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AGENDA

1.0 PUBLIC HEARING

1.1 MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 18147 (CASE NOS. SDP18107 & DOU18001) TO CONSTRUCT A 42,132 SQUARE-FOOT INDUSTRIAL BUILDING FOR THE INSTALLATION & SALES OF REFRIGERATION UNITS ON TRAILERS & TRUCKS ON 6 ACRES OF VACANT LAND 2610 RUBIDOUX BLVD. (APNS: 178-150-008 & -009); APPLICANT: MIDLAND CARRIERS, LCC.

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration have been prepared. The project is subject to a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Director (1) adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) and (2) approve Site Development Permit No. 18107 subject to the attached conditions of approval.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENTS

3.0 ADJOURNMENT

If you wish to speak, please complete a “SPEAKER IDENTIFICATION FORM” and give it to the Planning Director. The purpose of the public hearing is to allow interested parties to express their concerns. Please do not repeat information already given. If you have no additional information, but wish to be on record, simply give your name and address and state that you agree with the previous speaker(s).

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if any accommodations are needed, please contact Grizelda Reed at (951) 332-6464 or e-mail at greed@jurupavalley.org. Request should be made at least 48 hours or as soon as possible prior to the scheduled meeting.
DATE: FEBRUARY 28, 2019
TO: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR
BY: ANNETTE TAM, SENIOR PLANNER
SUBJECT: MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 18147
CASE NOS. SDP18107 & DOU18001
PROJECT: INSTALLATION & SALES OF REFRIGERATION UNITS ON TRAILERS & TRUCKS & THE CONSTRUCTION OF 42,132 SQUARE-FOOT BUILDING ON APPROXIMATELY 6.1 ACRES
PROJECT SITE: 2610 RUBIDOUX BLVD. (APNS: 178-150-008 & -009)
APPLICANT: MIDLANDS CARRIER, LLC.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the Planning Director (1) adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) and (2) approve Site Development Permit No. 18107 subject to the attached conditions of approval.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The proposed project is for the (1) establishment of the installation and sales of refrigeration units on trailers and trucks and (2) construction of a 42,132 square-foot building with minor improvements on approximately 6 acres of land located at 2610 Rubidoux Blvd.

EXHIBIT A. PROJECT SITE (SOURCE: COUNTY GIS)
TABLE 1: GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

| ACCESOR’S PARCEL NUMBER(S) | 178-150-008          |
|                           | 178-150-009          |
| TOTAL ACREAGE OF PROJECT SITE | 6.27 gross acres    |
| EXISTING GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION(S) | Light Industrial (LI) |
| EXISTING ZONING CLASSIFICATION(S) | M-SC and I-P |

ANALYSIS

I. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA). The City of Jurupa Valley has prepared and intends to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Project. The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration is supported by an Initial Study 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 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 mitigation measures have been required or 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.

The public review period began on February 4, 2019 and ended on February 25, 2019. The City did not receive any comment during the public review period.

II. GENERAL PLAN. The General Plan land use designation is Light Industrial (LI). It is consistent with the underlying zoning classifications of Industrial Park (I-P) and Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC). The land use designation allows for industrial use. The project is consistent with the policies of LI.

Environmental Justice Element. The project is consistent with the policies of the Environmental Justice (EJ) Element. The City has provided information handouts (see Attachment No. 7) in Spanish and English languages about the project. The City was available to answer any question and address any concern. The City received one comment by phone from a local resident. The resident had expressed that he wants to learn from about the proposed business from the applicant at the Director’s hearing.

III. ZONING ORDINANCE. The project is in compliance with the zoning ordinance subject to the attached conditions.

A. Industrial-Park (I-P). The project is consistent with the applicable standards of the zone.

<p>| TABLE 2. I-P ZONE’S APPLICABLE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| DEVELOPMENT STANDARD | DOES THE PROJECT COMPLY? |
| Setbacks                          | Yes – as shown on the site plan at 124 feet to 26th St. and 101 feet to Rubidoux St. |
| Side: 10 feet                     |                           |
| Rear: 15 feet                     |                           |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street: 25 feet</th>
<th>Maximum Bldg. Height: 35 feet</th>
<th>Yes – as shown on the elevations at 24 feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes – as shown on the plans that the overall project site is at 19%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Min. 15% of site must be landscaped &amp; irrigated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Min. 10-foot-wide landscape strip adjacent to streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Areas designed per Title 9</td>
<td>Yes – as shown on the plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Items to be Screened from Public View:</td>
<td>Yes – as shown on the plans to be screened by walls and/or landscaping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parking and Loading Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trash Collection Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outside storage and service areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities: All new utilities shall be underground.</td>
<td>Yes – as stated on the site plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting: All light fixtures shall be focused, directed, and arranged to prevent glare or direct illumination on streets or adjoining property.</td>
<td>Yes – per condition of approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC). The project is consistent with the applicable standards of the zone.

**TABLE 3. M-SC ZONE’S APPLICABLE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT STANDARD</th>
<th>DOES THE PROJECT COMPLY?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Min. 10% of site must be landscaped &amp; irrigated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Min. 10-foot-wide landscape strip adjacent to streets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Areas designed per Title 9</td>
<td>Yes – as shown on the plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Items to be Screened from Public View:</td>
<td>Yes – as shown on the plans to be screened by walls and landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trash Collection Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outside storage and service areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities: All must be underground except electrical lines rated at 33kV or greater</td>
<td>Yes – as shown on plan and per condition of approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting: All light fixtures shall be focused, directed, and arranged to prevent glare or direct illumination on streets or adjoining property.</td>
<td>Yes – per condition of approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. SITE DEVELOPMENT (PROJECT DESIGN & USE)

A. Overall Site Development. A 42,132 square-foot building is proposed on a total of approximately 6 acres of vacant land. The installation and sales of refrigeration units on trailers and trucks will occur within the building. The building is setback from 26th Street by 124 feet and from Rubidoux Boulevard by 101 feet. There is at least 25 feet of landscaping with trees on both 26th Street and Rubidoux Boulevard.

A 6-foot high split-face perimeter wall is proposed along the property line at 26th Street and along the eastern boundary line. A 6-foot high wrought iron fence is proposed along the perimeter of the parking area.

The other site improvements include a parking area with 74 parking spaces, trash enclosure, landscaping, irrigation, and walls and fences.

B. Floor Plan. The front of the building faces Rubidoux Boulevard. The building is a single-story. The western half of the building consists of offices, customer lobby area, conference room, restrooms, and parts storage. The remaining half of the building area (approximately 56%) consists of the service area for the vehicles. There is a total of twelve (12) service bays (six on each side of the building).

C. Access Points. Access to the site is from 26th Street and Rubidoux Boulevard. Per Engineering Condition of Approval No. 3, truck access is only allowed on Rubidoux Boulevard. The reason for the condition is there are two residential lots across the street on 26th Street from the project site. Automobiles are permitted on both access points.

D. Engineering Review. Engineering Department has reviewed the project for access, circulation, grading, and drainage.

V. FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL OF A SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT.

The proposal complies with the following required findings for the approval of a site development permit:

A. The proposed use must conform to all the requirements of the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan and with all applicable requirements of State law and the ordinance of the City of Jurupa Valley.

The project is consistent with the General Plan, zoning ordinance, and applicable state law. The General Plan land use designation is Light Industrial and the zoning classifications are Industrial Park (I-P) and Manufacturing-Service Commercial. It complies with all applicable development standards with the imposition of conditions of approval.

B. The overall development of the land shall be designed for the protection of the public health, safety, and general welfare; to conform to the logical development of the land and to be compatible with the present and logical development of the surrounding property. The plan shall consider the location and need for dedication and improvement of necessary streets and sidewalks, including the avoidance of traffic congestion; and shall take into account topographical and drainage conditions, including the need for dedication and improvements of necessary structures as a part thereof.

The combination of the site design, Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMMRP), and conditions of approval for this project are designed for the protection of the public health, safety, and general welfare.
The project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation (Light Industrial) and zoning classifications of Industrial-Park and Manufacturing-Service Commercial is to allow for the construction of a repair, sales, and service facility.

The project addressed the necessary topographical and drainage conditions with the site plan, conceptual grading plan, preliminary water quality management plan, and conditions of approval.

C. All site development permits which permit the construction of more than one structure on a single legally divided parcel shall, in addition to all other requirements, be subject to a condition which prohibits the sale of any existing or subsequently constructed structures on the parcel until the parcel is divided and a final map recorded in accordance with Title 3 in such a manner that each building is located on a separate legally divided parcel.

The Site Development Permit allows for only one structure on a single parcel.

CONCLUSION

Based on staff’s analysis and findings, Staff recommends the approval of the Site Development Permit No. 18107 subject to the attached recommended conditions.

Prepared and Submitted by:

Reviewed by:

Annette Tam
Senior Planner

Serita Young
Deputy City Attorney

ATTACHMENTS

1. Mitigated Negative Declaration with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (studies on file with City)
2. Recommended Conditions of Approval
3. Plans:
   a. Architectural Plans
   b. Conceptual Grading Plans
   c. Conceptual Landscape Plans
4. Determination of Use No. 18001
5. Outreach Handout to Mira Loma Village (English & Spanish)
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Mitigated Negative Declaration
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Determination of Use No. 18001

City of Jurupa Valley
8930 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
Contact: Annette Tam, Senior Planner
(951) 332-6464
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Applicant:
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MASTER APPLICATION NO. 18147 SUMMARY

Site Development Permit No. 18107: New 42,132 square-feet building on 6.1 net acres of land with parking lot and landscaping.

Determination of Use No. 18001. The use is for the installation of refrigeration units on trailers and sales of those trailers which is a use not specifically listed in the Industrial Park (I-P) zone. Pursuant to Section 9.145.020.G of the Municipal Code, any use that is not specifically listed in subsections (A) and (B) of this section may be considered a permitted or conditionally permitted use provided that the Planning Director finds that the proposed use is substantially the same in character and intensity as those listed in the designated subsections. Such a use is subject to the permit process which governs the category in which it falls.
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 Checklist/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 30-day public review period, comments on the adequacy of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration document may be submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department.

Following the 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 for review as part of their deliberations concerning the Project.

For this Project, the Jurupa Valley Planning Director has authority to approve, conditionally approve, or deny the Project subject to appeal to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission. Accordingly, a public hearing(s) will be held before the Jurupa Valley Planning Director to consider the proposed Project, consider any comments received and make a determination on the adequacy of this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

At the conclusion of the public hearing process, the Planning Director will take action to approve, conditionally approve, or deny the proposed Project. If approved, the Planning Director will adopt findings relative to the Project’s environmental effects as disclosed in the Initial Study /Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Notice of Determination will be filed with the Riverside County Clerk.

1.5 Initial Study /Mitigated Negative Declaration Findings and Conclusions

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

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

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [X] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [X] Land Use / Planning
- [ ] Population / Housing
- [ ] 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
- [X] 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 southeast corner of Rubidoux Boulevard and 26th Street (2610 Rubidoux Boulevard). (Refer to Exhibit 1).

The Project site is identified by the following Assessor Parcel Numbers: 178-150-008 and 009.

2.2 Project Description

The Project Applicant, Midland Carriers Transicold, submitted the following applications to the City of Jurupa Valley, which comprise the proposed Project: Site Development Permit (SDP) No. 18107 and Determination of Use No. 18001. The City of Jurupa Valley also refers to these applications as Master Application (MA) No. 18147. 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. Site Development Permit No. 18107

New 42,132 square-feet building on 6.14 acres of land with parking lot and landscaping. The use is for the installation of refrigeration units on trailers and sales of those trailers.

Street Improvements

The Project proposes the following street improvements:

- Rubidoux Boulevard: Remove existing driveway approach and construct a new 40-foot wide driveway approach on the southern portion of the site.

- 26th Street: Remove and reconstruct existing pavement and construct new curb and gutter.

Drainage Improvements

The proposed drainage pattern will mimic the existing patterns. Storm water will sheet across proposed AC pavement and landscaping in a northeasterly direction. Three catch basin inlets with filters are proposed to intercept runoff generated by the proposed development, and discharge into proposed underground storm drain pipes. At the northeasterly corner of the site, a proposed trench drain also intercepts storm flows and discharges into said storm drain. The on-site storm drain system will convey flows to the proposed underground storage infiltration system located in the northeasterly corner of the property. The underground storage infiltration system will be designed to infiltrate the entire design capture volume. Overflows from this system will bubble out of the proposed trench drain and sheet into the right-of-way of 26th Street.
Sewer and Water Improvements

The fire service line will connect to the existing 24-inch diameter water main in Rubidoux Boulevard. A new 1-inch diameter water line will be installed to the existing 8-inch water main in 26th Street. The construction of the water lines will take place within the existing developed roadways of Rubidoux Boulevard and 26th Street.

A new sewer lateral will be constructed to the existing 8-inch diameter sewer main in 26th Street (or to the terminus manhole as determined by Rubidoux Community Services District). The construction of the sewer lateral will take place within the developed roadway of 26th Street.

Construction Duration

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

Operational Characteristics

The Project involves the following operations:

- Installation of refrigeration units in trailers and bobtail trucks.
- On-site sales of refrigeration units.

The outdoor area is proposed to be used as a staging area for trailers and bobtail truck for service and installation. Those vehicles and trailers will be moved to and from the service bays. A total of 11 company vehicles will also be stored on-site when not in use: 9 service trucks and 2 pick-up trucks. The hours of operation are 7:00am-7:00pm on Monday through Friday. There will be 32 employees (25 technicians, 6 administrative staff, and 1 branch manager).

B. Determination of Use No. 18001.

The use is for the installation of refrigeration units on trailers and sales of those trailers which is a use not specifically listed in the Industrial Park (I-P) zone. Pursuant to Section 9.145.020.G of the Municipal Code, any use that is not specifically listed in subsections (A) and (B) of this section may be considered a permitted or conditionally permitted use provided that the Planning Director finds that the proposed use is substantially the same in character and intensity as those listed in the designated subsections. Such a use is subject to the permit process which governs the category in which it falls.

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 November, 2018.

The Project site consists of vacant land. Rubidoux Boulevard adjacent to the western boundary of the Project site is a 4-lane paved roadway with curb, gutter, and sidewalk. 26th Street adjacent to the Project site is a 2-lane paved roadway with no curb, gutter, or sidewalk.

Existing conditions within the Project site include disturbance by human activities, and a general lack of native vegetation and natural topographic relief. Overall, the site shows evidence of previous soil disturbances through periodic fire fuel reduction activities. Topographically, the site ranges in elevation from 844 above mean sea level (AMSL) to 880 AMSL and generally drains from southeast to the northwest and northeast due to a gentle ridgeline that bisects the site. 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>26th street with industrial uses and single-family residential further to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Single-family residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Pallet yard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Rubidoux Boulevard with single-family further to the west.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Inspection, November 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.

The Project site’s General Plan land use designation is Light Industrial (LI) which allows industrial, service-commercial, and related uses including warehousing/distribution, research and development, assembly and light manufacturing, repair facilities, and supporting retail uses. The Project site’s zoning classification is Industrial Park (I-P) and Manufacturing-Services Commercial (M-SC). A summary of the General Plan land use and designations and zoning classifications 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 Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Light Industrial (L-I)</td>
<td>I-P (Industrial Park) &amp; M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Light Industrial (L-I)</td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Light Industrial (L-I)</td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Light Industrial (L-I)</td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Light Industrial (L-I)</td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Evaluation Format

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

1. Aesthetics 10. Land Use & Planning
3. Air Quality 12. Noise
5. Cultural Resources 14. Public Services
6. Geology & Soils 15. Recreation
8. Hazards & Hazardous Materials 17. Tribal Cultural Resources
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[f5]).

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 to 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
Determinations

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.

_________________________________________  City of Jurupa Valley
Signature

_________________________________________  January 30, 2019
Agency

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director  Date
Printed Name/Title
Appendices (Under Separate Cover or on Compact Disk)


Appendix D.  *Geotechnical Investigation*, Southern California Geotechnical, October 1, 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 9.145-050 (2), the maximum height of all structures, including buildings, shall be thirty-five (35) feet at the yard setback line. Any portion of a structure that exceeds thirty-five (35) feet in height shall be set back from each yard setback line not less than two (2) feet for each one (1) foot in height that is in excess of thirty-five (35) feet. All buildings and structures shall not exceed fifty (50) feet in height, unless a height up to seventy-five (75) feet for buildings, or one hundred and five (105) feet for other structures is specifically permitted under the provisions of Section 9.240.370.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

The Project site is approximately 6.14 acres in size and is located in an area largely characterized by a mix of industrial and residential development. Land uses to the north are 26th Street followed by industrial uses with outdoor storage and single-family homes further to the north, to the south is...
vacant land (approved for industrial development), to the east is a pallet facility, and to the west is Rubidoux Boulevard followed by single-family residences further to the west.

According to the General Plan, scenic vistas are points or corridors that are accessible to the public and that provide a view of scenic areas and/or landscapes. According to General Plan Figure 4-23, the Project site is not adjacent to a scenic corridor.

Scenic vistas in the Project vicinity are the Jurupa Hills located approximately 3/4th of a mile to the west of the Project site and the foothills of Rattlesnake Mountain located approximately 1.5 miles to the northwest of the Project site.

As required by PPP 3.1-1 above, the future building proposed on the property will be restricted to 35 feet in height. As such, the Project would not block or completely obstruct views from surrounding public vantage points (Hall Avenue looking west and 28th Street looking northwest) 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)*

PPP 3.1-2 The Project is required to comply with the Development Standards specified in Section 9.145.050 for the I-P Zone.

*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 43,132 with related site improvements (e.g. parking and landscaping). 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 a mix of residential and industrial development. Land uses to the north are 26th Street followed by industrial uses with outdoor storage and single-family homes further to the north, to the south is vacant land (approved for industrial development), to the east is a pallet facility, and to the west is Rubidoux Boulevard followed by single-family residences further to the west. The project will be developed in accordance with City design standards and development standards as required by Municipal Code Section 9.145.050 per PPP 3.11-2 above. As such, development of the site would be consistent with the surrounding development,
In addition, the Project site is currently planned for industrial use by the General Plan (Light Industrial). The introduction of industrial development will be compatible to the existing development in the surrounding area.

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

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

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

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

PPP 3.1-3 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 building would be consist of concrete tilt-up panels 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>Scenario</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. 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>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 (a) **Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

**Determination:** No Impact

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

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

**Determination:** No Impact.

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

**Agricultural Zoning**

The Project site currently has a zoning classification of I-P (Industrial Park). The I-P Zone is not considered a primary agricultural zone. As such, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use if the change of zone were approved.

**Williamson Act**

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

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

**Determination:** No Impact.

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

The Project site currently has a zoning classification of I-P (Industrial Park). 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) Involves 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, MSHCP Habitat Assessment Report (Appendix B).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program classifies the site as “Other Lands” (i.e. land not included in any other mapping category and generally not suitable for agricultural purposes).

In addition, the Project site is approximately 6.1 acres in size and is located in an area largely characterized by a mix of residential and industrial development. Land uses to the north are 26th Street followed by industrial uses with outdoor storage and single-family homes further to the north, to the south is vacant land (approved for industrial development), to the east is a pallet facility, and to the west is Rubidoux Boulevard followed by single-family residences further to the west. In addition, the Project site is planned for industrial 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>Determinations</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.

*Sources: Focused Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Evaluation (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$_{10}$)
Fine Particulate Matter (PM$_{2.5}$)
Carbon Monoxide (CO)
Nitrogen Dioxide (NOx)
Sulphur Dioxide (SO$_2$), 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$_{10}$)
- Fine Particulate Matter (PM$_{2.5}$)
- Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NOx)
- 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Pollutant</th>
<th>State Designation</th>
<th>Federal Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 *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 Light Industrial (LI). 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 industrial development 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 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$_{10}$ 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 construction equipment to be used for the Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Equipment Unit Amount</th>
<th>Hours Per Day Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generator Sets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 shows the tentative Project construction schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Equipment Unit Amount</th>
<th>Hours Per Day Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>Pavers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving Equipment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rollers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>Air Compressors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>VOV (ROG)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Emissions</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>45.64</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>25.96</td>
<td>12.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Thresholds</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant? No No No No No No

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

Long-Term Regional Operation Related Impacts

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

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

<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>Area</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.60E-04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.00E-05</td>
<td>6.00E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>2.53E-03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.40E-04</td>
<td>1.75E-03</td>
<td>1.75E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>31.21</td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Emissions</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>31.23</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>1.75</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 Analysis (Appendix A)*

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

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\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 9.
Construction Localized Significance Threshold Analysis (lbs/day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On-Site Preparation Emissions</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>13.87</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>6.13</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>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Grading Emissions</td>
<td>NO\textsubscript{X}</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10}</td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Emissions</td>
<td>28.35</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>2.80</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: Focused Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Evaluation (Appendix A).

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

Operational-Related Localized Emissions

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

Table 10.
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>On-Site Emissions</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.09</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: Focused Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Evaluation (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) 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).
There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

Sensitive Receptors

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

Localized Impacts

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

Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC)

Diesel particulate matter (DPM) which is a known carcinogen would be emitted and has the potential to impact surrounding uses. Although the Project is expected to generate approximately 115 total truck trips per day, not all of these trucks would be diesel trucks. The 115 total truck trips per day consist of approximately 68 2-axle trucks, 8 3-axle trucks, and 39 4+-axle trucks. Based on information from CARB’s EMFAC 2014, 43% of 2-axle trucks are diesel, 87% of 3-axle trucks are diesel, and 99% of 4+-axle trucks are diesel. This results in approximately 100 daily truck trips that could be diesel accessing the Project site. As previously discussed, there are residences in close proximity to the Project site. However, all on site idling would be limited to five minutes consistent with State law. As such, any potential impacts from DPM would be less than significant and no further analysis is warranted.

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 a facility for the installation of refrigeration units on trailers and sales of those trailers 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: MSHCP Habitat Assessment Report (Appendix B).*
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 (MHSVP) as required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.80.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Existing Conditions

The proposed Project is located within 6.1 acres of entirely disturbed, vacant land immediately southeast of the intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard and 26th Street. The Project site is surrounded by residential, commercial, and industrial development, which isolate it from the larger extant habitats of the region. The northwestern boundary abuts Rubidoux Boulevard. The northeastern boundary abuts 26th Street. The southwestern boundary of the Project abuts residences and vacant land. The southeastern boundary abuts light industrial development. No native vegetation communities exist on the Project site or within the Survey Area, and the entire Project site has been disturbed through periodic mowing and disking for fire prevention.

One distinct vegetation community/land use type was observed within the Survey Area which consists of a total of approximately 6.1 acres of Residential/Urban/Exotic – Disturbed Areas.

Per the MSHCP, residential/urban/exotic land uses often include ruderal plant communities. These areas often occur due to edge effects of developed roads and associated urban land uses. Typical species include pineapple-weed (Matricaria discoidea), common knotweed (Polygonum arenastrum), sow-thistle (Sonchus oleraceus), horseweed (Erigeron canadensis) and goosefoot (Chenopodium spp.). Disturbed areas may also include escaped landscaping and ornamentals (Holland and Keil 1995). Within the Project, these ruderal plant communities are further described as “Disturbed Areas.” Disturbed areas at the time of the survey were composed primarily of desiccated and recently mowed annual grasses for which species-level ID was not always possible. These areas exhibited nonnative, ruderal, vegetative ground cover typical of frequent soil disturbances such as brome (Bromus spp.), Russian thistle (Salsola tragus), Mediterranean schismus grass (Schismus barbatus), wild oat (Avena barbata), tumble mustard (Sisymbrium spp.), short-pod mustard (Hirschfeldia incana), tocalote (Centaurea melitensis), stinknet (Oncosiphon piluliferum), golden crownbeard (Verbesina encelioides), and common sow thistle with occasional native species such as brome grass, horseweed and annual bur-sage (Ambrosia acanthacarpa) were also observed. Disturbed areas also contained several non-native trees, including three tamarisk trees (Tamarix spp.) and two olive trees (Olea spp.).
Sensitive Plant Species
The literature review resulted in a list of one sensitive plant species with the potential to occur within the Project vicinity. The Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) mapping system further indicated the need to assess the site for its potential to contain three additional plant species. These three species and their potential for occurrence for the three narrow Endemic Plant species described below.

- **Brand’s Star Phacelia**: There are no suitable habitat types onsite. Therefore, this species is presumed absent from the Project site.

- **San Diego Ambrosia**: There are no suitably moist soils onsite, and the frequencies of historic disking onsite are too high to facilitate presence. Therefore, this species is presumed absent from the Project site.

- **San Miguel Savory**: There are no rocky slopes onsite or other suitable habitats onsite. Therefore, this species is presumed absent from the Project site.

Conclusion: The Project does not provide habitat for sensitive plant species or MSHCP plant species. There are no impacts in this regard and no further action is required.

Sensitive Wildlife Species

Wildlife species observed on the Project site and in the general vicinity included northern mockingbird (Mimus polyglottos), house sparrow (Passer domesticus), mourning dove (Zenaida macroura), rock dove (Columba livia), Eurasian collared dove (Streptopelia decaocto), common raven (Corvus corax), house finch (Haemorhous mexicanus), bushtit (Psaltriparus minimus), and domestic dog (scat; Canis lupus familiaris).

Other than the burrowing owl, there are no sensitive wildlife species that will be impacted by the Project.

- **Burrowing Owl**: While the Project site and survey area may be suitable for burrowing owl foraging, nesting opportunities are precluded by a lack of suitable host burrows. Developed areas surrounding the Project site were excluded due to a lack of suitable foraging habitat and a lack of suitable burrows/burrow surrogates. Disturbed areas exhibited open, recently mowed or grazed, non-native grasses. No burrowing owls and/or burrowing owl sign or potential burrows were observed during the habitat assessment within the Project site or the survey area.

However, since burrowing owls can quickly occupy a site, a pre-construction survey is still recommended to confirm absence before ground-disturbing activities commence as required by Mitigation Measure BIO-2 below.

**MM-BIO-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. If burrowing owl have colonized the property site prior to the initiation of construction, the City shall immediately inform the RCA and the Wildlife Agencies regarding next steps, including coordinating on the potential need for a Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan, prior to initiating ground disturbance.

Conclusion: 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: MSHCP Habitat Assessment Report (Appendix B).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

Determination: No Impact.
Source: MSHCP Habitat Assessment Report (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 Habitat Assessment prepared for the Project identified no drainage features, water bodies, vernal pools or seasonally inundated waters within the Project site. No additional information is required to determine if specific areas of the Project site meet the three-parameter criteria of a wetland and fall under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and/or California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Additional jurisdictional waterway permitting will not be required.

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: MSHCP Habitat Assessment Report (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.

Many small mammal burrows were observed within the Project site, primarily in the northern and eastern corners. Except for small runways between localized burrow locations, no concentrations of wildlife tracks or sign were observed, and no established corridors or connectivity to larger conservation areas of the region were observed.

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: MSHCP Habitat Assessment Report (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.
The General Plan contains the following policies with respect to trees:

- **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.

The site contains three tamarisk trees (Tamarix spp.) and two olive trees (Olea spp.). None of these trees are afforded protection under General Plan Policies COS 1.2 or 1.3 above. There are no other ordinances (including a tree protection ordinance) in place protecting biological resources that are applicable to the Project. As such, there are no impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

**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: MSHCP Habitat Assessment Report (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 (MHSCP) as required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.80.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

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

Based on the analysis under Issues 3.4 (a) through 3.4 (d) above:
• The Project site is not in an MSHCP survey area for riparian/riverine areas or vernal pools.

• The Project will not impact Narrow Endemic Plant Species.

• The Project site does not contain suitable soils to support the Delhi Sand Flower-Loving Fly.

• The Project site is not required to comply with the Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines.

• Burrowing owl habitat exists on the site. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 (30-day Pre-Construction Survey) is required:

With implementation of PPP 3.4-1 and Mitigation Measures 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: Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix E).*

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Source: Cultural Resources Study (Appendix E).

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

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

A cultural resources records search, additional research, and a field survey were conducted for the Project site. Although no cultural resources were previously documented within the Project site by the records search, a quarry was in operation during the historic period on the east side of the Project site. Also, numerous prehistoric resources are documented in the immediately vicinity of...
the eastern edge of the quarry. Therefore, due to the proximity of these resources, the Project site retains some potential for subsurface resources and part-time archaeological monitoring is recommended.

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

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

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

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

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

Source: 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.*

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 Map My County website, based on geologic formations or mappable rock units that are rocks that contain fossilized bode elements, the Project site is classified as High Sensitivity (HIGH A) for paleontological resources. As such, the following mitigation measure is required.

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

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

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

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

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.  

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

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

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

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

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

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

**3.6 (a) (1) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix D), 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: Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix D), 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: Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix D), Riverside County Map My County Website.***

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

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

Based on information obtained from the County of Riverside Map My County website, the Project site has a “moderate” potential for liquefaction. Groundwater was not encountered during any subsurface exploration as part of the geotechnical investigation conducted for the Project site to a depth of 20+/- feet. Review of California Department of Water Resources, Water Data Library online database indicates groundwater in the general site area is 82 +/- feet below the existing ground surface.

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

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

**Determination: No Impact.**

*Source: Field Inspection.*

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

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

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

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: City Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.010, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (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. The proposed BMP’s include an infiltration chamber and the landscaping will be depressed to minimize irrigation and runoff, to promote infiltration. 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: Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix D),*
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 20-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 20-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: Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix D),

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Expansive soils are those that undergo volume changes as moisture content fluctuates; swelling substantially when wet or shrinking when dry. Soil expansion can damage structures by cracking foundations, causing settlement and distorting structural elements. According to the results of the laboratory testing performed, the near-surface older alluvial soils exhibited a “negligible” to “very low” expansion potential when tested in accordance with ASTM D 4829. Design-level geotechnical plans pursuant to the California Building Code are required prior to approval of construction, as required by PPP 3.6-1. Compliance with the California Building Code is a standard practice and would be required by the City Building and Safety Department. Therefore, compliance with the requirements of the California Building Code as identified in a site specific geotechnical design would be reviewed by the City, as part of the building plan check and development review process, would ensure that potential soil stability impacts would be less than significant level.
3.6(e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

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

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

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

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

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

- Industrial projects that emit less stationary source greenhouse gas emissions less than 10,000 MTCO2e per year are not considered a substantial greenhouse gas emitter and the impact is less than significant. Projects that emit in excess of 10,000 MTCO2e per year require additional analysis and mitigation.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Source</th>
<th>GHG Emissions (metric tons per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Construction Emissions (amortized over 30 years)</td>
<td>11.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>4.39E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>56.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources (Passenger Cars)</td>
<td>252.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources (Trucks)</td>
<td>1,571.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>19.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Usage</td>
<td>53.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CO2E (All Sources)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,965.20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance Threshold</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant?</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Focused Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Evaluation (Appendix A).

Based on guidance from the SCAQMD, if this type of project would emit GHG emissions less than 10,000 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 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 E).*

**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, the Project is required to comply with federal and state laws regarding the management of hazardous waste and materials.

PPP 3.8-2  
As required by Health and Safety Code Section 25507, the owner or operator of any business that handles or stores any hazardous material/waste equal to or above the threshold quantities; 55 gallons of a liquid, 200 cubic feet of a gas, 500 pounds of a solid, and/or radioactive materials (where an emergency plan is required by Federal Law), and/or extremely hazardous substances, shall contact the Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Management Branch at (951)358-5055 for requirements.

**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 a facility for the installation of refrigeration units on trailers and sales of those trailers. Liquids stored onsite include oil, antifreeze, and freon. Any business that operates any of the facilities at the Project site and that handles and/or stores substantial quantities of hazardous materials (§ 25500 of California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95) would be required to prepare and submit a Hazardous Materials Business Emergency Plan (HMBEP) to the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health (RCDEH) in order to register the business as a hazardous materials handler. Such business is also required to comply with California's Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Law, which require immediate reporting to Riverside County Fire Department and State Office of Emergency Services regarding any release or threatened release of a hazardous material, regardless of the amount handled by the business.

With mandatory regulatory compliance as required by PPP 3.8-1 and 3.8-2, potential hazardous materials impacts associated with long-term operation of the Project is not expected to pose a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor would the Project increase the potential for accident operations which could result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: Project Application Materials, Google Earth.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

The Project site is not located within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest school in Nueva Vista Continuation School located approximately 2 miles west of the Project site. As discussed in the responses to issues 3.8 (b) and 3.8 (b) above, the all hazardous or potentially hazardous materials would comply with all applicable federal, State, and local agencies and regulations with respect to hazardous materials. As such, impacts are less than significant.
3.8(d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

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

Impact Analysis

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

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

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 nearest airport is Flabob Airport located approximately 1.5 miles southwest of the Project site. According to Map FL-1, Flabob Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Project site is not located within an airport compatibility zone. As such, the Project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area.

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 Rubidoux Boulevard and 26th Street 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 Rubidoux Boulevard and 26th 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 shown as “Urban Unzoned” and is not located within a high wildfire 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: Hydrology Study (Appendix F), Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (Appendix G).*

**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:
   1. 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 an underground storage infiltration system with a design capture volume (DCV) sufficient retain all stormwater runoff for percolation into the groundwater. The underground storage infiltration system 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.

The proposed drainage pattern will mimic the existing patterns. Storm water will sheet across proposed AC pavement and landscaping in a northeasterly direction. Three catch basin inlets with filters are proposed to intercept runoff generated by the proposed development, and discharge into proposed underground storm drain pipes. At the northeasterly corner of the site, a proposed trench drain also intercepts storm flows and discharges into said storm drain. The on-site storm drain system will convey flows to the proposed underground storage infiltration system located in the northeasterly corner of the property. The underground storage infiltration system will be designed to infiltrate the entire design capture volume. Overflows from this system will bubble out of the proposed trench drain and sheet into the right-of-way of 26th Street.
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 Water Quality Management Plan (Appendix G).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

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

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

In August 2015, DWR released a draft list of 21 groundwater basins and subbasins significantly overdrafted by "excessive" pumping in response to a series of executive orders issued by Governor Brown since January 2014. The Riverside-Arlington Subbasin was not included in this list. DWR
published the final list in January 2016, with no changes to the designation of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin.

Development of the Project would increase impervious surface coverage on the site which would in turn reduce the amount of direct infiltration of runoff into the ground. This would have a less than significant impact on groundwater recharge in the areas of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin 1 that are managed for that purpose, since those recharge areas do not encompass the Project site.

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

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

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

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

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

Determination: Less than Significant Impact.
Sources: Hydrology Study (Appendix F), Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (Appendix G).

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.

Existing Conditions

The Project site is currently undeveloped and entirely pervious with poor natural grass coverage. The existing contours of the site sheet storm flows in a northeasterly direction. An existing graded ridge divides the property into two drainage area. Drainage Area A consists of the northwesterly portion of the property. The project site discharges storm water runoff from this area into the right-of-way of 26th St. Drainage Area B consists of the southeasterly portion of the property. Storm water runoff discharges from this area across the southeasterly boundary of the site into the adjacent pallet storage facility’s property. There are no tributary flows to the Project site. An
existing graded ridge along the Project site’s southwesterly boundary prohibits storm water runoff from the adjacent residential development from sheeting into the site. Rather, this adjacent property directs storm water runoff in a northwesterly direction and discharges into the right-of-way of Rubidoux Blvd. The undeveloped lot adjacent to the Project’s southwesterly boundary sheets storm water runoff in a southeasterly direction into said pallet storage facility.

**Proposed Conditions**

The proposed drainage pattern will mimic the existing patterns. Storm water will sheet across proposed AC pavement and landscaping in a northeasterly direction. Three catch basin inlets with filters are proposed to intercept runoff generated by the proposed development, and discharge into proposed underground storm drain pipes. At the northeasterly corner of the site, a proposed trench drain also intercepts storm flows and discharges into said storm drain. The on-site storm drain system will convey flows to the proposed underground storage infiltration system located in the northeasterly corner of the property. The underground storage infiltration system will be designed to infiltrate the entire design capture volume. Overflows from this

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

**3.9(f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**  
*Sources: Hydrology Study (Appendix F), Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (Appendix G).*

**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), and3.9 (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 nor does it propose any housing. 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

<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 site is in an area largely characterized by a mix of residential and industrial development. Land uses to the north are 26th Street followed by industrial uses with outdoor storage and single-family homes further to the north, to the south is vacant land (approved for industrial development), to the east is a pallet facility, and to the west is Rubidoux Boulevard followed by single-family residences further to the west. Therefore, no impacts would occur with respect to dividing an established community.
3.10(b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: General Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan, Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board's Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program Project Application Materials*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

The applicable plans and policies relating to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect are described in the analysis below.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

The Project is consistent with the General Plan Land Use Designation of Light Industrial (LI), which allows development on the Project site with industrial, service-commercial, and related uses including warehousing/distribution, research and development, assembly and light manufacturing, repair facilities, and supporting retail uses.

As demonstrated throughout this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Project would otherwise not conflict with any applicable goals, objectives, and policies of the City of Jurupa General Plan or the City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. Additionally, the Project would not conflict with any applicable policy document, including the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program, the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Air Quality Management Plan, and the Flabob Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The purpose of these plans are to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect.

In conclusion, the Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating adverse environmental effects and impacts are less than significant with implementation of all of the Plans, Policies, and Programs identified in the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

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

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

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

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to a conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. This measure would be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant 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.
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 Due Diligence Letter (Appendix H).*

**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 background ambient noise levels in the Project study area are dominated by the transportation
related noise associated with the arterial roadway network and the nearby industrial land uses.
This includes the auto and heavy truck activities on Rubidoux Boulevard and State Route 60 near
the noise level measurement locations. Based on the ambient noise level measurements, existing
noise levels on Rubidoux Boulevard are shown to approach 73.9 dBA Leq during the daytime, and
72.0 dBA Leq during the nighttime hours. Ambient noise levels within existing, non-conforming
residential neighborhoods are shown to range from 61.1 to 66.3 dBA Leq during the daytime hours
and are reflective of a typical urban daytime noise environment. Nighttime residential ambient
noise levels were measured to range between 56.7 to 63.1 dBA Leq which is representative of
quieter urban daytime noise environments, and are likely higher than typical urban nighttime noise
levels due to the background traffic and industrial (stationary) noise sources in the Project study
area.

Sensitive Receiver Locations

To assess the potential for long-term operational noise impacts, the following four receiver
locations as shown on Exhibit 3 below were identified as representative locations for focused
analysis since they represent noise-sensitive, non-conforming uses on industrial-designated land.
Sensitive receivers are generally defined as locations where people reside or where the presence
of unwanted sound could otherwise adversely affect the use of the land. Noise-sensitive land uses are
generally considered to include: schools, hospitals, single-family dwellings, mobile home parks,
churches, libraries, and recreation areas. Moderately noise-sensitive land uses typically include:
multi-family dwellings, hotels, motels, dormitories, out-patient clinics, cemeteries, golf courses,
country clubs, athletic/tennis clubs, and equestrian clubs. Land uses that are considered relatively
insensitive to noise include business, commercial, and professional developments. Land uses that
are typically not affected by noise include: industrial, manufacturing, utilities, agriculture, natural
open space, undeveloped land, parking lots, warehousing, liquid and solid waste facilities, salvage
yards, and transit terminals. Sensitive receivers near the Project site include existing single-family
residential homes at receiver locations R1 to R4. The closest sensitive receiver locations are
represented by R3 and R4, adjacent to the southwestern Project site boundary.
Construction Noise

The proposed Project would require the use of heavy-duty, off-road construction equipment throughout development activities. Potential construction-related noise impacts are evaluated based on the typical construction activities associated with industrial development. Potential construction source noise levels were developed based on methodologies, reference noise levels, and equipment usage and other operating factors documented and contained in the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) Construction Noise Handbook (FHWA, 2010), Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment document (FTA, 2006), and Caltrans’ Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual (Caltrans, 2013).

Project construction activities would include: staging, site preparation (e.g., land clearing), grading, utility trenching, foundation work (e.g., excavation, pouring concrete pads), material deliveries, building construction (e.g., framing, concrete pouring, welding), paving, coating application, and site finishing work. In general, these activities would involve the use of worker vehicles, delivery trucks, dump trucks, and heavy-duty construction equipment such as (but not limited to) backhoes, tractors, loaders, graders, excavators, rollers, cranes, material lifts, generators, and air compressors. Table 12 presents the noise levels associated with typical types of construction equipment that could be used to develop the Project.

With regard to construction noise, site preparation and grading phases typically result in the highest temporary noise levels due to the use of heavy-duty equipment such as dozers, excavators, graders, loaders, scrapers, and trucks. As shown in Table 12, the worst-case Leq and Lmax noise levels associated with the operation of a dozer, excavator, scraper, etc. are predicted to be approximately 82 and 85 dBA, respectively, at a distance of 50 feet from the equipment operating area. At an active construction site, it is not uncommon for two or more pieces of construction equipment to operate at the same time and in close proximity. The concurrent operation of two or more pieces of construction equipment would result in noise levels of approximately 85 to 88 dBA at a distance of 50 feet from equipment operating areas. These maximum noise levels would occur for a short period time; as site preparation and grading is completed and building construction begins, work activities would occur further from property lines and generate lower construction noise levels.

<table>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>
## Equipment Type

<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>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 88 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

**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

To estimate the Project operational noise impacts, reference noise level measurements were collected from similar types of activities to represent the noise levels expected with the operation of the proposed Project. Table 13 below shows the combined noise level associated with truck storage movements, roof-top air conditioning units, parking lot vehicle movements, and air impact wrench activity against the City’s noise thresholds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiver Location</th>
<th>Noise Level at Receiver Location (dBA Leq)</th>
<th>Threshold (Per General Plan Policy NE 1.3)</th>
<th>Threshold Exceeded?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without Barrier</td>
<td>With 8-Foot High Barrier</td>
<td>Normally Acceptable dBA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>55 to 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>55 to 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>55 to 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>55 to 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Noise Due Diligence Letter (Appendix H).

As shown on Table X above, noise levels at Receiver Location No. 4 (single-family residence located adjacent to the southwestern Project site boundary) would be exposed to noise level in excess of the normally acceptable noise levels. Therefore, the following mitigation measure is required:

Mitigation Measure

**Mitigation Measure NOI-2-Noise Barrier.** A barrier shall be constructed 8- feet above the finished grade elevation along the boundary between the Project and the closest existing residential homes to block the line-of-sight of adjacent residential uses to the proposed Project noise sources. In order to be
effective, the noise barrier must have a surface density of at least four pounds per square foot, and be free of openings and cracks (with the exception of expansion joints gaps and other construction techniques, which could create an opening or crack). The noise barrier may be constructed of acrylic glass, masonry material, earthen berm, or a combination of these materials. Prior to issuance of building permits, the City shall review and approve the noise barrier design, placement and materials to ensure that the required level of sound attenuation will be achieved (i.e. residences will not be exposed to noise levels in excess of 60 dBA).

Traffic Noise

Since there is no Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Land Use Code for truck repair facilities in their Trip Generation Manual, an existing truck repair facility located at 10155 Azusa Boulevard in City of Industry, CA was surveyed to estimate trip generation rates for the proposed Project. A Passenger Car Equivalents (PCE) factor was applied to the trip generation for heavy trucks (large 2-axles, 3-axles, and 4+-axles). PCEs allow the typical “real-world” mix of vehicle types to be represented as a single, standardized unit, such as the passenger car, to be used for the purposes of capacity and level of service analyses.

The proposed Project is anticipated to generate a net total of 632 PCE trip-ends per day, 59 PCE AM peak hour trips and 80 PCE PM peak hour trips. In comparison, the proposed Project is anticipated to generate a net total of 462 actual vehicle trip-ends per day with 39 AM peak hour trips and 50 PM peak hour trips.

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.

Conclusions

With implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 and NOI-2, impacts are 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.
Source: Project Application Materials, Caltrans.

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 adjacent to the southwestern boundary of 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: Noise Due Diligence Letter (Appendix H).

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: Noise Due Diligence Letter (Appendix H).

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 directly result in population growth because it does not propose any residential dwelling units. The Project consists of a facility for the installation of refrigeration units on trailers and sales of those trailers.

According to the General Plan Economic Sustainability Element, "The City is a net exporter of jobs, with more residents working outside the City than non-residents working inside the City." (General Plan p. 11-3). Thus, it is anticipated that new employees generated by the Project would be within commuting distance and would not generate needs for any housing.

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.

The fire service line will connect to the existing 24-inch diameter water main in Rubidoux Boulevard. A new 1-inch diameter water line will be installed to the existing 8-inch water main in...
26th Street. The construction of the water lines will take place within the existing developed roadways of Rubidoux Boulevard and 26th Street.

A new sewer lateral will be constructed to the existing 8-inch diameter sewer main in 26th Street (or to the terminus manhole as determined by Rubidoux Community Services District). The construction of the sewer lateral will take place within the developed roadway of 26th Street.

In addition, the analysis in Section 3.14, Public Services, of this Initial Study Checklist demonstrates that the impacts on public services are less than significant so the public service provider’s ability to provide services will not be reduced. Based on the above analysis, impacts are less than significant.

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

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Sources: Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

The Project site does not contain any residential housing units. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not displace a substantial number of existing housing, nor would it necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. As such, there would be no impact.

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

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Source: Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.
As described above under the response to Issue 3.13(b), the Project site does not contain residential housing units. Therefore, the Project would not displace substantial numbers of people and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Impacts would be less than significant.
3.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

FIRE PROTECTION

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Riverside County Fire Department.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

PPP 3.14-1 The Project applicant shall comply with all applicable Riverside County Fire Department codes, ordinances, and standard conditions regarding fire prevention and suppression measures relating to water improvement plans, fire hydrants,
automatic fire extinguishing systems, fire access, access gates, combustible construction, water availability, and fire sprinkler systems.

PPP 3.14-2 As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 et seq., the Project proponent shall pay a Development Impact Fee (DIF) following protocol for impact fee collection.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

The Riverside County Fire Department provides fire protection services to the Project area. The Project would primarily be served by the Rubidoux Fire Station No. 38, an existing station located at an existing station located approximately 1.5 roadway miles southwest of the Project site at 5721 Mission Boulevard.

Development of the Project would impact fire protection services by placing an additional demand on existing fire protection resources should its resources not be augmented. To offset the increased demand for fire protection services, the Project would be conditioned by the City to provide a minimum of fire safety and support fire suppression activities, including compliance with State and local fire codes, fire sprinklers, a fire hydrant system, paved access, and secondary access routes. Although the Project would increase the demand for fire protection services, it is not anticipated that it would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities as the Fire Department has reviewed the Project and will provide fire protection services from existing facilities.

Furthermore, the Project would be required to comply with the provisions of Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 which requires payment of the Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing for fire protection services. Payment of the Development Impact Fee would ensure that the Project provides fair share funds for the provision of additional public services, including fire protection services, which may be applied to fire facilities and/or equipment, to offset the incremental increase in the demand for fire protection services that would be created by the Project.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.14-1 and PPP 3.14-2, impacts related to fire protection are less than significant.

POLICE PROTECTION

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: Riverside County Sheriff’s Department “Stations,” Riverside County General Plan, Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to police protection. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:
PPP 3.14-2  As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 et seq., the Project proponent shall pay a Development Impact Fee (DIF) following protocol for impact fee collection.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

The Riverside County Sheriff's Department provides community policing to the Project area via the Jurupa Valley Station located at 7477 Mission Boulevard, Jurupa Valley, CA. The Project would increase the demand for police protection services. The Project would be required to comply with the provisions of Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 which requires payment of the Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing for public services, including police protection services. Payment of the Development Impact Fee would ensure that the Project provides its fair share of funds for additional police protection services, which may be applied to sheriff facilities and/or equipment, to offset the incremental increase in the demand that would be created by the Project.

Although the Project would increase the demand for police protection services, it is not anticipated that it would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities as the Sheriff's Department has reviewed the Project and will provide police protection services from existing facilities. As such, the Project would not result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives.

In addition, consistent with General Plan Policy CSSF 2.1-2, the Project plans were routed to the Sheriff's Department for review and comment to increase public safety and maintain close coordination with the Sheriff's Department and law enforcement programs.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.14-2, impacts related to police protection are less than significant.

SCHOOLS

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: California Senate Bill 50 (Greene), Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

PPP 3.14-3  As required by Section 65995 of the Government Code, the Project Applicant shall pay required development impact fees to the applicable school district following protocol for impact fee collection required by that district.
Project Design Features (PDF)

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

The Project does not propose any housing and would not directly create additional students to be served by the Jurupa Unified School 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 will not create an additional need for housing thus directly increasing the overall population of the City and generating 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 cause a substantial physical deterioration of any park facilities or would accelerate the physical deterioration of any park facilities because the Project does not proposes residential dwelling units which would increase the population that would use parks. 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 r
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.*

As noted in the response to Issue 3.15(a) above, 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 above analysis, impacts related to parks.
### 3.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<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 an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.16(a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Riverside County Transportation Department, Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines.*
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to transportation/traffic. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.16-1 The Project Proponent shall make required per-unit fee payments associated with the Western Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF) pursuant to Chapter 3.70 of the Municipal Code.

PPP 3.16-2 As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75, the Project is required to pay a Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing revenue that the City can use to fund transportation improvements such as roads, bridges, major improvements and traffic signals.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Motor Vehicle Analysis

Since there is no Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Land Use Code for truck repair facilities in their Trip Generation Manual, an existing truck repair facility located at 10155 Azusa Boulevard in City of Industry, CA was surveyed to estimate trip generation rates for the proposed Project. The proposed Project is anticipated to generate a net total of 632 PCE trip-ends per day, 59 PCE AM peak hour trips and 80 PCE PM peak hour trips.

The City of Jurupa Valley relies upon the Riverside County Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guide to evaluate impacts from traffic. According to the Guidelines, any use which can demonstrate, based on the most recent edition of the Trip Generation Report published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) or other approved trip generation data, trip generation of less than 100 vehicle trips during the peak hours, are generally exempt from preparing a traffic study.

The City's Transportation Manager has determined that based on the low volume of traffic, impacts from traffic will not have a significant impact on the circulation system.

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 Rubidoux.
Boulevard and 26th Street. Therefore, the Project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy applying to non-motorized travel. Impacts are less than significant.

**3.16(b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**  
*Source: Riverside County Congestion Management Program.*

**Impact Analysis**

The Riverside County Transportation Commission was designated as the Congestion Management Agency for Riverside County in 1990, and therefore, prepares and administers the Riverside County Congestion Management Program in consultation with the Technical Advisory Committee which consists of local agencies, the County of Riverside, transit agencies, and subregional agencies.

The intent of the Riverside County Congestion Management Program is to more directly link land use, transportation, and air quality, thereby prompting reasonable growth management programs that will effectively utilize new transportation funds, alleviate traffic congestion and related impacts, and improve air quality.

The 2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program is the latest version of the CMP prepared by the Riverside County Transportation Commission in accordance with Proposition 111, passed in June 1990. The Congestion Management Program was established in the State of California to more directly link land use, transportation, and air quality and to prompt reasonable growth management programs that would more effectively utilize new and existing transportation funds, alleviate traffic congestion and related impacts, and improve air quality. Deficiencies along the CMP system are identified by the Riverside County Transportation Commission when they occur so that improvement measures can be identified. Understanding the reason for these deficiencies and identifying ways to reduce the impact along a critical CMP corridor is intended to conserve scarce funding resources and help target those resources appropriately.

The proposed Project is anticipated to generate a net total of 632 PCE trip-ends per day, 59 PCE AM peak hour trips and 80 PCE PM peak hour trips.

Due to the low volume of traffic, Project traffic will not result in significant direct and cumulatively considerable impacts to Congestion Management Program roadway system. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not conflict with the applicable Congestion Management Program, including Level of Service standards, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Determination: No Impact.**  
*Source: Google Earth.*
Impact Analysis

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

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

The Project does not include an air travel component (e.g., runway, helipad, etc.). Accordingly, the Project would not have the potential to affect air traffic patterns, including an increase in traffic levels or a change in flight path location that results in substantial safety risks. Impacts are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

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

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

All roadway improvements will be constructed to meet City standards. The Project would not be incompatible with existing development in the surrounding area to the extent that it would create a transportation hazard as a result of an incompatible use. Accordingly, the Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use. Impacts would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

3.16(e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

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

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

The Project which would increase the need for emergency access to-and-from the site. Adequate emergency access would be provided to the Project site from Rubidoux Boulevard and 26th 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>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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.17(a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?

Determination: No Impact.

Source: Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix C), AB52 Tribal Consultation.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(a) clarifies that historical resources include the following:
1. A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.

2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements [of] section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code.

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

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

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

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

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

3.17(b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

**Determination: Potentially Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.**

*Source: Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix C), 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.*

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.
- San Manuel Band of Mission Indians.

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

**Mitigation Measure TCR-1- Native American Monitoring, Treatment of Discoveries, and Disposition of Discoveries.**

**I. a. TREATMENT PLAN:** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a treatment plan in accordance with II (b) “Treatment of Discoveries” of this mitigation measure for the review and approval of the Planning Director.

**b. ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITOR:** Prior to the issuance of the grading permit, the applicant shall submit documentation that an archeological monitor meeting the professional standards of the Register of Professional Archaeologists or the Secretary of Interior’s Standards will be present for all ground-disturbing activities. The documentation shall include the archaeological contact information, too. An archaeological monitor shall be present for all ground-disturbing activities in conjunction with the project.

**II. a. MONITORING:** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall contact the consulting Native American Tribe(s) that have requested monitoring through consultation with the City during the AB 52 process. The applicant shall coordinate with the Tribe(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.

b. **TREATMENT OF DISCOVERIES:** If a significant tribal cultural resource is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). A representative of the appropriate Native American Tribe(s), the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented to protect the identified tribal cultural resources from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the tribal cultural resources in accordance with current professional archaeology standards. The treatment plan shall require monitoring by the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during data recovery and shall require that all recovered artifacts undergo basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, whichever is appropriate. At the completion of the basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, any recovered tribal cultural resources shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility, or, the artifacts may be delivered to the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) if that is recommended by the City of Jurupa Valley. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department, the Eastern Information Center, and the appropriate Native American Tribe.

c. **DISPOSITION OF DISCOVERIES:** In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this project. The following procedures will be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries:

The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to tribal cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the Jurupa Valley Planning Department with evidence of same:

1. A fully executed reburial agreement with the appropriate culturally affiliated Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed.

2. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.

3. If more than one Native American Group is involved with the project and cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center by default.

4. Should reburial of collected cultural items be preferred, it shall not occur until after the Phase IV monitoring report has been submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department. Should curation be
preferred, the developer/permit applicant is responsible for all costs and the repository and curation method shall be described in the Phase IV monitoring report.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure TCR-1, impacts will be less than significant.
### 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.*

The fire service line will connect to the existing 24-inch diameter water main in Rubidoux Boulevard. A new 1-inch diameter water line will be installed to the existing 8-inch water main in 26th Street. The construction of the water lines will take place within the existing developed roadways of Rubidoux Boulevard and 26th Street.

A new sewer lateral will be constructed to the existing 8-inch diameter sewer main in 26th Street (or to the terminus manhole as determined by Rubidoux Community Services District). The construction of the sewer lateral will take place within the developed roadway of 26th Street.

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.*

The fire service line will connect to the existing 24-inch diameter water main in Rubidoux Boulevard. A new 1-inch diameter water line will be installed to the existing 8-inch water main in 26th Street. The construction of the water lines will take place within the existing developed roadways of Rubidoux Boulevard and 26th Street.

A new sewer lateral will be constructed to the existing 8-inch diameter sewer main in 26th Street (or to the terminus manhole as determined by Rubidoux Community Services District). The construction of the sewer lateral will take place within the developed roadway of 26th 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 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 2015 Draft Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the sole source of potable water supply for the District is groundwater extracted from the southern portion of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin (also referred to herein as the “Basin”) of the Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin.

The Basin encompasses the District's entire service area. The District currently does not purchase or otherwise obtain water from a wholesale water supplier, and recycled water is not currently available to the District. 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, the California Department of Water Resources (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 2015 UWMP estimated that, in 2020 during normal-year, single-dry-year, and multiple-dry-year conditions, the District anticipates a total water supply of approximately 17,000 AFY and a demand of 10,397 AFY, resulting in an excess capacity of 6,603 AFY (RCSD 2015). The District issued a “Will Serve” letter dated October 2, 2018. The Will Serve letter does not guarantee that the District will provide water service for the Project, but rather is an indicator that the District has the potential to provide water service 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 City 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.

The proposed Project would be primarily composed of a truck service facility with approximately 32 employees. This type of use does not typically produce excessive wastewater volumes that would affect the Wastewater Treatment Plant’s capacity of 40 MGD.

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

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:

PP 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 November 20, 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

Based on solid waste generation rates obtained from the CalRecycle webpage on January 29, 2019, the proposed Project would result in a solid waste generation of approximately 285 pounds per day (8.93 pounds X 32 employees = 10,430 pounds per year or 52 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 26 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 13 tons per year.

According to the Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details website accessed on January 29, 2019 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,</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projects)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the Project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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, 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, CR-1 through CR-4, NOI-1, NOI-2, 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 NOI-2 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: MA 18147 (Midlands Carrier)

DATE: January 30, 2019

PROJECT MANAGER: Annette Tam, Senior Planner

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Site Development Permit No. 18107: New 42,132 square-feet building on 6.1 net acres of land with parking lot and landscaping.

Determination of Use No.18001: The use is for the installation of refrigeration units on trailers and sales of those trailers which is a use not specifically listed in the Industrial Park (I-P) zone. Pursuant to Section 9.145.020.G of the Municipal Code, any use that is not specifically listed in subsections (A) and (B) of this section may be considered a permitted or conditionally permitted use provided that the Planning Director finds that the proposed use is substantially the same in character and intensity as those listed in the designated subsections. Such a use is subject to the permit process which governs the category in which it falls.

PROJECT LOCATION: The Project is located on the southeast corner of Rubidoux Boulevard and 26th Street (2610 Rubidoux Boulevard). The Project site is identified by the following Assessor Parcel Numbers: 178-150-008 and 009.

Throughout this Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, reference is made to the following:

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

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

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

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) and Project Design Features (PDF) were assumed and accounted for in the assessment of impacts for each issue area. Mitigation Measures were formulated only for those issue areas where the results of the impact analysis identified significant impacts. All three types of measures described above will be required to be implemented as part of the Project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AESTHETICS</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.1-1</strong> As required by Municipal Code Section 9.145-050 (2), the maximum height of all structures, including buildings, shall be thirty-five (35) feet at the yard setback line. Any portion of a structure that exceeds thirty-five (35) feet in height shall be set back from each yard setback line not less than two (2) feet for each one (1) foot in height that is in excess of thirty-five (35) feet. All buildings and structures shall not exceed fifty (50) feet in height, unless a height up to seventy-five (75) feet for buildings, or one hundred and five (105) feet for other structures is specifically permitted under the provisions of Section 9.240.370.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.1-2</strong> The Project is required to comply with the Development Standards specified in Section 9.145.050 for the I-P Zone.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.1-3</strong> As required by General Plan Policy COS 10.1, require outdoor lighting to be shielded and prohibit outdoor lighting that: 1. Operates at unnecessary locations, levels, and times. 2. Spills onto areas off-site or to areas not needing or wanting illumination. 3. Produces glare (intense line-of-site contrast). 4. Includes lighting frequencies (colors) that interfere with astronomical viewing.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a building permit and during project operation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIR QUALITY</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.3-1</strong> The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, &quot;Fugitive Dust.&quot; 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:</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Notes must be on the grading plan prior to the issuance of the grading permit and the project is required to comply with the provisions of “Fugitive Dust” during grading</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>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.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“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.”</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department Engineering Department Planning Department</td>
<td>Notes must be on the plans and documents; the project shall comply with the provisions of “Architectural Coatings” during construction and on-going</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>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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 “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.
<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 3.3-5 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.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM-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>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If burrowing owl has colonized the property site prior to the initiation of construction, the City shall immediately inform the RCA and the Wildlife Agencies regarding next steps, including coordinating on the potential need for a Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan, prior to initiating ground disturbance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM- CR-1: Archaeological Monitoring.</strong> A qualified archaeologist (the “Project Archaeologist”) shall be retained by the Project Applicant prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Project Archaeologist will be on-call to monitor ground-disturbing activities and excavations on the Project site following identification of potential cultural resources by project personnel. If archaeological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project, ground-disturbing activities will be temporarily redirected from the vicinity of the find. The Project Archaeologist will be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading or excavation activities in the vicinity in order to make an evaluation of the find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure CR-2 shall apply.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM-CR-2: Archeological Treatment Plan</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>During grading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MM-CR-4: Paleontological Treatment Plan</th>
<th>Planning Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit or as otherwise determined by the Planning Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If a significant paleontological resource(s) is discovered on the property, in consultation with the Project proponent and the City, the qualified paleontologist shall develop a plan of mitigation which shall include salvage excavation and removal of the find, removal of sediment from around the specimen (in the laboratory), research to identify and categorize the find, curation in the find a local qualified repository, and preparation of a report summarizing the find.</td>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</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 plans showing that the Project will be constructed in compliance with the most recently adopted edition of the applicable California Building Code Title 24 requirements. | 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 and irrigation plans, the Project Applicant shall prepare and submit landscaping and irrigation 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 3.8-1 | As required by *General Plan* Policy CSSF 1.31-Federal/State Laws, the Project is required to comply with federal and state laws regarding the management of hazardous waste and materials. | Fire Department Riverside County Department of Environmental Health | On-going as required by the Fire Department and Riverside County Department of Environmental Health per |

M-6
As required by Health and Safety Code Section 25507, the owner or operator of any business that handles or stores any hazardous material/waste equal to or above the threshold quantities; 55 gallons of a liquid, 200 cubic feet of a gas, 500 pounds of a solid, and/or radioactive materials (where an emergency plan is required by Federal Law), and/or extremely hazardous substances, shall contact the Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Management Branch at (951)358-5055 for requirements.

| PPP 3.8.2 | Planning Department | Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, the Planning Department shall verify with Riverside County Department of Environmental Health if a business plan is required. |

### HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

**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.

Engineering Department | Prior to the issuance of grading permits |

**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.

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/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

Engineering Department | Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during operation |
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering Department</th>
<th>During operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### PDF 3.9-1

The Project will provide an underground storage infiltration system with a design capture volume (DCV) sufficient to retain all stormwater runoff for percolation into the groundwater. The underground storage infiltration system will provide water quality treatment during percolation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of a building permit,</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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building &amp; Safety Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of a building permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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>Building &amp; Safety Department</th>
<th>During operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Mitigation Measure NOI-1-Construction Noise Mitigation Plan

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant is required to submit a construction-related noise mitigation plan to the City Planning Department for review and approval. The plan must depict the location of construction equipment and how the noise from this equipment will be mitigated during construction of this project. In addition, the plan shall require that the following notes are included on grading plans and building plans. Project contractors shall be required to ensure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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) “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.”

| Mitigation Measure NOI-2-Noise Barrier. A barrier shall be constructed 8- feet above the finished grade elevation along the boundary between the Project and the closest existing residential homes to block the line-of-sight of adjacent residential uses to the proposed Project noise sources. In order to be effective, the noise barrier must have a surface density of at least four pounds per square foot, and be free of openings and cracks (with the exception of expansion joints gaps and other construction techniques, which could create an opening or crack). The noise barrier may be constructed of acrylic glass, masonry material, earthen berm, or a combination of these materials. Prior to issuance of building permits, the City shall review and approve the noise barrier design, placement and materials to ensure that the required level of sound attenuation will be achieved (i.e. residences will not be exposed to noise levels in excess of 60 dBA). |
| Planning Department Building & Safety Department | Prior to the issuance of a building permit, check plans for compliance. Installation shall be completed prior to occupancy. |

**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

Building & Safety

Per Municipal Code
proponent shall pay a Development Impact Fee (DIF) following protocol for impact fee collection.

| 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**

<p>| 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) per Title 3 of the Municipal Code. | Building &amp; Safety Department | TUMF shall be paid in accordance to the deadline stated in Chapter 3.70 DIF shall be paid in accordance to the deadline stated in Chapter 3.75 |
| 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. | Building &amp; Safety Department | DIF shall be paid in accordance to the deadline stated in Chapter 3.75 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

| I. a. TREATMENT PLAN: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a treatment plan in accordance with I (b) “Treatment of Discoveries” of this mitigation measure for the review and approval of the Planning Director. |

| b. ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITOR: Prior to the issuance of the grading permit, the applicant shall submit documentation that an archeological monitor meeting the professional standards of the Register of Professional Archaeologists or the Secretary of Interior’s Standards will be present for all ground-disturbing activities. The documentation shall include the archaeological contact information, too. An archeological monitor shall be present for all ground-disturbing activates in conjunction with the project. |

| II. a. MONITORING: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall contact the consulting Native American Tribe(s) that have requested monitoring through consultation with the City during the AB 52 process. The applicant shall coordinate with the Tribe(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. |

| b. TREATMENT OF DISCOVERIES: If a significant tribal cultural resource is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). A representative of the appropriate Native American Tribe(s), the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented to protect the identified tribal cultural resources from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the tribal cultural resources in accordance with current professional archaeology standards. The treatment plan shall require monitoring by the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during data recovery and shall require that all recovered artifacts undergo basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, whichever is appropriate. At the completion of the basic field |

| Planning Department & Engineering Department | Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and during grading |
analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, any recovered tribal cultural resources shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility, or, the artifacts may be delivered to the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) if that is recommended by the City of Jurupa Valley. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department, the Eastern Information Center, and the appropriate Native American Tribe.

c. DISPOSITION OF DISCOVERIES: In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this project. The following procedures will be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries:

The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to tribal cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the Jurupa Valley Planning Department with evidence of same:

1. A fully executed reburial agreement with the appropriate culturally affiliated Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed.

2. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.

3. If more than one Native American Group is involved with the project and cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center by default.

4. Should reburial of collected cultural items be preferred, it shall not occur until after the Phase IV monitoring report has been submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department. Should curation be preferred, the developer/permit applicant
is responsible for all costs and the repository and curation method shall be described in the Phase IV monitoring report.

**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 |
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. **SDP - PROJECT PERMITTED.** MA18147 (SDP18017) is for the approval the (1) establishment of the installation and sales of refrigeration units on trailers and trucks and (2) construction of a 42,132 square-foot building with minor improvements on approximately 6 acres of land located at 2610 Rubidoux Blvd.

   Truck access is allowed on Rubidoux Boulevard, but is prohibited on 26th Street.

2. **SDP - 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. **SDP - 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. **SDP - MITIGATION MEASURES.** This project shall be subject to the mitigation measures of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

5. **SDP - FEES.** The approval of MA18147 (SDP18107) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.
6. **SDP - APPROVAL PERIOD – SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT.** This approval shall be used within two (2) years of the approval date; otherwise, it shall become null and void and of no effect whatsoever. By use is meant the beginning of substantial construction contemplated by this approval within two (2) year period which is thereafter diligently pursued to completion or to the actual occupancy of existing buildings or land under the terms of the authorized use. Prior to the expiration of the two (2) year period, the permittee may request up to three (3) years of extension of time in which to begin substantial construction or use of this permit. Should the extension be obtained and no substantial construction or use of this permit be initiated within five (5) years of the approval date this permit, it shall become null and void.

7. **SDP - CONFORMANCE TO APPROVED EXHIBITS.** The project shall be in conformance to the approved plans (listed below) with changes in accordance to these conditions of approval: Plans dated 12/6/18 (Architectural, Grading, Wall & Fence, and Landscaping)

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

9. **SDP – NO ON-SITE ACTIVITIES AFTER 8PM.** There shall be no activities on-site after 8 pm.

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

11. **SDP - ON-SITE LANDSCAPING.**

   Prior to the issuance of the first Building permit, the applicant shall submit the following items for Planning Director’s review and approval:

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

   b) Initial deposit for PROS application.

   c) The total cost estimate of landscaping, irrigation, labor, and one-year maintenance.

   d) Completed City Faithful Performance Bond for Landscape Improvements form with original signatures after the City provides the applicant with the required amount of bond.

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

   f) Three (3) sets of final landscape, irrigation plans, shading plan with digital copies (CD format) that shall demonstrate compliance to the applicable provisions of Title 9. All landscape plans must be consistent with each other and modified to include an additional 29 trees (at a minimum of 15 gallons for each tree at 30 feet on-center) consistent with Exhibit A which is made a part of this condition:
Prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy for MA18147, the following events shall be satisfied in the order it is listed:

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

b) **City Inspection**: The City landscape architect shall conduct an inspection of the installation to confirm the landscape and irrigation plan was constructed in accordance to the approved plans.

12. **SDP – REVIEW OF PHOTOMETRIC PLANS**. Prior to the issuance of the first building permit, the applicant shall submit a Photometric Plan and exhibits of lighting fixtures for Planning Department review and approval. Lighting shall not flood onto any adjoining properties. Light fixtures shall direct light only onto Project site.

13. **SDP – ON-SITE OUTDOOR LIGHT FIXTURES**. On-site lighting shall be designed to shield direct rays from abutting properties and shall not increase the ambient light level of any residential properties to exceed one (1) foot candle at the property line.

Prior to the issuance of the first building permit, the applicant shall submit a Photometric Plan and exhibits of all on-site lighting fixtures for Planning Department review and approval.

14. **SDP – TRASH ENCLOSURE**. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit plans to include the trash collection with details and specification to the Planning Director for review and approval. The design of the enclosure shall match the architecture of the retail buildings of the shopping center. Walls of the enclosure and any solid gates shall have graffiti protection coating. In addition, the
applicant shall submit an approval or clearance letter for the trash enclosure from the appropriate waste collection agency to the Planning Department.

15. **SDP – WALL AND FENCE PLAN.** *Prior to the issuance of any building permit,* the applicant shall submit a final Wall & Fence plan for Planning Director’s review and approval.

16. **SDP – CHAIN LINK FENCE PROHIBITED.** Chain-link fence is prohibited on the project site.

17. **SDP – GRAFFITI PROTECTION FOR BUILDING WALLS AND PERIMETER WALLS.** *Prior to the issuance of any building permit,* the applicant shall submit a plan that includes anti-graffiti coating or protection for the exterior side of all perimeter walls and exterior of building walls to half the height of the structure, or 12 feet, whichever is greater, for Planning Director 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.

18. **SDP – MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTY.**

   a) **General Maintenance.** The property shall be maintained in perpetuity. The property shall be kept free of debris, weeds, abandoned vehicles, code violations, and any other factor or condition that may contribute to potential blight or crime.

   b) **Removal of Graffiti.** All graffiti shall be removed 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.

   c) **Pruning of Trees and Landscape Maintenance.**

      o All landscaped areas shall be maintained as approved on the final landscape plans in an orderly, attractive and healthy condition. This shall include proper pruning, mowing of turf areas (if any), weeding, removal of litter, fertilization, replacement of plants when necessary, and the regular application of appropriate quantities of water to all landscaped areas.

      o All irrigation systems shall be maintained as approved on the final landscape plans in proper operating condition. Waterline breaks, head/emitter ruptures, overspray or runoff conditions and other irrigation system failures shall be repaired immediately.

      o Canopy trees shall be maintained in a manner that they provide the required shade coverage and encourages the canopy to grow to provide shade. Avoid topping trees or pruning the trees in a manner that the trees do not achieve mature height and form.

19. **SDP - JARPD CFD.** *Prior to the issuance of any building permit,* the applicant shall annex into the existing Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District (JARPD) District-Wide Community Facilities District (CFD) or form a new Community Facilities District (CFD) to contribute to the cost of park maintenance.
20. SDP - JARPD FEES. 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.

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

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

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

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

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

1. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (ENGINEERING)

1.1. The use hereby conditioned is for a Site Development Permit (SDP18107) for 2610 Rubidoux Boulevard (southeast corner Rubidoux Boulevard and 26th Street) more particularly Assessor’s Parcels Numbers 178-150-008 and 178-150-009. Exhibit titled Site Plan by Lord Constructors, Inc. dated December 6, 2018 is hereby referenced.

1.2. It is assumed that any easements shown on the referenced exhibit are shown correctly and include all the easements that encumber the subject property. The Project proponent shall secure approval from all (if any) 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.

1.3. Rubidoux Boulevard is classified as a Primary Mobility Corridor and a Major Roadway by the General Plan, with ultimate right-of-way width of 118 feet. Right-of-way dedication will be required to provide a modified right-of-way width of 118 feet (59-foot half street from centerline in accordance with County of Riverside Transportation Department Road Standard No. 93. The applicant is required to remove any unused drive approaches and construct new drive approaches in accordance with County of Riverside Transportation Department Road Standard No. 207A. A separate street improvement plan is not required; these improvements may be shown on the grading plan.

1.4. 26th Street is classified as a Local Road with a right-of-way width of 60 feet. No additional right-of-way dedication is required. The applicant is required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on 26th Street along the project’s frontage as described on these conditions of approval.

1.5. Right-of-way dedication for property line corner cut back at the intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard and 26th Street will be required. Corner cut back shall be in
accordance with County of Riverside Transportation Department Road Standard No. 805.

1.6. New streetlights are required on Rubidoux Boulevard along the project frontage. The applicant is required to prepare street light plans and construct lights as approved by the City Engineer.

1.7. Owner will be required to annex into Jurupa Valley Landscape & Lighting Maintenance District 89-1-C.

2. PRIOR TO GRADING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

2.1. No grading permit shall be issued until the Site Development Permit and all other related cases are approved and are in effect, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

2.2. This project will require a grading permit, installation of BMPs, and a hauling permit from the Engineering and Public Works Department.

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

2.3.1. Grading of the site shall be per the recommendations of the geotechnical report as reviewed and approved by the Engineering department. All recommendations of the report shall be incorporated in the grading plan.

2.3.2. The title and date of the Geotechnical/Soils Engineer shall be included on the face of the grading plan.

2.3.3. The Geotechnical/Soils Engineer must sign the grading plan.

2.4. The Applicant shall prepare a “rough” grading plan or a combined “rough and precise” grading plan for the entire site.

2.4.1. 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.

2.4.2. 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.

2.4.3. 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.

2.4.4. 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. 207A. Existing driveway approaches, if any, shall be removed and replaced with full height curb.

2.4.5. Applicant shall provide written proof and authorization from easement holders (if any) for work proposed over easements.

2.5. 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. 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. 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.

2.6. Grading agreement and securities shall be in place prior to grading permit issuance.

2.7. 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.

2.8. The Applicant is responsible for the preparation of improvement plans. All required plans shall conform to Riverside County Road Improvement Standards (Ordinance No. 461) and all other relevant laws, rules, and regulations governing grading in the City of Jurupa Valley. Improvement plans shall be approved and securities in place prior to the issuance of any grading permit.

2.8.1. Applicant shall prepare Street Improvement plans for 26th Street for review and concurrence of the City Engineer.

2.8.1.1. Improvements shall include 6-foot curb adjacent sidewalk and 15-foot landscaped parkway adjacent to property line.

2.8.1.2. Truck access to the site from 26th Street will be restricted. The applicant can propose passenger vehicle access only to/from 26th Street.

2.8.1.3. Applicant shall be responsible for any utility relocation needed in order to provide the required parkway improvements.

2.8.2. Applicant shall submit street light plans for review and approval of the City Engineer.

2.8.2.1. Applicant is required to provide streetlights along the project frontage on Rubidoux Boulevard as approved and deemed adequate by the City Engineer.

2.8.3. Applicant is responsible for the improvements as shown on Table A.

2.9. Prior to approval of the grading plan, the Applicant shall prepare a detailed
hydrology and hydraulics report corresponding with the detailed plans for grading, site development, storm drain improvements, and street improvements, including analysis of offsite drainage tributary to the site, for approval of the City Engineer.

2.9.1. All drainage and storm drain improvements shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District's (RCFCD) standards. The receiving drainage facilities shall be analyzed to determine the extent of any downstream control or restrictions that might affect this site or other properties. All drainage improvements shall be designed to accommodate 100-year storm flows.

2.9.2. Drainage in streets shall comply with RCFCD standards which require that 10-year flows be contained within the tops of curbs and 100-year flows be contained within the right-of-way. Additional drainage facilities may be required in the streets as necessary to satisfy this requirement.

2.10. The grading plan shall provide for acceptance and proper disposal of all off-site drainage flowing to or through the site. Should the quantities exceed the street capacity, the Applicant shall provide adequate drainage facilities and/or appropriate easements as approved by the City Engineer. All drainage easements shall be shown and clearly identified on grading plans.

2.11. The grading plan shall provide for protection of downstream properties from damages caused by alteration of the drainage patterns, e.g. increase, 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 as necessary.

2.12. If grading is required offsite, the Applicant 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 Applicant to obtain any and all proposed or required easements and/or permissions necessary to perform the grading shown on the site plan and grading exhibits.

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

2.13.1. A hauling permit from the Public Works Department will be required.

2.14. Temporary erosion control measures shall be implemented immediately following any grading to prevent transport and deposition of debris onto downstream 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.

2.15. Applicant is required to annex into Jurupa Valley Landscape & Lighting Maintenance District 89-1-C for maintenance of the landscape parkway improvements. The Applicant shall submit landscape and irrigation plans for review and approval of the City Engineer.

2.15.1. The annexation shall be in a manner approved by the City Engineer and City Attorney.
2.15.2. For landscaping within public road rights-of-way, separate landscape and irrigation plans shall be prepared for approval of the City Engineer. The improvements shall comply with Riverside County Ordinance 461, as adopted by the City, “Comprehensive Landscaping Guidelines & Standards”, and Riverside County Ordinance 859, as adopted by the City. Landscaping and irrigation plans shall be submitted with the street improvement plans.

Landscaping plans shall depict ONLY such landscaping, irrigation and related facilities as are to be placed within the public rights-of-way.

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

2.17. Electrical power, telephone, communication, street lighting, and cable television lines shall be designed to be placed underground in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance No. 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.

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

3. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

3.1 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.

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

3.3 Street improvement plans for the required improvements along 26th Street must be approved by the City Engineer.

3.4 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.

3.5 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.

3.6 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).

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

3.8 Applicant shall form, or annex to if one already exists, a Community Facilities District (CFD) in order to provide funding for City Public Safety Services. The formation or annexation to a CFD for Public Safety Services shall be in a manner approved by the City Engineer and City Attorney. Participation in a CFD is intended to fully mitigate the incremental impact of new development on City public safety costs and maintain such levels service at the standards established in the City’s General Plan.

3.9 Separate sanitary sewer and domestic water system improvement plans shall be prepared for required improvements for approval of the Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) and concurrence of the City Engineer. Water system improvement plans showing the locations of fire hydrants (see County Standard 400) off-site and on-site must also be approved by Riverside County Fire Department.

3.10 Necessary easements for sewer and water systems on-site (if any), as determined by RCSD, shall be shown on the plans.

4. PRIOR TO OCCUPANCY

4.1. The Project shall install Project-Specific street modifications, as shown in Table A.

4.2. All Fair-Share payments, as shown on Table A, shall be paid to the City.
# TABLE A

**MA18147 - INTERSECTION AND ROADWAY SEGMENT IMPROVEMENT AND MITIGATION LIST**

<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 Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (N/S) and 26th Street (E/W) | Restripe the roadways to install geometries to provide:  
  - NB: one LT lane, one TH lane, one shared TH/RT lane.  
  - SB: one LT lane, one TH lane, one shared TH/RT lane.  
  - EB: one wide shared LT/TH/RT lane.  
  - WB: one wide shared LT/TH/RT lane. |
| Fair-Share Intersection Improvements           |                                                                             |
| Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (N/S) and 26th Street (E/W) | Install a traffic signal  
  Project share = $37,450 = ($350,000 X 10.7%) |
| Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (N/S) and 24th Street (E/W) | Install a traffic signal  
  Restripe the roadways to install geometries to provide:  
  - NB: one LT lane, one TH lane, one shared TH/RT lane.  
  - SB: one LT lane, one TH lane, one shared TH/RT lane.  
  - EB: one wide shared LT/TH/RT lane.  
  - WB: one wide shared LT/TH/RT lane.  
  Project share = $13,950 = ($498,400 X 2.8%) |
| Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (N/S) and 20th/Market Street (E/W) | Modify Traffic Signal to install EB and WB protected LT phasing.  
  - SB: Install 2nd left-turn lane  
  - WB: Install 2nd left-turn lane  
  Project Share = $ 7.550 = (445,200 X 1.7%) |
| Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (N/S) and 30th Street/WB SR-60 Off Ramp (E/W) |  
  - WB: Install 2 LT lanes  
  Project Share = $7,583.24 = ($103,880 X 7.3%) |
| Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (N/S) and SR-60 WB On-Ramp (E/W) |  
  - SB: Install RT lane  
  Project Share = $4,900 = ($74,200 X 6.6%) |
| Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (N/S) and SR-60 EB Off Ramp (E/W) |  
  - NB: Install RT lane.  
  - EB: Install LT lane.  
  Project Share = $4,250 = ($103,880 X 4.1%) |
| Intersection of Agua Mansa Road (N/S) and Market Street (E/W) | Modify Traffic Signal to implement SB RT overlap phasing  
- SB: Install RT lane  
- EB: Install 2nd LT lane |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Share = $3,400 = ($259,700 x 1.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages and most project costs from the “Truck Repair Facility Due Diligence Traffic Assessment” memorandum prepared by Urban Crossroads and dated January 23, 2019.

4.3. The Applicant is responsible for the completion of all grading and all improvements in the public rights-of-way and for compliance with all other requirements applicable to the public rights-of-way in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance 461, as adopted by the City.

4.3.1. Landscape improvements within the parkway shall be completed and accepted by the City Engineer.

4.3.2. New streetlights must be installed, energized, and accepted by the City Engineer.

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

Applicant’s name (Print Form): __________________________________________

Applicant’s name (Signature): __________________________________________ Date: __________________
LANDSCAPE SCHEDULE (ON-SITE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COLOR/FINISH</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MEDIUM GRIND MULCH</td>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>45,118 S.F.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CRUSHED GRAVEL</td>
<td>GRAY</td>
<td>1/4&quot;</td>
<td>4,148 S.F.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SIERRA BOULDERS</td>
<td>DARK AND LIGHT GRAY TONES</td>
<td>3/4&quot;</td>
<td>13 EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLASTIC BENDA BOARD</td>
<td>REDWOOD</td>
<td>2&quot; x 6&quot; x 16'</td>
<td>711 L.F.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALL PLANTING AREAS ARE TO BE MULCHED TO A DEPTH OF THREE (3") INCHES, 1 1/2" IN GROUNDCOVER AREAS.

UNDERGROUND SERVICE ALERT
CALL TOLL FREE 1-800-422-4133 (two working days before you dig)

Section 4216/4217 of the government code requires a dig alert identification number.
TREE SHADING LEGEND

- Parking area shaded by trees

Total parking area: 13,111 S.F. (Excludes drive aisles)

30% shading required for uncovered areas: 3,933 S.F.
Parking area shaded by trees: 3,941 S.F. (30% of uncovered parking area)

Tree size shown at 15 years maturity, per Riverside County Ordinance 348, Section 18.12

Underground Service Alert

Call Toll Free 1-800-422-4133 (two working days before you dig)

Section 4216/4217 of the government code requires a dig alert identification number
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

DETERMINATION OF USE NO. 18001 – MIDLANDS CARRIER

I. DETERMINATION. “The combination of (1) repair and installation of refrigeration units in trailers and bobtail trucks and (2) on-site sales of refrigeration units” is permitted in the Industrial Park (I-P) zone with a Site Development Permit.

II. BACKGROUND. Midlands Carrier Transicold has proposed to establish the use in an I-P zone. The project site is 2610 Rubidoux Blvd., in the Industrial Park (I-P) zone. Midlands Carrier Transicold would sell and install refrigeration units in trailers and bobtail trucks inside the proposed concrete tilt-up building.

III. REASONS. The Planning Director has determined that the proposed use, the combination of (1) repair and installation of refrigeration units and (2) sales of refrigeration units is substantially the same in character and intensity as the following uses in the I-P zone:

a. Section 9.145.020 (A) (1) (d) (iii) Manufacture, assembly, testing and repair of components, devices, equipment and systems of an electrical, electronic, or electro-mechanical nature.

b. Section 9.145.020 (A) (1) (e) Transportation and related industries

Sincerely,
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director

ATTACHED

- Project Description
August 23, 2018

City of Jurupa Valley
8930 Limonite Ave.
Jurupa Valley, Ca. 92509.

Attn: Annette Tam, Senior Planner
Planning Division

Re: Letter of Intended Use (MA18147, CUP18004)

Dear Annette,

Lord Constructors, Inc. has submitted a proposed/new 42,132 s.f. concrete tilt building on 6.14 net acres (vacant lot) on behalf of Midlands Carrier Transicold for review and approval (MA18147, CUP18004). The building is to be made up of a 9,300 s.f. single story office, a 5,700 s.f. parts area and a 27,132 s.f. area for installation of trailer/truck refrigeration systems.

The building is to be used for office, parts storage, sales & repair of transport refrigeration units. These refrigeration units are installed in the front nose of trailers and bobtail trucks. All installation of refrigeration units will be done inside the shop building.

Liquids stored on site are oil, antifreeze and freon. All of these materials will be stored in small quantities. There is no actual truck or trailer storage on site. Equipment on the lot and in the building is for repair and installation staging only. Once the install is complete (normally in one day) the unit is picked up by the customer.

There will be 32 employees (25 technicians, 6 administrative, 1 branch manager) at this location. The hours of operation are 7:00 am – 7:00 pm Monday thru Friday. There will be 9 company service trucks and 2 company pickup trucks on site. Minimal outside operations will include check in for new customers, marshalling trailers to inside shop Stall positions. If an install is not complete at the end of the day, the trailer would be stored overnight for completion and pick up the following day.

Midlands Carrier Transicold expects to sell/install 600 new refrigeration units per year. This location will be the point of sale. They expect parts sales to be 8 – 9 million dollars
for the full year 2020. They expect new equipment sales of 8 – 10 million dollars in 2020. These numbers are just for the first full year. They have good growth potential in the area because of the existing refrigerated base in the Inland Empire and believe this number will grow.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Gregg S. Lord
August 23, 2018

City of Jurupa Valley
8930 Limonite Ave.
Jurupa Valley, Ca. 92509.

Attn: Annette Tam, Senior Planner
Planning Division.

Re: Project Description, (MA18147, CUP18004).

Dear Annette,

Lord Constructors, Inc. has submitted a proposed/new 42,132 s.f. concrete tilt building on 6.14 net acres (vacant lot) on behalf of Midlands Carrier Transicold for review and approval (MA18147, CUP18004). The building is to be made up of a 9,300 s.f. single story office, a 5,700 s.f. parts area and a 27,132 s.f. area for installation of trailer/truck refrigeration systems. There will be a full recessed (single truck) dock at the rear of the building and a smaller (bobtail truck) recessed dock on the side of the building for parts delivery. All installation of refrigeration units will be done inside the shop building. All parts stored are used in the installation of the refrigeration units.

The balance of the lot will consist of asphalt paving and landscaping. There will be 176,101 s.f. of asphalt paving (66%) and 49,548 s.f. of landscaped area (19%). All of the employee parking is out in front of the building behind wrought iron fencing & block pilasters. There is a 46’ wide landscape band between the parking area and the public sidewalk. There is a 39’ band of landscape between the CMU wall and the public sidewalk on 26th St. All rear yard areas are screened from the street with landscape and 6’ high split face CMU walls. Because of the hilly nature of the site a combination of retaining walls & landscape will be used to table/level the site.

The public sidewalk and concrete drive approach are proposed. All street improvements on 26th St. are proposed.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Gregg S. Lord
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Information Sheet for Midland Carriers Project (MA18147)

January 15, 2019

INTRODUCTION

The City is interested in receiving your opinion for a new project in your neighborhood. Please provide your comments by contacting the project manager, Annette Tam, Senior Planner, or at a future Planning Director’s public hearing.

The City of Jurupa Valley is considering an application for a proposed new business for the sales and installation of refrigeration units on trailers and bobtail trucks near your neighborhood at 2610 Rubidoux Boulevard (southeast corner of Rubidoux Boulevard and 26th Street). The Exhibit “A” below is a map that shows the location of the project.

This handout is to provide you information about the proposed use. A drawing of the proposed project is included with this handout. Full drawings of the project are available at City Hall for review.

EXHIBIT A: PROJECT SITE LOCATION (GOOGLE)
PROJECT DESCRIPTION. The project includes the construction of a 42,132 square-foot concrete tilt-up building on 6.14 acres. The proposed sales and installation of refrigeration units in trailers and bobtail trucks would generally occur in the building. The building includes offices, storage for parts, and area for the sales and repair of transport refrigeration units. Minor improvements include parking areas, walls, fences, and landscaping.

The hours of operations are 7:00 am – 7:00 pm on Monday thru Friday. There will be 32 employees (25 technicians, 6 administrative staff, and 1 branch manager).

The project will be designed and operated in such a way that would minimize impacts to the neighborhood:

- Most of the project site will be screened by a perimeter wall from public view. All the operations will be screened from the street.
- The building has truck bays that are screened by a perimeter wall.
- The site will be well-lit for security purposes.

The Planning Department will recommend the following requirements that will minimize impact to the neighborhood:

- No activities on the project site after 8 pm.
- All lighting fixtures cannot flood light onto the adjacent property or street.
- All walls must have anti-graffiti coating. The applicant must remove graffiti as soon as possible.

PUBLIC HEARING. This project will require a public hearing and the approval of the Planning Director. At least ten (10) days before the public hearing, the City will mail a notice with the date, time, and location of the public hearing.

The City welcomes any comment or question for this project. If you have any comments or need assistance, please contact Annette Tam, Senior Planner (English) or Grizelda Reed, Planning Secretary (Spanish).

City Contact

- English: Annette Tam, Senior Planner (atat@jurupavalley.org)
- Spanish: Grizelda Reed, Planning Secretary (greed@jurupavalley.org)

City Hall Address: 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
City Hall Telephone: 951-332-6464
DEPARTAMENTO DE PLANIFICACIÓN
Hoja De Información Para El Proyecto De Portadores De Midland (MA18147)

January 15, 2019

INTRODUCCIÓN
La Ciudad está interesada en recibir su opinión para un nuevo proyecto en su vecindario. Envíe sus comentarios poniéndose en contacto con la gerente del proyecto, Annette Tam, Planificador Senior, o en una audiencia pública futura del Director de Planificación.

La Ciudad de Jurupa Valley está considerando una solicitud para un nuevo negocio propuesto para la venta e instalación de unidades de refrigeración en remolques y camiones de bobina cerca de su vecindario en 2610 Rubidoux Boulevard (esquina sureste de Rubidoux Boulevard y 26th Street). El Anexo “A” a continuación es un mapa que muestra la ubicación del proyecto.

Este folleto es para proporcionarle información sobre el uso propuesto. En este folleto se incluye un dibujo del proyecto propuesto. Los planos completos del proyecto están disponibles en el Ayuntamiento para su revisión.

ANEXO A: UBICACIÓN DEL SITIO DEL PROYECTO (GOOGLE)

DESCRIPCIÓN DEL PROYECTO.
El proyecto incluye la construcción de un edificio de 42,132 pies cuadrados en 6.14 acres. La venta e instalación propuestas de unidades de refrigeración en remolques y camiones de bobtail generalmente
se realizarán en el edificio. El edificio incluye oficinas, almacenamiento de piezas y área para la venta y reparación de unidades de refrigeración para transporte. Las mejoras menores incluyen áreas de estacionamiento, paredes, cercas y paisajismo.

El horario de atención es de 7:00 a.m. a 7:00 p.m. de lunes a viernes. Habrá 32 empleados (25 técnicos, 6 personal administrativo y 1 gerente de sucursal).

El proyecto se diseñará y operará de tal manera que minimice los impactos en el vecindario:

- La mayor parte del sitio del proyecto se proyectará por un muro perimetral desde la vista pública. Todas las operaciones se proyectarán desde la calle.
- El edificio tiene bahías de camiones que se filtran por un muro perimetral.
- El sitio estará bien iluminado por razones de seguridad.

El Departamento de planeación se recomienda los siguientes requisitos que minimizarán el impacto a la comunidad:

- No hay actividades en el sitio del proyecto después de las 8 pm.
- Todos los accesorios de iluminación no pueden iluminar la propiedad o calle adyacente.
- Todas las paredes deben tener revestimiento anti-graffiti. El solicitante debe eliminar el graffiti lo antes posible.

AUDIENCIA PÚBLICA.

Este proyecto requerirá una audiencia pública y la aprobación del Director de Planificación. Al menos diez (10) días antes de la audiencia pública, la Ciudad enviará un aviso con la fecha, la hora y el lugar de la audiencia pública.

La Ciudad agradece cualquier comentario o pregunta para este proyecto. Si tiene algún comentario o necesita ayuda, comuníquese con Annette Tam, Planificadora Principal (en inglés) o Grizelda Reed, Secretaria de Planificación (en español).

Contacto De La Ciudad

- Inglés: Annette Tam, planificadora senior (atam@jurupavalley.org)
- Español: Grizelda Reed, Secretaria de Planificación (greed@jurupavalley.org)

Dirección Del Ayuntamiento: 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
Teléfono Del Ayuntamiento: 951-332-6464
EXHIBICIÓN B: DISEÑO DE PROYECTO
2610 Rubidoux Blvd.