory for fiscal year 2019-20.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Take no action.

2. Provide staff with further direction.
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RESOLUTION NO. 2019-07


THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY HEREBY FINDS, DETERMINES, RESOLVES AND ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Pursuant to the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, Part 2 of Division 15 of the California Streets and Highways Code (hereinafter referred to as the "Act"), the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley initiated proceedings for the annexation of territory to City of Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated (hereinafter referred to as the "District") and the levy and collection of assessments within such territory for the 2019-2020 fiscal year and caused to be prepared a written report (the 'Engineer's Report") in accordance with the Act and Article XIII D of the California Constitution.

Section 2. Following notice duly given in accordance with law, the City Council has held a full and fair public hearing regarding the Engineer's Report, the annexation of territory to the District, and the levy and collection of the proposed assessment within such territory for fiscal year 2019-2020. All interested persons were afforded the opportunity to hear and be heard. The City Council considered all oral and written statements, protests and communications made or filed by interested persons and tabulated all ballots. The City Council hereby finds that a majority protest does not exist as defined in Section 4(e) of Article XIII D of the California Constitution. All protests and objections to the annexation of territory to the District and the levy and collection of the proposed assessment against lots or parcels of property within the annexed territory for fiscal year 2019-2020 are hereby overruled by the City Council.

Section 3. The City Council hereby orders the annexation of territory, which is described as Assessor's Parcel Number 166-040-021, to the District. The District will continue to be designated as City of Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1- Consolidated.
Section 4. Based upon its review of the Engineer’s Report and other reports and information, the City Council hereby finds and determines that (i) the land within the annexed territory will be benefited by the improvements as described in such Engineer’s Report, (ii) the annexed territory includes all of the lands so benefited, (iii) the net amount to be assessed upon the lands within the annexed territory for the 2019-2020 fiscal year, in accordance with the Engineer's Report, is apportioned by a formula and method which fairly distributes the net amount among all assessable lots or parcels in proportion to the estimated benefits to be received by each such lot or parcel from the improvements; and (iv) only special benefits are assessed and no assessment is imposed on any parcel which exceeds the reasonable cost of the proportional special benefit conferred on that parcel.

Section 5. The City Council hereby orders the proposed improvements to be made, which improvements are briefly described as follows: The installation and planting of landscaping, including trees, shrubs, grass and other ornamental vegetation; the installation or construction of public lighting facilities including but not limited to, street lights; the installation or construction of any facilities which are appurtenant to any of the foregoing, or which are necessary or convenient for the maintenance or servicing thereof, including, but not limited to, grading, clearing, removal of debris; the installation or construction of curbs, gutters, walls, sidewalks or paving, water irrigation, drainage or electrical facilities; and, the maintenance and/or servicing of any of the foregoing.

Section 6. Lots or parcels of land within the annexed territory that are owned or used by any county, city, city and county, special district or any other local governmental entity, the State of California, or the United States shall be assessed unless the City demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that such lots or parcels receive no special benefit from the proposed improvements.

Section 7. The City Council hereby confirms the diagram and assessment, with respect to the annexed parcels, as originally proposed in the Engineer's Report.

Section 8. The assessment is in compliance with the provisions of the Act and Article XIIID of the California Constitution.

Section 9. The assessment is levied without regard to property valuation.

Section 10. The assessment is levied for the purpose of paying the costs and expenses of the improvements described in Section 5 above for the fiscal year commencing on July 1, 2019 and ending on June 30, 2020.

Section 11. The adoption of this Resolution constitutes the levy of an assessment for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 2019 and ending June 30, 2020.

Section 12. The improvements shall be performed pursuant to law.
Section 13. The County Auditor of Riverside County shall enter on the County Assessment Roll opposite each lot or parcel of land the amount of the assessment and such assessments shall then be collected at the same time and in the same manner as the County taxes are collected. After collection by the County, the net amount of the assessments shall be paid to the City Administrative Services Director.

Section 14. The Administrative Director shall deposit all moneys representing assessments collected by the County to the credit of a special fund known as "City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-1-C Zone K," and such moneys shall be expended only for the improvements described in Section 5 above.

Section 15. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to file the diagram and assessment, or a certified copy of the diagram and assessment, with the County Auditor, together with a certified copy of this Resolution upon its adoption.

Section 16. A certified copy of the diagram and assessment shall be filed in the office of the City Engineer, with a duplicate copy on file in the office of the City Clerk and open for public inspection

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 17th day of January, 2019.

___________________________
Brian Berkson
Mayor

ATTEST:

___________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

I, Victoria Wasko, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-07 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 17th day of January, 2019 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, on the 17th day of January, 2019.

________________________________
Victoria Wasko, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
ENGINEER’S REPORT FOR
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING
MAINTENANCE DISTRICT
NO. 89-1-CONSOLIDATED

ZONE K
Jurupa Estates

November 2018

Prepared By:

HR Green Pacific
1260 Corona Pointe Court, Suite 305
855.900.4742

www.hrgreen.com

8930 Limonite Avenue | Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
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AGENCY: CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
SUBJECT: ANNEXATION OF JURUPA ESTATES TO CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO.89-1-CONSOLIDATED ("CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY L&LMD NO.89-1-C") AS ZONE K
TO: CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY CITY COUNCIL

Pursuant to the direction from the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley ("City Council"), California, this Engineer’s Report ("Report") is prepared and hereby submitted for the City of Jurupa Valley ("City") in compliance with the provisions of Section 22565 through 22574 of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 ("1972 Act"), said Act being Part 2 of Division 15 of the Streets and Highways Code of the State of California, Section 4 of Article XIII D of the California Constitution.

This Report provides for the annexation of a portion of Jurupa Estates to City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD No. 89-1-C as Zone K and establishes the Maximum Assessment to be levied in the Fiscal Year commencing July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020 (2019-2020) and continuing in all subsequent Fiscal Years, for this area to be known and designated as:

CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY L&LMD NO. 89-1-C ZONE K

JURUPA ESTATES

I do hereby assess and apportion the total amount of the costs and expenses upon several parcels of land within said designated area liable therefor and benefited thereby, in proportion to the estimated benefits that each parcel receives, respectively, from said services.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, the appointed ENGINEER, acting on behalf of the City of Jurupa Valley, pursuant to the 1972 Act, do hereby submit the following:

Pursuant to the provisions of law, the costs and expenses of the Zone have been assessed upon the parcels of land in the Zone benefited thereby in direct proportion and relation to the estimated benefits to be received by each of said parcels. For particulars as to the identification of said parcels, reference is made to the Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map, a reduced copy of which is included herein.

As required by law, an Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map is filed herewith, showing the Zone, as well as the boundaries and dimensions of the respective parcels and subdivisions of land within said Zone as they exist, as of the date of this Report, each of which subdivisions of land or parcels or lots, respectively, have been assigned a parcel/lot number within a specific tract and indicated on said Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map and in the Assessment Roll contained herein.

The separate numbers given the subdivisions and parcels of land, as shown on said Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map and Assessment Roll, correspond with the numbers assigned to each parcel by the Riverside County Assessor. Reference is made to the County Assessor Roll for a description of the lots or parcels.
As of the date of this Report, there are no parcels or lots within Zone K that are owned by a federal, state or other local governmental agency that will benefit from the services to be provided by the assessments to be collected.

November 15, 2018.

Steve Loriso, R.C.E. 64701
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the provisions of law, the costs and expenses of the Zone have been assessed upon the parcels of land in the Zone benefited thereby in direct proportion and relation to the estimated benefits to be received by each of said parcels. For particulars as to the identification of said parcels, reference is made to the Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map, a reduced copy of which is included herein. On this 15th day of November, 2018 the City Council, City of Jurupa Valley, State of California, ordering the preparation of the Report providing for the annexation of a portion of Jurupa Estates to L&LMD No. 89-1-C as Zone K did, pursuant to the provisions of the 1972 Act, being Division 15 of the Streets and Highways Code of the State of California, adopt Resolution No. 2019-XX for a special assessment district zone known and designated as:

ZONE K

JURUPA ESTATES

The annexation of Zone K includes a portion of the parcels of land within the residential subdivision known as Jurupa Estates, also identified by the Assessor Parcel Number(s) valid as of the date of this Report: November 15th, 2018. As required by law, an Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map is filed herewith, showing the Zone, as well as the boundaries and dimensions of the respective parcels and subdivisions of land within said Zone as they exist, as of the date of this Report, each of which subdivisions of land or parcels or lots, respectively, have been assigned a parcel/lot number within a specific tract and indicated on the Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map and in the Assessment Roll contained herein.

The following report presents the engineering analysis for the annexation of Zone K and the establishment of the Maximum Assessment to be levied and collected commencing Fiscal Year 2019-2020 and all subsequent fiscal years.

DEFINITIONS

Agency – Means the local government, City of Jurupa Valley.
Capital cost – Means the cost of acquisition, installation, construction, reconstruction, or replacement of a permanent public improvement by the Agency.
District – Means an area determined by the Agency to contain all parcels which will receive a special benefit from a proposed public improvement of property-related service.
Maintenance and operation expenses - Means the cost of rent, repair, replacement, rehabilitation, fuel, power, electrical current, care, and supervision necessary to properly operate and maintain a permanent public improvement.
Ad Valorem Reduction — The corresponding general benefit value of the improvements.
Special benefit — Means a particular and distinct benefit over and above general benefits conferred on real property located in the district or to the public at large. General enhancement of property value does not constitute “special benefit.”
PART I – BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT

LOCATION OF THE ASSESSMENT ZONE

Zone K shall consist of a benefit zone encompassing a portion of the properties within the residential development known as Jurupa Estates. The proposed improvements described in this Report are based on current development and improvement plans provided as of the date of this Report.

Zone K is generally located northerly of Jurupa Road, southerly of Galena Street, easterly of Pyrite Street, and westerly of Tyrolite Street, in the City of Jurupa Valley, in the County of Riverside, State of California. It includes a portion of Jurupa Estates and parkway area on Jurupa Road and Pyrite Street at Jurupa Estates’ frontage. At the time of this assessment, the assessment zone consists of 25 assessable lots designated as proposed single family residence lots and one non-assessable lot identified as a water quality basin. Zone K consists of all lots/units, parcels, and subdivisions of land located in the following development area:

Jurupa Estates — Assessor Parcel Number as of date of this Report: 166-040-021
PART II – PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
L&LMD NO. 89-1-C ZONE K

The services to be funded by City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD No. 89-1-C Zone K include the landscape and streetlight maintenance within the residential subdivision designated as Jurupa Estates (TR 32704) and the servicing streetlights on Jurupa Road. The proposed improvements, the associated costs, and assessments have been carefully reviewed, identified, and allocated based on:
  a. Level of Service
  b. Improvement Types
  c. Proximity to Improvement
  d. Levels of Special Benefit from Zone (on Public versus Private)

The 1972 Act permits the establishment of assessment districts by agencies for the purpose of providing certain public improvements, which include the construction, maintenance, and servicing of public lights, landscaping, dedicated easements for landscape use, and appurtenant facilities. The 1972 Act further provides that assessments may be apportioned upon all assessable lot(s) or parcel(s) of land within an assessment district in proportion to the estimated benefits to be received by each lot or parcel from the improvements rather than by assessed value.

It was determined that the improvements identified by this report will directly benefit the parcels to be assessed within Zone K. The assessments and method of apportionment is based on the premise that the assessments will be used to construct and install landscape and lighting improvements within the existing district as well as provide for annual maintenance of those improvements and the assessment revenues generated by the Zone will be used solely for such purpose.

LANDSCAPING IMPROVEMENTS
The assessment will provide for landscaping servicing and maintenance on public right-of-way and as approved by the City during the tentative tract map (TTM32704) approval. The following apply:

1. Servicing: the furnishing of water for the irrigation of any landscaping on the parkway along Jurupa Road and Pyrite Street as identified on the approved L&LMD Landscape Plans for Zone K.
2. Maintenance: the furnishing of services and materials for the ordinary and usual maintenance, operation and servicing of any improvement, including the repair, removal, or replacement of all of part of landscape improvements. Maintenance shall also include tree trimming for the trees along the parkway and as identified on the approved L&LMD Landscape Plans for Zone K.
3. This assessment does not include servicing nor maintenance of any (if any) ground cover landscaping on parkway in front of or adjacent to private properties; excepting tree trimming of trees identified on the approved L&LMD Landscape Plans for Zone K.

The benefits associated with landscaping improvements include:

1. Enhanced environmental quality of the parcels through improved erosion resistance, dust and debris control, and fire protection.
2. Reduced criminal activity and property-related crimes (especially vandalism) against properties through well-maintained surrounding and amenities.
3. Enhanced environmental quality of the parcels by moderating temperatures, providing oxygenation and attenuation noise.

STREET LIGHTING IMPROVEMENTS
The assessment will provide for the operating energy cost of the street lights servicing Jurupa Estates as shown in the Street Lighting Improvement Plans prepared for Jurupa Estates development and approved by the City Engineer.

The benefits associated with streetlight improvements include:

1. Enhanced deterrence of crime such as vandalism and other criminal activities which would reduce damage to improvements or property.
2. Improved visibility to assist police in the protection of property.
3. Improved visibility for egress from and ingress to the property.

There is ten streetlights considered for this assessment. Seven (7) in-tract streetlights identified as Group 1 on the Engineer’s Cost Estimate; and three (3) streetlights on Jurupa Road identified as Group 2 on the Engineer’s Cost Estimate The streetlights on Jurupa Road service the entrance to the new development and have an Ad-Valorem Reduction identified on the Financial Analysis section of this report.

WATER QUALITY BASIN
The assessment will provide for landscaping servicing and maintenance of the water quality basin located within the Zone and servicing the homes within the tract.

OTHER IMPROVEMENTS
The assessment will provide for the maintenance of the paseo (meandering sidewalk) along the water quality basin; and as shown on the approved L&LMD Landscape Plans for Zone K and associated with Tract Map 32704.
PART III - FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION
The formula used for calculating assessments reflects the composition of the parcels and the improvements and services provided by the Zone to fairly apportion the costs based on the estimated benefit to each parcel.

The landscaping and streetlight improvements within Zone K provide direct and special benefit to the lots or parcels within the Zone. Therefore, the maintenance of these improvements also provides direct and special benefit by maintaining the functionality of the improvements and allowing the improvements to operate in a proper manner.

Because all benefiting properties consist of a uniform land use, it is determined that all residential parcels benefit equally from the improvements and the costs and expenses for the maintenance and servicing of landscaping and streetlight are apportioned on a per parcel basis.

The total benefit from the works of improvement is a combination of the special benefits to the parcels within the Zone and the general benefits to the public at large and to adjacent property owners. A portion of the total maintenance costs for the landscaping and streetlights, if any, associated with general benefits will not be assessed to the parcels in the Zone, but will be paid from other City of Jurupa Valley funds.

No property is assessed in excess of the reasonable cost of the proportional special benefit conferred on that property. Additionally, because the benefiting properties consist of a uniform land use (residential), it is determined that each of the residential parcels within the Zone benefit equally form the improvements. Therefore, the proportionate share of the costs and expenses for the provisions of landscaping and streetlights, as well as costs and expenses for the maintenance of the landscaping and streetlights apportioned equally on a per parcel basis.

The ten streetlights considered for this assessment were separated into two groups for the assessment. Group 1, in-tract street lighting, is assessed to all assessable lots (1 through 25 inclusive) and includes seven streetlights at cul-de-sacs and residential streets’ intersections. Group 2, Jurupa Road street lighting, is assessed to all assessable lots (1 through 25 inclusive) and includes three streetlights servicing the entrance of the project site. The benefiting properties consist of a uniform land use (residential), it is determined that each of the residential parcels within the Zone will benefit equally from the lighting improvements.

MAXIMUM ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY
The following methodology was adopted by City Council in Resolution No. 2016-01 dated February 4, 2016. Such methodology has been maintained in preparation of this Report. The purpose of establishing a Maximum Assessment formula is to provide for reasonable increases and inflationary adjustments to annual assessments without requiring costly noticing and mailing procedures, which would add to the Zone K costs and assessments.
The Maximum Assessment formula shall be applied to all assessable parcels of land within the Zone. For Zone K, the initial Maximum Assessment(s) for Fiscal Year 2019-2020 are as follows:

1. The initial Total Maximum Assessment established within Zone K (Jurupa Estates) shall be $14,819.03.
2. The initial Maximum Assessment per assessable parcel/lot/unit established within Zone K (Jurupa Estates) is anticipated to be $592.76.

The initial Maximum Assessment is subject to an annual inflator starting in Fiscal Year 2020-2021. The initial Maximum Assessment shall be adjusted by the greater of two percent (2%) or the cumulative percentage increase in the CPI-U Index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor.

The Maximum Assessment is adjusted annually and is calculated independent of Zone K’s annual budget and proposed annual assessment. The proposed annual assessment (rate per assessable parcel) applied in any fiscal year is not considered to be an increased assessment if less than or equal to the Maximum Assessment amount. In no case shall the annual assessment exceed the Maximum Assessment.

Although the Maximum Assessment will increase each year, the actual Zone K assessments may remain virtually unchanged. The Maximum Assessment adjustment is designed to establish reasonable limits on Zone K assessments. The Maximum Assessment calculated each year does not require or facilitate an increase of the annual assessment and neither does it restrict assessments to the adjusted maximum amount. If the budget and assessments for the fiscal year require an increase and the increase is more than the adjusted Maximum Assessment, it is considered an increased assessment.

To impose an increase assessment, the City of Jurupa Valley must comply with the provisions of the California Constitution Article XIII D Section 4c, that requires a public hearing and certain protest procedures including mailed notice of the public hearing and property owner protest balloting. Property owner through the balloting process must approve the proposed assessment increase. If the proposed assessment is approved, then a new Maximum Assessment is established for Zone K. If the proposed assessment is not approved, the City may not levy an assessment greater than the adjusted Maximum Assessment previously established for Zone K.

**COST ESTIMATE**

The Ad Valorem reduction is the corresponding general benefit value of the improvements, and it is determined by identifying the general public benefit from the installation and upkeep of the improvements identified on this report. All proposed landscape and water quality improvements contained within this report are located directly in front of the assessed zone and the construction and installation of the improvements were only necessary for the development of properties within the Zone. Therefore, it was determined that any public access or use of these local improvements by others is incidental and there is no measurable general benefit to properties outside the one or to the public at large.
The proposed lighting improvements contained within this report are located directly in front of the assessed zone and the construction and installation of the improvements were necessary for the development of properties within the Zone. Group 1 represents streetlights within the development, in tract; and Group 2 represent streetlights on Jurupa Road.

The public benefit of the local improvement and installation of streetlights on Group 1 is incidental and there is no measurable general benefit to properties outside the Zone or to the public at large. The public benefit of the local improvement and installation of streetlights on Group 2 is mostly incidental and the general benefit to properties outside the Zone or to the public at large has been estimated as follows:

- The installation of streetlights on Jurupa Road will incidentally provide a general benefit to three parcels outside the Zone boundary, located immediately west and east of the residential tract 32704 with direct access to Jurupa Road. The improvements don’t represent a needed benefit to the properties outside the Zone. Since the construction and installation of this lighting improvement was only necessary for the development of the properties within the Zone, the incidental benefit to the properties outside the Zone is estimated to approximately 11% of the total annual cost.

Therefore, the Ad Valorem reduction for the streetlight improvements on Jurupa Road is calculated to be approximately 11% or $11.31 for the first assessed year.

The Assessment for each assessable parcel within Zone K is calculated by dividing the total Annual Balance to Levy minus the Ad Valorem Reduction by the total number of assessable subdivided parcels within Zone K to determine the Annual Assessment per assessable parcel.

\[
\frac{\text{Annual Balance to Levy} - \text{Ad Valorem Reduction}}{\text{Total number of assessable parcels}} = \text{Annual Assessment per assessable parcel}
\]

The Annual Balance to Levy is the Total Annual Landscaping Costs plus the Total Annual Streetlight Costs as seen in the following summary table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Assessable Parcels/Lots: 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Lighting:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1 (Internal Tract)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Energy Charge of $118.93 per street light for 7 Street Lights – 100 Watt 9,500 Lumen LED Equivalent: Administration :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Reserve :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Reserve :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Assessment for Group 1 (Internal Tract):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2 (Jurupa Road)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Energy Charge of $118.93 per street light for 3 Street Lights –100 Watt 9,500 Lumen LED Equivalent: Administration :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Reserve :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Reserve :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Street Lighting Cost:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Valorem Reduction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Assessment for Group 2 (Jurupa Road):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ANNUAL STREET LIGHTING ASSESSMENT:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscaping:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Landscaping Maintenance :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Trimming :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulch :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calsense Single:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backflow Certificate :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizer Injector :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Landscaping Maintenance Costs:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Reserve :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ANNUAL LANDSCAPING COSTS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ANNUAL STREET LIGHTING AND LANDSCAPING ASSESSMENT:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INITIAL MAXIMUM ASSESSMENT PER ASSESSABLE LOT/UNIT OR PARCEL :</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See notes on next page
Notes:
Water meter cost included on landscape rate.
Electric meter cost included on landscape rate.
Water cost included in landscape rate.
PART IV – ASSESSMENT DIAGRAM
(See next page)
PART V – ASSESSMENT ROLLS

Parcel identification for each lot/unit or parcel within Zone K shall be the parcels as shown on the Riverside County Secured Roll for the year in which this Report is prepared and reflective of the Assessor’s Parcel Maps. Zone K includes the following Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APNs) as of the date of this Report: 166-040-021.

The initial Maximum Assessment shall be adjusted annually by the greater of two percent (2%) or the cumulative percentage increase in the CPI-U for All Items Index published by the BLS.

When subdivided, the initial Maximum Assessments per assessable lot/unit or parcel for Zone K are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 6</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 7</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 8</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 9</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 10</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 11</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 12</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 13</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 14</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 15</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 16</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 17</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 18</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 19</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 20</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 21</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 22</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 23</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 24</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 32704</td>
<td>Lot 25</td>
<td>$592.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-08, entitled:


BACKGROUND

The public hearing for the Annexation of Territory (Zone C) to City of Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1- Consolidated was continued from the December 20, 2018 meeting.

The Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, being Part 2 of Division 15 of the California Streets and Highways Code (the “Act”) and Article XIII D of the California Constitution (“Proposition 218”), requires the City Council to conduct proceedings to annex territory
into an assessment district formed under the Act and to levy assessments within such territory.

In connection with the City’s incorporation in 2011, the Local Agency Formation Commission of Riverside County (LAFCO) adopted its Resolution No. 12-10 on July 22, 2010, to establish the Terms and Conditions of Incorporation, which require that the authority and responsibility for special assessment districts within the incorporated City associated with any County Landscape Maintenance District be transferred to the City upon its incorporation.

By its Resolution No. 11-26, adopted on July 1, 2011, the City Council assumed all authority and responsibility for the special assessment districts within the incorporated City associated with any County Landscape Maintenance District and specifically assumed responsibility for any and all special assessments levied in connection with such districts.

The County’s Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated (the “County District”), established pursuant to the provisions of the Act includes various territories located both within the incorporated boundaries of the City (the “City Territory”) and outside the incorporated boundaries of the City (the “County Territory”). Pursuant to its Resolution No. 2016-01 adopted on February 4, 2016, the City declared that the City Territory is a district under the 1972 Act, which is separate and distinct from the County Territory, and designated such territory as the “Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated.”

At its November 1, 2018 meeting, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2018-64 initiating proceedings for the annexation of territory to the Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated (the “District”) as Zone C and the levy and collection of assessments within such territory. Zone C includes 4 assessable parcels identified on Parcel Map 37062, generally located at the northwest corner of Limonite Avenue and Felspar Street.

Further, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2018-66 declaring its intention to annex territory to the District and to levy and collect assessments within such territory for fiscal year 2019-20. Resolution No. 2018-66 set December 20, 2018 as the public hearing date for protests to the levy of annual assessments and the annexation.

Subsequent to the November 1, 2018 meeting and in accordance with the Act and Proposition 218, notice was mailed to the owners of the properties within the territory to be annexed, along with an assessment ballot for such owners to indicate support for, or opposition to, the proposed annexation. The notice indicated the amount of the proposed assessment for their respective parcels and the date, time and place of the public hearing.
ANALYSIS

It is proposed to include the additional parcels within the boundaries of the District and to levy assessments within such territory for fiscal year 2019-20. Such territory is shown on a map on file in the office of the City Clerk and is open to public inspection.

At the public hearing, the City Council must hear and consider all oral and written statements, protests, objections or other communications made or filed with respect to the annexation of territory to the District and the levy and collection of annual assessments within such territory.

The assessment ballots must be tabulated at the public hearing. A majority protest exists if ballots submitted in opposition to the assessment and annexation exceed the ballots submitted in favor of the assessment and annexation. In tabulating the ballots, the ballots shall be weighted according to the proportional financial obligation of the affected property. In the absence of a majority protest, the City Council may adopt a resolution ordering the annexation and levy and collection of assessments within the territory.

OTHER INFORMATION

- City Council initiated proceedings for the annexation on November 1, 2018.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The property owners are responsible for the annual payments of the special assessment. The City will file the special assessment with the County Auditor-Controller for collection via the annual property tax bills. The property owners have posted a deposit with their application to form Zone C, in order to cover City costs incurred in connection with the annexation. Approval of this resolution does not in any way commit the City to any financial contribution or liability for the Zone C. The City’s cost to administer Zone C annually will be reimbursed through the special assessment charged to property owners. The fiscal year 2019-20 (base year) maximum assessment for landscape maintenance and street lighting for each parcel is $1,928.58 and is subject to escalation beginning in FY 2020-21 to account for reasonable increase cost for maintenance and inflation.

The revenue from this special assessment will be deposited into City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-1-C and will be used to pay for the services provided in Zone C. Both the revenue and expenses will be part of the City’s FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget, and there is no anticipated impact to the general fund.
CONCLUSION

It is recommended that the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2018-81 ordering annexation of territory to the District and the levy and collect assessments within such territory for fiscal year 2019-20.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Take no action.

2. Provide staff with further direction.

******************************** SIGNATURES ON FOLLOWING PAGE ********************************
Attachments:

1. Resolution No. 2019-08; Ordering Annexation
2. Engineer's Report
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-08


THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY HEREBY FINDS, DETERMINES, RESOLVES AND ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Pursuant to the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, Part 2 of Division 15 of the California Streets and Highways Code (hereinafter referred to as the "Act"), the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley initiated proceedings for the annexation of territory to City of Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated (hereinafter referred to as the "District") and the levy and collection of assessments within such territory for the 2019-2020 fiscal year and caused to be prepared a written report (the "Engineer's Report") in accordance with the Act and Article XIII D of the California Constitution.

Section 2. Following notice duly given in accordance with law, the City Council has held a full and fair public hearing regarding the Engineer's Report, the annexation of territory to the District, and the levy and collection of the proposed assessment within such territory for fiscal year 2019-2020. All interested persons were afforded the opportunity to hear and be heard. The City Council considered all oral and written statements, protests and communications made or filed by interested persons and tabulated all ballots. The City Council hereby finds that a majority protest does not exist as defined in Section 4(e) of Article XIII D of the California Constitution. All protests and objections to the annexation of territory to the District and the levy and collection of the proposed assessment against lots or parcels of property within the annexed territory for fiscal year 2019-2020 are hereby overruled by the City Council.

Section 3. The City Council hereby orders the annexation of territory, which is described as Assessor's Parcel Number 165-240-019, to the District. The District will continue to be designated as City of Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated.

Section 4. Based upon its review of the Engineer's Report and other reports and information, the City Council hereby finds and determines that (i) the land within the annexed territory will be benefited by the improvements as described in such Engineer's Report, (ii) the annexed territory includes all of the lands so benefited, (iii) the net amount to be assessed upon the lands within the annexed territory for the 2019-2020 fiscal year, in accordance with the Engineer's Report, is apportioned by a formula and method which fairly distributes the net amount among all assessable lots or parcels in proportion to the estimated benefits to be
received by each such lot or parcel from the improvements; and (iv) only special benefits are assessed and no assessment is imposed on any parcel which exceeds the reasonable cost of the proportional special benefit conferred on that parcel.

**Section 5.** The City Council hereby orders the proposed improvements to be made, which improvements are briefly described as follows: The installation and planting of landscaping, including trees, shrubs, grass and other ornamental vegetation; the installation or construction of public lighting facilities including but not limited to, street lights; the installation or construction of any facilities which are appurtenant to any of the foregoing, or which are necessary or convenient for the maintenance or servicing thereof, including, but not limited to, grading, clearing, removal of debris; the installation or construction of curbs, gutters, walls, sidewalks or paving, water irrigation, drainage or electrical facilities; and, the maintenance and/or servicing of any of the foregoing.

**Section 6.** Lots or parcels of land within the annexed territory that are owned or used by any county, city, city and county, special district or any other local governmental entity, the State of California, or the United States shall be assessed unless the City demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that such lots or parcels receive no special benefit from the proposed improvements.

**Section 7.** The City Council hereby confirms the diagram and assessment, with respect to the annexed parcels, as originally proposed in the Engineer's Report.

**Section 8.** The assessment is in compliance with the provisions of the Act and Article XIIID of the California Constitution.

**Section 9.** The assessment is levied without regard to property valuation.

**Section 10.** The assessment is levied for the purpose of paying the costs and expenses of the improvements described in Section 5 above for the fiscal year commencing on July 1, 2019 and ending on June 30, 2020.

**Section 11.** The adoption of this Resolution constitutes the levy of an assessment for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 2019 and ending June 30, 2020.

**Section 12.** The improvements shall be performed pursuant to law.

**Section 13.** The County Auditor of Riverside County shall enter on the County Assessment Roll opposite each lot or parcel of land the amount of the assessment and such assessments shall then be collected at the same time and in the same manner as the County taxes are collected. After collection by the County, the net amount of the assessments shall be paid to the City Administrative Services Director.

**Section 14.** The Administrative Director shall deposit all moneys representing assessments collected by the County to the credit of a special fund known as "City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-I -C Zone C," and such moneys shall be expended only for the
improvements described in Section 5 above.

**Section 15.** The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to file the diagram and assessment, or a certified copy of the diagram and assessment, with the County Auditor, together with a certified copy of this Resolution upon its adoption.

**Section 16.** A certified copy of the diagram and assessment shall be filed in the office of the City Engineer, with a duplicate copy on file in the office of the City Clerk and open for public inspection.

**PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED** by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 17th day of January, 2019.

______________________________
Brian Berkson
Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE ) ss.
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY )

I, Victoria Wasko, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-08 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 17th day of January, 2019 by the following votes, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, this 17th day of January, 2019.

__________________________
Victoria Wasko, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
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AGENCY: CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
SUBJECT: ANNEXATION OF PM 37062 TO CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO.89-1-CONSOLIDATED ("CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY L&LMD NO.89-1-C") AS ZONE C
TO: CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY CITY COUNCIL

Pursuant to the direction from the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley ("City Council"), California, this Engineer’s Report ("Report") is prepared and hereby submitted for the City of Jurupa Valley ("City") in compliance with the provisions of Section 22565 through 22574 of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 ("1972 Act"), said Act being Part 2 of Division 15 of the Streets and Highways Code of the State of California, Section 4 of Article XIII D of the California Constitution.

This Report provides for the annexation of PM 37062 to City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD No. 89-1-C as Zone C and establishes the Maximum Assessment to be levied in the Fiscal Year commencing July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020 (2019-2020) and continuing in all subsequent Fiscal Years, for this area to be known and designated as:

CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY L&LMD NO. 89-1-C ZONE C

PM 37062

I do hereby assess and apportion the total amount of the costs and expenses upon several parcels of land within said designated area liable therefor and benefited thereby, in proportion to the estimated benefits that each parcel receives, respectively, from said services.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, the appointed ENGINEER, acting on behalf of the City of Jurupa Valley, pursuant to the 1972 Act, do hereby submit the following:

Pursuant to the provisions of law, the costs and expenses of the Zone have been assessed upon the parcels of land in the Zone benefited thereby in direct proportion and relation to the estimated benefits to be received by each of said parcels. For particulars as to the identification of said parcels, reference is made to the Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map, a reduced copy of which is included herein.

As required by law, an Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map is filed herewith, showing the Zone, as well as the boundaries and dimensions of the respective parcels and subdivisions of land within said Zone as they exist, as of the date of this Report, each of which subdivisions of land or parcels or lots, respectively, have been assigned a parcel/lot number within a specific tract and indicated on said Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map and in the Assessment Roll contained herein.

The separate numbers given the subdivisions and parcels of land, as shown on said Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map and Assessment Roll, correspond with the numbers assigned to each parcel by the Riverside County Assessor. Reference is made to the County Assessor Roll for a description of the lots or parcels.
As of the date of this Report, there are no parcels or lots within Zone C that are owned by a federal, state or other local governmental agency that will benefit from the services to be provided by the assessments to be collected.

November 1st, 2018.

[Signature]

Steve Loriso, R.C.E.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION
Pursuant to the provisions of law, the costs and expenses of the Zone have been assessed upon the parcels of land in the Zone benefited thereby in direct proportion and relation to the estimated benefits to be received by each of said parcels. For particulars as to the identification of said parcels, reference is made to the Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map, a reduced copy of which is included herein. On this 1st day of November, 2018 the City Council, City of Jurupa Valley, State of California, ordering the preparation of the Report providing for the annexation of PM 37062 to L&LMD No. 89-1-C as Zone C did, pursuant to the provisions of the 1972 Act, being Division 15 of the Streets and Highways Code of the State of California, adopt Resolution No. 2018-65 for a special assessment district zone known and designated as:

ZONE C
PM 37062
The annexation of Zone C includes the parcels/lots within the commercial subdivision known as PM 37062, also identified by the Assessor Parcel Number(s) 165-240-019 valid as of the date of this Report: November 1st, 2018. As required by law, an Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map is filed herewith, showing the Zone, as well as the boundaries and dimensions of the respective parcels and subdivisions of land within said Zone as they exist, as of the date of this Report, each of which subdivisions of land or parcels or lots, respectively, have been assigned a parcel/lot number within a specific tract and indicated on the Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map and in the Assessment Roll contained herein.

The following report presents the engineering analysis for the annexation of Zone C and the establishment of the Maximum Assessment, based on Proposition 218 and the Act of 1972, to be levied and collected commencing Fiscal Year 2019-2020 and all subsequent fiscal years.

DEFINITIONS
Agency – Means the local government, City of Jurupa Valley.
Assessment – Means any levy or charge upon real property by the Agency for a special benefit conferred upon the real property. “Assessment”, includes, but is not limited to, “special assessment,” “benefit assessment,” maintenance assessment and special assessment tax.
Capital cost – Means the cost of acquisition, installation, construction, reconstruction, or replacement of a permanent public improvement by the Agency.
District – Means an area determined by the Agency to contain all parcels which will receive a special benefit from a proposed public improvement of property-related service.
Maintenance and operation expenses - Means the cost of rent, repair, replacement, rehabilitation, fuel, power, electrical current, care, and supervision necessary to properly operate and maintain a permanent public improvement.
Ad Valorem Reduction — Means a particular and distinct benefit over and above general benefits conferred on real property located in the district or to the public at large. General enhancement of property value does not constitute "special benefit."

Special benefit — Means a particular and distinct benefit over and above general benefits conferred on real property located in the district or to the public at large. General enhancement of property value does not constitute "special benefit."
PART I - BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT

LOCATION OF THE ASSESSMENT ZONE

Zone C shall consist of a benefit zone encompassing a portion of the properties within the commercial development known as PM 37062. The proposed improvements described in this Report are based on current development and improvement plans provided as of the date of this Report.

Zone C is generally located North East corner of Limonite Avenue intersection with Felspar Street, in the City of Jurupa Valley, in the County of Riverside, State of California. It includes 4 commercial parcels, identified in Parcel Map 37062. At the time of this assessment, the assessment zone consists of 4 assessable parcels designated as commercial lots and zero non-assessable lots identified. Zone C consists of all lots/units, parcels, and subdivisions of land located in the following development area:

Assessor Parcel Number as of date of this Report: 165-240-019
PART II - IMPROVEMENTS AND SERVICES FOR CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
L&LMD NO. 89-1-C ZONE C

The services to be funded by City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD No. 89-1-C Zone C include the parkway landscape maintenance fronting the commercial subdivision designated as PM 37062 and streetlights. The proposed improvements, the associated costs, and benefiting properties were carefully reviewed, identified, and evaluated. Zone C was reviewed and specific areas of special benefit within the District were identified, based on:
   a. Level of Service
   b. Improvement Types
   c. Proximity to Improvement
   d. Levels of Special Benefit from Zone (on Public versus Private)

The 1972 Act permits the establishment of assessment districts by agencies for the purpose of providing certain public improvements, which include the construction, maintenance, and servicing of public lights, landscaping, dedicated easements for landscape use, and appurtenant facilities. The 1972 Act further provides that assessments may be apportioned upon all assessable lot(s) or parcel(s) of land within an assessment district in proportion to the estimated benefits to be received by each lot or parcel from the improvements rather than by assessed value.

It was determined that the improvements identified by this report will directly benefit the parcel to be assessed within Zone C. The assessments and method of apportionment is based on the premise that the assessments will be used to construct and install landscape and lighting improvements within the existing district as well as provide for annual maintenance of those improvements and the assessment revenues generated by the Zone will be used solely for such purpose.

LANDSCAPING IMPROVEMENTS
The assessment will provide for landscaping servicing and maintenance as approved by the City during the Tentative Parcel Map approval; where the following apply:

1. Servicing: the furnishing of water for the irrigation of any landscaping, the operation of any fountains, or the maintenance of any other improvements.

2. Maintenance: the furnishing of services and materials for the ordinary and usual maintenance, operation and servicing of any improvement, including the repair, removal, or replacement of all or part of landscape improvements. Maintenance shall also include tree trimming for the trees identified on the Landscape plans associated with Parcel Map 37062 and the commercial development.

The benefits associated with landscaping improvements include:
1. Enhanced environmental quality of the parcels through improved erosion resistance, dust and debris control, and fire protection.
2. Reduced criminal activity and property-related crimes (especially vandalism) against properties through well-maintained surrounding and amenities.
3. Enhanced environmental quality of the parcels by moderating temperatures, providing oxygenation and attenuation noise.

**STREET LIGHTING IMPROVEMENTS**

The assessment will provide for the operating energy cost of the street lights servicing the commercial development, as shown in the Street Lighting Improvement plans associated with the project.

The benefits associated with streetlight improvements include:

1. Enhanced deterrence of crime such as vandalism and other criminal activities which would reduce damage to improvements or property.
2. Improved visibility to assist police in the protection of property.
3. Improved visibility for egress from and ingress to the property.
PART III - FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION
The formula used for calculating assessments reflects the composition of the parcels and the improvements and services provided by the Zone to fairly apportion the costs based on the estimated benefit to each parcel.

The landscaping improvements within Zone C provide direct and special benefit to the lots or parcels within the Zone. Therefore, the maintenance of these improvements also provides direct and special benefit by maintaining the functionality of the improvements and allowing the improvements to operate in a proper manner.

Equivalent Benefiting Unit method of apportionment and proposition 218 where reviewed to provide a weighted proportional benefit to properties. Because all benefiting properties consist of a uniform land use, it is determined that all parcels benefit equally from the improvements and the costs and expenses for the maintenance and servicing of landscaping are apportioned on a per parcel basis.

The total benefit from the works of improvement is a combination of the special benefits to the parcels within the Zone and the general benefits to the public at large and to adjacent property owners. A portion of the total maintenance costs for the landscaping and streetlights, if any, associated with general benefits will not be assessed to the parcels in the Zone, but will be paid from other City of Jurupa Valley funds.

No property is assessed in excess of the reasonable cost of the proportional special benefit conferred on that property. Additionally, because the benefiting property consists of a uniform land use (commercial), it is determined that all parcels within the Zone benefit equally form the improvements. Therefore, the proportionate share of the costs and expenses for the provisions of landscaping, as well as costs and expenses for the maintenance of the landscaping are apportioned equally on a per parcel basis.

MAXIMUM ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY
The following methodology was adopted by City Council in Resolution No. 2016-01 dated February 4, 2016. Such methodology has been maintained in preparation of this Report. The purpose of establishing a Maximum Assessment formula is to provide for reasonable increases and inflationary adjustments to annual assessments without requiring costly noticing and mailing procedures, which would add to the Zone C costs and assessments.

The Maximum Assessment formula shall be applied to all assessable parcels of land within the Zone. For Zone C, the initial Maximum Assessment(s) for Fiscal Year 2019-2020 are as follows:

1. The initial Total Maximum Assessment established within Zone C (PM 37062) shall be $7,714.34.
2. The initial Maximum Assessment per assessable parcel/lot/unit established within Zone C, composed of one assessable lot, is anticipated to be $1,928.58.

In compliance with California Constitution Article XIIIID (Proposition 218), the assessment established for Zone “C” on this report, include an adjustment formula to account for reasonable increase in cost for maintenance and inflation. The initial Maximum Assessment shall be adjusted by the greater of two percent (2%) or the cumulative percentage increase in the CPI-U Index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor for Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario.

The Maximum Assessment is adjusted annually and is calculated independent of Zone C’s annual budget and proposed annual assessment. The proposed annual assessment (rate per assessable parcel) applied in any fiscal year is not considered to be an increased assessment if less than or equal to the Maximum Assessment amount. In no case shall the annual assessment exceed the Maximum Assessment.

Although the Maximum Assessment will increase each year, the actual Zone C assessments may remain virtually unchanged. The Maximum Assessment adjustment is designed to establish reasonable limits on Zone C assessments. The Maximum Assessment calculated each year does not require or facilitate an increase of the annual assessment and neither does it restrict assessments to the adjusted maximum amount. If the budget and assessments for the fiscal year require an increase and the increase is more than the adjusted Maximum Assessment, it is considered an increased assessment.

To impose an increase assessment, the City of Jurupa Valley must comply with the provisions of the California Constitution Article XIII D Section 4c, that requires a public hearing and certain protest procedures including mailed notice of the public hearing and property owner protest balloting. Property owner through the balloting process must approve the proposed as increase. If the proposed assessment is approved, then a new Maximum Assessment is established for Zone C. If the proposed assessment is not approved, the City may not levy an assessment greater than the adjusted Maximum Assessment previously established for Zone C.

**COST ESTIMATE**

The Ad Valorem reduction is the corresponding general benefit value of the improvements, and it is determined by identifying the general public benefit from the installation and upkeep of the improvements identified on this report. All proposed landscape improvements contained within this report are located directly in front of the assessed parcel and the installation of the improvements were only necessary for the development of properties within the Zone. Therefore, it was determined that any public access or use of these local improvements by others is incidental and there is no measurable general benefit to properties outside the one or to the public at large. The Ad Valorem reduction for this assessment is zero.

The Assessment for each assessable parcel within Zone C is calculated by dividing the total Annual Balance to Levy minus the Ad Valorem Reduction by the total number of assessable subdivided parcels within Zone C to determine the Annual Assessment per assessable parcel.
\[
\frac{Annual\ Balance\ to\ Levy - Ad\ Valorem\ Reduction}{Total\ number\ of\ assessable\ parcels} = Annual\ Assessment\ per\ assessable\ parcel
\]

The Annual Balance to Levy is the Total Annual Landscaping Costs as seen in the following summary table:
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY L&LMD NO. 89-1-C ZONE C  
TR 37062  
FY 2019-2020

Total Assessable Parcels/Lots: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Description</th>
<th>Total Cost for Zone C</th>
<th>Cost per Parcel/Lot for Zone C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscaping &amp; Trails:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Landscaping Maintenance</td>
<td>$2,793.60</td>
<td>$698.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>$2,404.80</td>
<td>$601.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Trimming</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulch</td>
<td>$291.00</td>
<td>$72.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calsense</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$62.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backflow Certificate</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Landscaping Maintenance Costs:</strong></td>
<td>$5,989.40</td>
<td>$1,497.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$509.10</td>
<td>$127.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$598.94</td>
<td>$149.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ANNUAL LANDSCAPING &amp; TRAILS COSTS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,097.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,774.36</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Lighting:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Energy Charge of $134.05 per street light for 3</td>
<td>$402.15</td>
<td>$100.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lights – 200 Watt 22,000 Lumen LED equivalent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Energy Charge of $118.44 per street light for 1</td>
<td>$118.44</td>
<td>$29.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lights – 100 Watt 9,500 Lumen LED equivalent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$44.25</td>
<td>$11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Rese</td>
<td>$52.06</td>
<td>$13.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ANNUAL STREET LIGHTING COSTS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$616.90</strong></td>
<td><strong>$154.23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL ANNUAL STREET LIGHTING AND LANDSCAPING COSTS:**  
$7,714.34  
$1,928.58

**INITIAL MAXIMUM ASSESSMENT PER ASSESSABLE LOT/UNIT OR PARCEL:**  
$1,928.58

Notes:  
Water meter cost included on landscape rate.  
Water cost included in landscape rate.
PART IV – ASSESSMENT DIAGRAM

(See next page)
ASSEMENT DIAGRAM/ BOUNDARY MAP
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING
MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO. 89-1- CONSOLIDATED
ZONE C
TR 37062
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
T2S R6W SEC 23 S

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER AS OF DATE OF ENGINEER'S REPORT
165-240-019

Subzone Boundary

VICINITY MAP

For details concerning the lines and dimensions of the applicable Assessor's Parcel numbers, refer to the County Assessor's Map as of the date of the Report.

165-240-019

HRGreen
PART V – ASSESSMENT ROLLS

Parcel identification for each lot/unit or parcel within Zone C shall be the parcels as shown on the Riverside County Secured Roll for the year in which this Report is prepared and reflective of the Assessor’s Parcel Maps. Zone C includes the following Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APNs) as of the date of this Report: 165-240-019.

The initial Maximum Assessment shall be adjusted annually by the greater of two percent (2%) or the cumulative percentage increase in the CPI-U for All Items Index published by the BLS.

When subdivided, the initial Maximum Assessments per assessable lot/unit or parcel for Zone C are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel/ Lot No.</th>
<th>Maximum Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,928.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,928.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,928.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,928.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF REPORT

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER

BY: STEVE R. LORISO, P.E., CITY ENGINEER/ DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 13.A

UPDATE ON OVERHEAD STREET BANNER POLES

RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council receive the update on Overhead Street Banner Poles and provide further direction to staff

BACKGROUND

In advance of City sanctioned events, banners are made and installed at various locations throughout the City, including City Hall. These banners are intended to inform residents and visitors alike of upcoming public events. These banners are typically installed on temporary structures and/or fences at ground level.

At their August 16, 2018 meeting, City Council received a presentation on the potential use of overhead street banner poles. At that meeting the following three locations were discussed and approved:

1. Mission Boulevard (east of Crestmore Road)
2. Van Buren Boulevard (north of 60th Street)
3. Limonite Avenue (between Wineville Avenue and Lucretia Avenue)

The approximate locations are depicted on the location maps provided (Attachment 1).

ANALYSIS

Staff has begun preparing preliminary design plans for these three locations (Attachment 2). Final design calculations for the poles and their footings would be
completed by the contractor as part of their contract. As can be seen with new traffic signal installations, updated design parameters for the poles require analysis of higher wind loads.

Staff has also researched and provided various decorative features that can be added to these poles (Attachment 3).

In addition to installation of the overhead street banner poles, a banner policy should be considered by City Council in order to develop guidelines/regulations for banner usage (i.e., types of events and organizations, etc.) and permitting.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The installation of overhead street banner poles has an initial cost as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Van Buren Boulevard</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Boulevard</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limonite Avenue</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$215,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost for Van Buren is higher due to needing an additional pole to be placed in the median. These costs are for non-decorative poles. Depending on what type of decorative features, if any, are preferred the cost can increase roughly $5,000 to $10,000 per location.

The FY 18/19 adopted budget identifies $30,000 for these banner poles. Therefore, an additional budget appropriation will be necessary for any installations.

Installation/replacement of banners for future events would be less than $1,000 per location per event.

CONCLUSION

It is recommended that City Council provide further direction on how to proceed.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Take no action.
2. Provide staff with further direction.
Prepared by:  
Steve R. Loriso  
City Engineer/Director of Public Works

Reviewed by:  
George A. Wentz  
Deputy City Manager

Reviewed by:  
Alan Kreimeier  
Administrative Services Director

Submitted by:  
Gary S. Thompson  
City Manager

Approved as to Form:  

Peter M. Thorson  
City Attorney

Attachments:  

1) Location Maps  
2) Preliminary Design Plans  
3) Available Decorative Features
ATTACHMENT 2
PRELIMINARY DESIGN PLANS
SECTION A-A

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. Furnish and install banner pole and appurtenances per details on this sheet and Sheet 2

2. Furnish and install banner pole and appurtenances per details on this sheet and Sheet 2
ASPHALT

TOP OF SLOPE

TOP OF SLOPE

TOP OF SLOPE

TOP OF SLOPE

TOE OF SLOPE

TOE OF SLOPE

TOE OF SLOPE

TOE OF SLOPE

BACK OF SIDEWALK

ROW

ROW

SECTION A-A

SCALE 1" = 20'

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

☐ FURNISH AND INSTALL BANNER POLE AND APPURTENANCES PER DETAILS ON THIS SHEET AND SHEET 2.

CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

BANNER POLES

SITE 2 LAYOUT

MISSION BOULEVARD

SHEET A OF 3
CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. Furnish and install banner pole and appurtenances per details on this sheet and Sheet 2.

2. Remove 15" from existing horse rail fence.
ATTACHMENT 3

AVAILABLE DECORATIVE FEATURES
Decorative bases for Banner Poles

- Sterling Series (ST)
- Coast Series (CST)
- Huntington Series (HNT)
- Washington Series (WSH)
- Tustin Series (TUS)

Source: South Coast
Top Part of the Pole

Source: Visco Light
STAFF REPORT

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER
BY: STEVE R. LORISO, PE, CITY ENGINEER/DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 13.B
RESOLUTION AMENDING SECTION 2 OF RESOLUTION NO. 2015-03, ESTABLISHING THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE BY ADDING MEMBERS APPOINTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL AND MAKING NEW APPOINTMENTS IF THE RESOLUTION IS ADOPTED

RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-09, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY AMENDING SECTION 2 OF RESOLUTION NO. 2015-03, ESTABLISHING THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE BY ADDING MEMBERS APPOINTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL

BACKGROUND

On January 15, 2015, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2015-03, which established the Jurupa Valley Traffic Safety Committee. The purpose of this body is to serve in an advisory role on traffic matters to the City Council.

At the December 20, 2018 meeting, the City Council discussed adding one or more members to the Traffic Safety Committee. The individuals who expressed interest in filling the vacancies on the Committee and were not selected were invited to attend the January 17th meeting in case the Council wished to make additional appointments at this time. Their Letters of Interest are attached to this staff report.
ANALYSIS

The Jurupa Valley Traffic Safety Committee was established with five (5) members. Three (3) members are appointed by the City Manager and two (2) members are appointed by the City Council. The proposed resolution intends to modify the total number of members to seven (7). Four (4) members would be appointed by the City Council and three (3) would still be appointed by the City Manager.

OTHER INFORMATION

- At the November 2, 2017 meeting, the City Council adopted Resolution 2017-67 requiring reconfirmation of Traffic Safety Committee members on an annual basis.

- At the November 19, 2015 meeting, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2015-56 adding the appointment of one (1) alternate member to the Committee.

ALTERNATIVES

1) Do not approve the Resolution

2) Provide staff alternate direction.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

No additional impact to the General Fund is anticipated.

****************************************************************SIGNATURES ON FOLLOWING PAGE****************************************************************
ATTACHMENTS:

1. Resolution No. 2019-09
2. Letters of Interest
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-09

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING SECTION 2 OF RESOLUTION NO. 2015-03, ESTABLISHING THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE BY ADDING MEMBERS APPOINTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 2 of Resolution No. 2015-03, establishing the Jurupa Valley Traffic Safety Committee, is here by amended to read as follows:


A. The Traffic Safety Committee shall consist of seven (7) members. Three (3) members shall be appointed by the City Manager. Four (4) members shall be appointed by the City Council.

B. Traffic Safety Committee members shall serve at the pleasure of the appointing authority and a member of the Traffic Safety Committee may be removed from the Committee by his or her appointing authority for any reason, with or without cause.

C. Each member shall serve a term commencing on appointment and expiring on December 1 of the year in which a general municipal election is held or the appointment and swearing-in of their successors, whichever is later. The City Council shall fill vacancies when they occur for appointments made by the City Council for the remainder of the expired term.

D. Not less than ten (10) days prior to the meeting at which the Council will consider one or more appointments to the Traffic Safety Committee the City Clerk shall post notice of the pending appointments and invite qualified persons to apply for the position or positions. The City Clerk shall post such notice at the locations where the City Council Agendas are posted pursuant to City Council resolution and on the City’s website. In addition to these posting requirements, the City Clerk shall also comply with the posting requirements for vacancies and terms of Planning Commissioners as provided in Government Code Sections 54970 to 54974 or their successor sections. The City Manager shall make his appointments following this period.

SECTION 2. Except as provided in this Resolution, all other terms and provisions of Resolution No. 2015-03 shall remain in full force and effect.
SECTION 3. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 17th day of January, 2019.

__________________________________  
Brian Berkson  
Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________________  
Victoria Wasko, CMC  
City Clerk
CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE   
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY  

I, Victoria Wasko, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-09 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 17th day of January, 2019 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, on the 17th day of January, 2019.

________________________________
Victoria Wasko, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
To: The Jurupa Valley City Council
From: Robert Galindo
Date: December 11, 2018
Ref: Traffic Safety Committee Appointment

Dear Jurupa Valley City Council,

I am submitting my letter of interest for the position of Traffic Safety Committee Member. I have reviewed the requirement and duties of this position. I believe I can be of service to this committee and the City of Jurupa Valley.

I have been a resident of Jurupa Valley since 1996. I have seen the growth and change to our community, both positive and negative. I am willing and able to help my city in the capacity of Traffic Safety Committee Member.

I have been involved in this community from Little League and Softball Coach. PTA member for local schools, Watch Dog Program at JMS, Parent Booster Member of Patriot HS Band, Vice President of Boosters for the Patriot Marching Band and Concert Band. I was a Member of the Boosters for Patriot HS Swim Team also the Official Timer and Score Keeper. While involved in these activates I worked alongside other parents, school employees, school administrators, city employees, public safety members and the Jurupa Valley Adopt a Family Program.

I am currently retired from public service. I was a Police Officer with the City of Upland for 32 years. I had been in several assignments I believe will help me in this committee. While working uniformed patrol part of my duties involved traffic enforcement and traffic collision investigation, while a detective I was appointed to the Traffic Division as a Supervisor. During that assignment I supervised 5 traffic motor officers, reviewed and approved all traffic collision reports, over saw NTSB Grants, Supervised DJI and Seat Belt Check Points. I worked with the Upland Unified School District to address traffic problems around schools. I attended Advance Officer Traffic Collision Investigators School. As a Patrol Sergeant I continued to supervise patrol officers in all aspects of patrol and traffic enforcement.

I believe traffic problems can contribute to the decline quality of life and source of numerous complaints for any city. As a member of this committee I hope to use my experience and training to help my city address these issues.

Respectfully Submitted

Robert Galindo

Martingale Dr.

Jurupa Valley, Ca. 92509
December 12, 2018

Vicki Wasko, City Clerk

City of Jurupa Valley

Jurupa Valley, CA 92509

Dear Mrs. Wasko,

My name is Mayra Jackson, and I am writing to apply for the vacancy on the City’s Traffic Safety Committee. I am a homeowner here in Jurupa Valley, and I am fully invested in seeing this city’s growth and development, while maintaining its equestrian roots. I look forward to the opportunity to serve my city and my community through the Traffic and Safety Committee. The city is growing and more changes are coming our way in the next years ahead. Jurupa Valley can either benefit from this growth or find itself overwhelmed. As part of the Traffic Safety Committee I would ensure that Jurupa Valley’s important traffic and safety issues are addressed and heard. I will listen and make sure to take accurate decisions in order to make a solutions fitted to our needs.

My educational achievements include a Bachelors in Teaching and many awards provided for all my achievements. I am from Ecuador and I am married. I have been active in my Home Owners Association (HOA) for the past year. I am the Regional Director for an environmental caucus and I serve as a board member for a nonprofit called Healthy Heritage Movement. I am also a member of the Jurupa Lions Club. Lastly I most recently volunteered for a toy drive hosted by the Riverside City Fire Department.

As written before I am very interested and look forward to hearing your response. I will be honored and do everything I can to make Jurupa Valley a safer and better place to live.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at if you would like to discuss my qualifications further. I can be reached at

Sincerely,

Mayra Jackson