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

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

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

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

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

1. 6:00 PM - CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL FOR CLOSED SESSION

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

2. CLOSED SESSION

A. PUBLIC COMMENTS PERTAINING TO CLOSED SESSION ITEMS

B. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - PENDING LITIGATION. The City Council will meet in closed session with the City Attorney pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1) with respect to one matter of pending litigation: (1) Application of Southern California Edison Company (U-238-E) for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct the Riverside Transmission Reliability Project, California Public Utilities Commission Case No. A15404013.
3. 7:00 P.M. - RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION

A. ANNOUNCEMENT OF ANY REPORTABLE ACTIONS IN CLOSED SESSION

4. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL FOR REGULAR SESSION

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

5. INVOCATION

6. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

7. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

8. PRESENTATIONS

A. REACH OUT GRANT UPDATE

9. PUBLIC APPEARANCE/COMMENTS

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

10. INTRODUCTIONS, ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, COUNCIL COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

11. CITY MANAGER’S UPDATE

12. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. FEBRUARY 21, 2019 REGULAR MEETING
13. CONSENT CALENDAR (COMMENTS ON CONSENT AGENDA TAKEN HERE)

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

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

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

B. CONSIDERATION OF CHECK REGISTER IN THE AMOUNT OF $825,436.47

Requested Action: That the City Council ratify the check registers dated February 14 and 21, 2019.

C. AMENDMENT TO THE WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (WRCOG) JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT TO MAKE A SERIES OF TECHNICAL CHANGES

Requested Action: That the City Council authorize the Mayor to execute the Amendment to the Joint Powers Agreement of the Western Riverside Council of Governments to authorize a series of technical changes.

D. SECOND QUARTER FY 2018-19 FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT

Requested Action: That the City Council receive and file the Second Quarter Financial Status Report.

E. NOTICE OF DECISION FOR MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. MA18141 (TTM37640 WITH EXCEPTION TO SECTION 7.10.080.C OF TITLE 7 & AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO PUD-02 DEVELOPMENT PLAN) PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT FOR NOTICING THE CITY COUNCIL OF AN APPROVED TENTATIVE TRACT MAP LOCATED SOUTH OF KENWOOD, EAST OF CANAL, WEST OF AVALON, AND NORTH OF SR-60 (APNS: 179-060-004; -006; -007 AND 178-191-001; -002; -004; -015)

Requested Action: That the City Council receive and file the Notice of Decision.

F. NOTICE OF DECISION FOR MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NOS. 19003 AND 19004 PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT FOR NOTICING THE CITY COUNCIL OF AN APPROVED EXTENSION OF TIME FOR HIGHLAND PARK’S TENTATIVE TRACT AND PARCEL MAPS AT ALONG SIERRA AVE. BETWEEN 20TH ST. AND CANAL ST. (APNS: 175-080-011; 177-020-004;...
Requested Action: That the City Council receive and file the Notice of Decision

G. STATUS REPORT ON EMERGENCY REPAIRS TO LIMONITE AVENUE ROAD DAMAGE AND CONTINUED AUTHORIZATION OF EMERGENCY WORK

Requested Action: That the City Council adopt by a 4/5ths vote, Resolution No. 2019-14, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, DETERMINING THAT THERE IS A NEED TO CONTINUE THE ACTIONS AUTHORIZED BY RESOLUTION NO. 2019-13 FOR THE EMERGENCY REPAIR OF LIMONITE AVENUE BETWEEN BAIN STREET AND BEACH STREET (PYRITE CREEK) PURSUANT TO PUBLIC CONTRACT CODE SECTION 22050

H. PURCHASE OF USED VEHICLES FOR CODE ENFORCEMENT

Requested Action: That the City Council approve the purchase of two used pick-up trucks from Enterprise Auto Sales and appropriate the necessary funds.

I. AWARD OF CONSTRUCTION AGREEMENT TO STURGEON ELECTRIC CALIFORNIA, LLC FOR THE TRAFFIC SIGNAL MODIFICATIONS PROJECT (17-C.2)

1. Requested Action: That the City Council approve and award a construction agreement to Sturgeon Electric California, LLC in the amount of $108,874.22 for Traffic Signal Modifications, for the work included in its proposal, and authorize the City Manager to execute the Agreement in substantially the form attached to the staff report as approved by the City Attorney; and

2. Authorize the City Manager to execute contract change orders not to exceed 5% of the total agreement, pursuant to requirements set forth in the agreement; and

3. That the City Council appropriate $35,275 of Development Impact Fee (DIF) funds from the Traffic Signal Installation/Interconnect, Limonite Avenue Project (Account No. 62311/62312) to the Project Account to fund the total Project Costs; and

4. Authorize the City Manager to record the Notice of Completion upon acceptance of the work by the City Engineer.
J. SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES BETWEEN THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY AND KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC. FOR THE TRAFFIC SIGNAL INSTALLATION, PEDLEY AND JURUPA PROJECT, CIP PROJECT NO. 16-C.2

Requested Action: That the City Council approve the “Second Amendment to Professional Consultant Services” between the City of Jurupa Valley and Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. and authorize the City Manager to execute the Amendment in substantially the form attached to the staff report as approved by the City Attorney.

K. AUTHORIZE THE SERVICES OF THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT FOR INVESTIGATION OF FOUNDATION SCOURING OF MARKET STREET BRIDGE AT THE SANTA ANA RIVER

1. Requested Action: That the City Council authorize the services of the Riverside County Transportation Department for the investigation, analysis and report of river bottom scouring at all pier foundations of the Market Street Bridge; and

2. That the City Council appropriate $62,700 of unencumbered Measure A funds for the analysis; and

3. Authorize the City Manager to execute an agreement with Riverside County Transportation Department in such final form as approved by the City Attorney.

14. CONSIDERATION OF ANY ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR

15. PUBLIC HEARING

A. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE PROPOSED VACATION OF PORTIONS OF CITY RIGHT-OF-WAY ON KACHINA DRIVE LOCATED NORTHWISTERLY OF THE INTERSECTION WITH VIRTUE VISTA DRIVE IN THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

1. Requested Action: That the City Council conduct a public hearing on the proposed vacation of city right-of-way being a portion of Kachina Drive located northwesterly of Virtue Vista Drive, with reservation and exemption of easement for public utility purposes and conditions of approval for the vacation.

2. That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-15, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, VACATING PORTIONS OF KACHINA DRIVE NORTHWISTERLY OF THE INTERSECTION WITH VIRTUE VISTA DRIVE WILL, WITH CONDITIONS, PURSUANT TO STREETS
AND HIGHWAYS CODE SECTIONS 8320 THROUGH 8325 AND FINDING THE VACATION EXEMPT FROM CEQA PURSUANT TO CEQA GUIDELINES SECTIONS 15061(B)(3) AND 15304

16. COUNCIL BUSINESS

A. MID-YEAR BUDGET PRESENTATION

1. Requested Action: That the City Council receive and file the Mid-Year Budget Presentation.

2. Discussion of an appropriation for expenses and other expenditures for a consultant to organize the Jurupa Valley Community Parade.

B. AUTHORIZING CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS TO SIGN A LETTER PROTESTING FALSE AND MISLEADING STATEMENTS BY THE CITY OF RIVERSIDE AND THE RIVERSIDE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE LETTER SOLICITING PUBLIC LOBBYING IN SUPPORT OF THE RIVERSIDE TRANSMISSION RELIABILITY PROJECT (RTRP) AND UPDATE ON STATUS OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

1. Requested Action: That the City Council review the draft letter protesting false and misleading statements by the City of Riverside and the Riverside Chamber of Commerce letter soliciting public lobbying in support of the RTRP and authorize each member of the City Council to sign the letter.

2. Receive update report from Staff on the status of the RTRP proceedings before the California Public Utilities Commission.

17. CITY COUNCIL MEMBER ORAL/Written REPORTS REGARDING REGIONAL BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

A. MAYOR BRIAN BERKSON

1. UPDATE ON THE MOBILE SOURCE AIR POLLUTION REDUCTION REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 21, 2019

B. MAYOR PRO TEM ANTHONY KELLY, JR.

1. UPDATE ON THE RIVERSIDE TRANSIT AGENCY BOARD MEETING OF FEBRUARY 28, 2019

C. COUNCIL MEMBER LORENA BARAJAS

1. UPDATE ON THE WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNTY – REGIONAL CONSERVATION AGENCY MEETING OF MARCH 4, 2019
D. COUNCIL MEMBER MICHEAL GOODLAND

1. UPDATE ON THE WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 4, 2019

2. UPDATE ON THE HEALTHY JURUPA VALLEY COMMUNITY MEETING OF MARCH 5, 2019

18. CITY ATTORNEY’S REPORT

19. COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS AND COMMENTS

20. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn to the Regular Meeting of March 21, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. at the City Council Chamber, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Government Code Section 54954.2, if you need special assistance to participate in a meeting of the Jurupa Valley City Council or other services, please contact Jurupa Valley City Hall at (951) 332-6464. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting or time when services are needed will assist staff in assuring that reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility to the meeting or service.

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

Agendas and Minutes are posted on the City’s website at www.jurupavalley.org.
MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE JURUPA VALLEY CITY COUNCIL
February 21, 2019

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

1. 6:00 PM - CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL FOR CLOSED SESSION

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

Mayor Berkson called the closed session meeting to order at 6:08 p.m.

2. CLOSED SESSION

A. PUBLIC COMMENTS PERTAINING TO CLOSED SESSION ITEM

There were no public comments regarding the closed session item.

B. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - PENDING LITIGATION. The City Council met in closed session with the City Attorney pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1) with respect to one matter of pending litigation: (1) Application of Southern California Edison Company (U-238-E) for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct the Riverside Transmission Reliability Project, California Public Utilities Commission Case No. A15404013.

3. 7:00 P.M. - RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION

A. ANNOUNCEMENT OF ANY REPORTABLE ACTIONS IN CLOSED SESSION

Mayor Berkson announced that there were no reportable actions taken.

4. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL FOR REGULAR SESSION

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

Mayor Berkson called the regular meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.
5. **INVOCATION** was given by Pastor Jeremy Williams, Grace Fellowship Church.

6. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** was led by Council Member Micheal Goodland.

7. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

   A motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Anthony Kelly, seconded by Council Member Chris Barajas, to approve the Agenda with a modification to the Agenda, moving Item No. 17 to after Item No. 10.

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

8. **PRESENTATIONS**

9. **PUBLIC APPEARANCE/COMMENTS**

   Bernard Cordella voiced concern that there is a lack of enforcement at the Pat Merritt Dog Park as patrons are allowing large dogs to enter the separate play area for small dogs. He suggested that speed bumps and a stop sign be installed on Limonite Frontage Road to curtail speeding in the area.

   Dana Burgess stated that she has noticed an increase in the number of homeless encampments at Armstrong and Avenue J. She outlined various concerns regarding how her truck and trailer were stolen from in front of her home and that there may be an illegal chop shop operating in the nearby hills. She noted her numerous calls to the Sheriff and asked that something be done to curtail this activity.

   Mayor Berkson asked City staff to look into this issue.

   Ron Spade echoed Mr. Cordella’s concerns regarding Pat Merritt Park. He added that Limonite Frontage Road needs to be repaved and if speed bumps were added it could help curtail speeding motorists.

10. **INTRODUCTIONS, ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, COUNCIL COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

   Council Member Lorena Barajas noted the recent heavy rains and encouraged residents to stay safe.

   Council Member Micheal Goodland welcomed everyone to tonight’s meeting by reciting a unifying prayer.

   Mayor Pro Tem Anthony Kelly, Jr. encouraged citizens to voice any comments or concerns.
Mayor Berkson shared photographs of his attendance at a special meeting called by Governor Newsom which was intended to discuss the governor’s efforts to combat the state’s housing crisis and push for more affordable housing options. The meeting was held in Long Beach and included a group of southern California mayors from cities, including Jurupa Valley that are considered by the governor’s office to be out of compliance with state law when it comes to creating new housing for low-income residents. Mayor Berkson stated that he discussed the City’s earlier fiscal challenges with the governor which impacted the timing and formulation of the City’s General Plan. He stated that he made a promise to the governor that the City would forward its revised Housing Element to the state for certification within 60 days.

The following item was taken out of order:

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

A. MAYOR BRIAN BERKSON

1. Mayor Berkson gave an update on the Metrolink / Southern California Regional Rail Authority meeting of February 8, 2019.

2. Mayor Berkson gave an update on the Riverside County Transportation Commission meeting of February 13, 2019.


B. MAYOR PRO TEM ANTHONY KELLY, JR.


C. COUNCIL MEMBER CHRIS BARAJAS


11. CITY MANAGER’S UPDATE

City Manager Gary Thompson discussed issues related to the recent heavy rains. He stated that a major mud slide occurred from the solar farm that is owned by the County of Riverside. He reported that a Notice of Violation has been issued by the City’s Code Enforcement personnel to ensure there is proper mitigation of this issue.
He discussed the damage that occurred on Limonite Avenue and the emergency repairs that were implemented. He reported that after City staff closed Limonite Avenue, several motorists were cited by the Sheriff’s Department for running through the barricades.

Mr. Thompson announced that the Western Riverside Council of Governments will hold their General Assembly on June 20, 2019 which conflicts with the Council meeting schedule. He will bring back a future discussion item to either cancel this meeting or re-schedule it.

12. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. JANUARY 30, 2019 SPECIAL MEETING

B. FEBRUARY 7, 2019 REGULAR MEETING

A motion was made by Council Member Chris Barajas, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Anthony Kelly, to approve the Minutes of the January 30, 2019 special meeting (as corrected) and the February 7, 2019 regular meeting.

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

13. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

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

B. CONSIDERATION OF CHECK REGISTER IN THE AMOUNT OF $1,896,813.87 – REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

Requested Action: That the City Council ratify the check registers dated January 31 and February 7 as well as the payroll registers dated February 5 and 13, 2019.

C. ORDINANCE NO. 2019-03

Requested Action: That the City Council conduct a second reading and adopt Ordinance No. 2019-03, entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, ADDING CHAPTER 6.100 AND AMENDING TITLE 9, PLANNING AND ZONING, OF THE JURUPA VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE TO IMPLEMENT
THE PERMITTING AND REGULATION OF MICROENTERPRISE HOME KITCHEN OPERATIONS AND FINDING AN EXEMPTION PURSUANT TO CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15061(B)(3)

D. ORDINANCE NO. 2019-04

Requested Action: That the City Council conduct a second reading and adopt Ordinance No. 2019-04, entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, ADDING SECTION 2.36 TO THE JURUPA VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE ESTABLISHING THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND SETTING FORTH PROCEDURAL RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

E. ORDINANCE NO. 2019-05

Requested Action: That the City Council conduct a second reading and adopt Ordinance No. 2019-05, entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, ADDING SECTIONS 9.05.100 AND 9.05.110 TO THE JURUPA VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE CONCERNING PROCEDURES FOR APPEALS OF PLANNING COMMISSION LAND USE DECISIONS TO THE CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CITY COUNCIL, AMENDING VARIOUS SECTIONS OF TITLE 7, SUBDIVISIONS, AND TITLE 9, PLANNING AND ZONING, TO IMPLEMENT NEW SECTION 9.05.100 AND FINDING THAT THE MODIFICATIONS TO PROCEDURES ARE EXEMPT FROM CEQA PURSUANT TO SECTION 15061(b)(3) OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES

F. ORDINANCE NO. 2019-06

Requested Action: That the City Council conduct a second reading and adopt Ordinance No. 2019-06, entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING SECTION 6.20.090 OF THE JURUPA VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE RELATING TO THE DISPLAY OF MOBILE FACILITY VENDING PERMITS AND SECTION 6.20.110 (20) AND (21) RELATING TO VENDING NEAR FARMER’S MARKETS AND SPECIAL EVENTS AND FINDING THE ORDINANCE EXEMPT FROM CEQA
G. ORDINANCE NO. 2019-07

Requested Action: That the City Council conduct a second reading and adopt Ordinance No. 2019-07, entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING CHAPTER 3.70 OF THE JURUPA VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE TO INCLUDE A PROCESS FOR WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS’ CALCULATION AND COLLECTION OF FEES UNDER THE WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION UNIFORM MITIGATION FEE (TUMF) PROGRAM, AND DETERMINING THAT THE ORDINANCE IS EXEMPT FROM FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW UNDER SECTION 15378(B)(4) OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES

H. AWARD OF CONSTRUCTION AGREEMENT TO ONYX PAVING COMPANY, INC. FOR THE RUBIDOUX BOULEVARD PAVEMENT REHABILITATION, CIP PROJECT NO. 18-A.2 – REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Requested Action: That the City Council approve and award a construction agreement to Onyx Paving Company, Inc. in the amount of $623,000 for the Rubidoux Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation Project, for the work included in its proposal for the Base Bid, and authorize the City Manager to execute the Agreement in substantially the form attached to the staff report as approved by the City Attorney; and

2. Authorize the City Manager to execute contract change orders not to exceed 5% of the total agreement, pursuant to requirements set forth in the agreement; and

3. Authorize the City Manager to record the Notice of Completion upon acceptance of the work by the City Engineer.

I. APPROVAL OF PARCEL MAP 36828 LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF SAN SEVAINE CHANNEL BETWEEN SAN SEVAINE WAY AND BAIN STREET INCLUDING ACCEPTANCE OF OFFERS OF DEDICATION, APPROVAL OF SUBDIVISION AGREEMENTS, AND ACCEPTANCE OF IMPROVEMENT BONDS (CRPF IV BAIN, LLC)

1. Requested Action: That the City Council approve Parcel Map 36828 and accept the dedications as follows:

   a. Accept the offers of dedication of easement for public utility purposes over all of Lots “A” and “B”, as shown on Parcel Map 36828.

   b. Accept the offers of dedication of easement “B” for public utility purposes within Parcels 1 and 2 as shown on Parcel Map 36828.
c. Accept the offers of dedication of easement “F” for public utility purposes within Parcels 1 and 2 as shown on Parcel Map 36828.

2. Authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to sign Parcel Map 36828.

3. Approve and authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to execute the Subdivision Improvement Agreements.

4. Accept the Faithful Performance Bond No. 1001089604 in the amount of $370,000 and Material and Labor Bond No. 1001089604 in the amount of $185,000 from American Contractors Indemnity Company for the construction of Improvements and Monument Bond in the amount of $2,500 in the form of a cash deposit.

J. APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, SPACE CENTER MIRA LOMA, INC., AND THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF DAY CREEK MDP LINE “N”, STAGE 4 STORM DRAIN

Requested Action: That the City Council approve the agreement with the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and Space Center Mira Loma, Inc. and authorize the Mayor to sign the agreement.

A motion was made by Council Member Micheal Goodland, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Anthony Kelly, to approve the Consent Calendar, with the exception of Item Nos. 13.B and 13.H, which were removed for further discussion.

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

14. CONSIDERATION OF ANY ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR

13.B CONSIDERATION OF CHECK REGISTER IN THE AMOUNT OF $1,896,813.87

Council Member Lorena Barajas requested that Item 13.B be removed from the Consent Calendar for further discussion.

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

A motion was made by Council Member Lorena Barajas, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Anthony Kelly, to ratify the check registers dated January 31 and February 7 as well as the payroll registers dated February 5 and 13, 2019.
H. AWARD OF CONSTRUCTION AGREEMENT TO ONYX PAVING COMPANY, INC. FOR THE RUBIDOUX BOULEVARD PAVEMENT REHABILITATION, CIP PROJECT NO. 18-A.2

City Manager Gary Thompson requested that Item 13.H be removed from the Consent Calendar for further discussion. He reported that not all of the technical requirements were met when the bid package was prepared and it will need to be re-bid. He recommended that the Council reject all bids to allow City staff to re-bid the project.

A motion was made by Council Member Micheal Goodland, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Anthony Kelly, to reject all bids for the Rubidoux Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation, CIP Project No. 18-A.2

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

15. PUBLIC HEARINGS

16. COUNCIL BUSINESS

A. INITIATION OF A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO ADOPT THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN INTO THE GENERAL PLAN SAFETY ELEMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FEDERAL DISASTER MITIGATION AND COST REDUCTION ACT OF 2000 IN AN EFFORT TO MAXIMIZE FUNDING ELIGIBILITY THROUGH FEMA AND THE CALIFORNIA DISASTER ASSISTANCE ACT

Thomas Merrell, Planning Director, presented the staff report.

Further discussion followed.

A motion was made by Council Member Chris Barajas, seconded by Council Member Micheal Goodland, to authorize the General Plan Amendment to proceed and refer the item to the Planning Commission for review and recommendation.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly
Noes: None
Absent: None
B. APPROVAL OF NEW STAFF POSTIONS, (CHIEF BUILDING OFFICIAL, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MANAGER, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS/CITY ENGINEER), AND ADVERTISING COSTS

City Manager Gary Thompson presented the staff report.

Further discussion followed.

A motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Anthony Kelly, seconded by Council Member Chris Barajas, to approve the creation of three new positions, (Chief Building Official, Economic Development Manager, and Director of Public Works/City Engineer), effective Fiscal Year 2019-20, Job Descriptions and Salary Ranges; and authorize $5,000 in recruitment advertising costs to be used as necessary; and bring back a discussion of whether the Council should be involved in the interview process for one or more of the positions.

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

C. EMERGENCY REPAIR WORK FOR THE SINKHOLES, ROAD FAILURES AND SLOPE FAILURES ON LIMONITE AVENUE BETWEEN BAIN STREET AND BEACH STREET

Steve Loriso, City Engineer, gave the staff report and provided a brief PowerPoint presentation.

City Manager Gary Thompson reported that a status report of the emergency repairs will be brought back at the next meeting.

Further discussion followed.

A motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Anthony Kelly, seconded by Council Member Micheal Goodland, to adopt Resolution No. 2019-13, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, FINDING THAT AN EMERGENCY EXISTS WITHIN THE MEANING OF PUBLIC CONTRACT CODE SECTION 22035 WITH RESPECT TO THE SINKHOLES, ROAD FAILURES, AND SLOPE FAILURES ON LIMONITE AVENUE, BETWEEN BAIN STREET AND BEACH STREET (PYRITE CREEK) AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER PURSUANT TO PUBLIC CONTRACT CODE SECTIONS 22035 AND 22050 TO ENTER INTO ONE OR MORE CONTRACTS ON BEHALF OF THE CITY TO IMMEDIATELY REPAIR THE DAMAGE AND REPLACE THE ROAD FACILITIES IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $500,000;

-9-
MAKING OTHER REQUIRED FINDINGS; AND PROVIDING FOR INCIDENTAL MATTERS RELATED THERETO

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

18. CITY ATTORNEY’S REPORT

City Attorney Peter Thorson had no report.

19. COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS AND COMMENTS

20. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the City Council, Mayor Berkson adjourned the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

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

Respectfully submitted,

______________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 7, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

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

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 13.B
CHECK REGISTERS

RECOMMENDATION

That the City Council ratify the check registers dated February 14 and 21, 2019.

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

ANALYSIS

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

OTHER INFORMATION

None.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Check registers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/14/19</td>
<td>$336,190.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/21/19</td>
<td>$489,273.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $825,463.47
ALTERNATIVES

1. Not ratify the attached check registers.

Prepared by: ___________________________  Submitted by: ___________________________

Alan Kreimeier  Gary S. Thompson
Administrative Services Director  City Manager

Attachments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Invoice</th>
<th>Inv Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
<th>Check Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>1/7/2019</td>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK USA</td>
<td>010219</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>PARS CONTRACT #86360-00-01</td>
<td>7,712.62</td>
<td>7,712.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>1/7/2019</td>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK USA</td>
<td>010319</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>PARS CONTRACT #86360-00-01</td>
<td>315.00</td>
<td>315.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>1/7/2019</td>
<td>ICMA-RC</td>
<td>010219</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>PLAN #307290 CITY OF JURU</td>
<td>2,264.00</td>
<td>2,264.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>1/7/2019</td>
<td>ICMA-RC</td>
<td>010319</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>PLAN #307290 CITY OF JURU</td>
<td>3,554.51</td>
<td>3,554.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>1/17/2019</td>
<td>ICMA-RC</td>
<td>011619</td>
<td>1/16/2019</td>
<td>PLAN #307290 CITY OF JURU</td>
<td>2,264.00</td>
<td>2,264.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>1/17/2019</td>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK USA</td>
<td>011619</td>
<td>1/16/2019</td>
<td>PARS CONTRACT #86360-00-01</td>
<td>7,747.86</td>
<td>7,747.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK USA</td>
<td>013019</td>
<td>1/30/2019</td>
<td>PARS CONTRACT #86360-00-01</td>
<td>7,772.67</td>
<td>7,772.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>ICMA-RC</td>
<td>013019</td>
<td>1/30/2019</td>
<td>PLAN #307290 CITY OF JURU</td>
<td>1,023.00</td>
<td>1,023.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>ICMA-RC</td>
<td>013119</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>PLAN #307290 CITY OF JURU</td>
<td>3,554.51</td>
<td>3,554.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK USA</td>
<td>013119</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>PARS CONTRACT #86360-00-01</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td>225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11192</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>ACCELA, INC.</td>
<td>INV-ACC43774</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>ACCELA CIVIC PLATFORM SL</td>
<td>65,487.42</td>
<td>65,487.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11193</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>AUTOMATED GATE SERVICES131570</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>REPAIR CITY HALL GATE</td>
<td>282.50</td>
<td>282.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11194</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>AVANCE PUBLIC OUTREACH</td>
<td>011719</td>
<td>1/17/2019</td>
<td>MA16186 INTERPRETATION S</td>
<td>844.41</td>
<td>844.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td>Check Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11196</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPERS</td>
<td>P0011225655</td>
<td>1/23/2019</td>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL MOD PRCTJ</td>
<td>761.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00112230690</td>
<td>2/3/2019</td>
<td>MA19011- LEGAL NOTICE</td>
<td>374.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0011226588</td>
<td>1/25/2019</td>
<td>MA18089 - LEGAL NOTICE</td>
<td>369.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00112230711</td>
<td>1/23/2019</td>
<td>MA18141 (SIGNATURE HOME)</td>
<td>369.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00112230730</td>
<td>2/4/2019</td>
<td>MA18147 NOTICE OF INTENT</td>
<td>360.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00112230334</td>
<td>2/1/2019</td>
<td>MA17250 - LEGAL NOTICE</td>
<td>352.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0011226683</td>
<td>1/25/2019</td>
<td>MA17250 - LEGAL NOTICE</td>
<td>343.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0011225492</td>
<td>1/23/2019</td>
<td>CDBG FUNDS - LEGAL NOTIC</td>
<td>193.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0011227278</td>
<td>1/28/2019</td>
<td>2/7/19 PUBLIC HEARING NOT</td>
<td>171.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,295.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11196</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA SENSOR CORPC</td>
<td>012919</td>
<td>1/25/2019</td>
<td>5YR IRRIGATION CONTROLLI</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11197</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA CHOICE BENEFIT</td>
<td>3086535</td>
<td>2/1/2019</td>
<td>MAR 2019 MEDICAL INSURANCE</td>
<td>7,514.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,514.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11198</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>SL190542</td>
<td>1/15/2019</td>
<td>OCT-DEC 2018 SIGNALS &amp; LIGHTS</td>
<td>9,609.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,609.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11199</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>CAMPOS, EDWARD A.</td>
<td>BD2018-15313</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-9820 BERKSHIR</td>
<td>316.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>316.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201901-222</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>SAND FOR SANDBAGS</td>
<td>295.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,135.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11201</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>C-HARTER BUSINESS, - COMM</td>
<td>1028733020119</td>
<td>2/1/2019</td>
<td>FEB 2019 BUSINESS TV</td>
<td>68.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11202</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>CHOICE BUILDER</td>
<td>444395</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>MAR 2019 DENTAL-VISION PL</td>
<td>617.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>617.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11203</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>CVIC SOLUTIONS, INC</td>
<td>020819</td>
<td>2/8/2019</td>
<td>JAN 2019 PROF SERVICES</td>
<td>145,536.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>145,536.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11204</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>COASTAL BUSINESS GROUP</td>
<td>BD2018-16102</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-12085 LIMONITE</td>
<td>284.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>284.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11205</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>COLE EQUIPMENT, INC.</td>
<td>28239</td>
<td>1/23/2019</td>
<td>W/B TRENCHER-CITY HALL V</td>
<td>321.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>321.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11206</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, TLM,TLM</td>
<td>000000014490</td>
<td>1/11/2019</td>
<td>SLF - DEC 2018 COSTS</td>
<td>15,467.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,467.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11207</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>CROWN CASTLE</td>
<td>BD2017-14155</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4752 FELSPAR</td>
<td>390.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>629.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11208</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>DAVILA, LAUREN</td>
<td>BD2018-15799</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4752 FELSPAR</td>
<td>239.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>730.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2018-16071</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5947 CROWN D</td>
<td>730.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td>Check Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11209</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>02087</td>
<td>BD2017-14656</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-10334 48TH ST.</td>
<td>810.80</td>
<td>810.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0064</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>259.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0296</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>60.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-9140</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>43.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-35-433-98533</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>42.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-9033</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>36.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-35-433-9731</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>36.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-39-606-9478</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>SIGNAL LIGHT ELECTRIC CH1.</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-707-4222</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>29.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0510</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>26.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8365</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>26.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8514</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>25.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8571</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>25.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8308</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>25.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-914-7931</td>
<td>2/1/2019</td>
<td>LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>25.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8217</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>25.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8258</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>25.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8324</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>25.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-914-8079</td>
<td>2/1/2019</td>
<td>LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>25.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8951</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>24.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0403</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-983-2460</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-617-0027</td>
<td>2/1/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-534-6651</td>
<td>2/1/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8886</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-9793</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0692</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0486</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8662</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8696</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8720</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8829</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0585</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td>Check Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-38-506-3094</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>2,807.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11211</td>
<td>2/14/19</td>
<td>EDISON - SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>38-499-8614</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>4,573.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>38-499-7185</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>794.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33-840-4775</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>463.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-476-0477</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>CDF 14-002 STREET LIGHT E</td>
<td>382.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33-840-6655</td>
<td>2/7/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>251.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-500-0898</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>177.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41-364-0913</td>
<td>1/30/2019</td>
<td>LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>120.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-499-9512</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>101.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-500-2613</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>94.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-500-1462</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>86.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35-433-9637</td>
<td>2/8/2019</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>84.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-474-0402</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>CDF 2013-001 STREET LIGHT E</td>
<td>79.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-702-6715</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>70.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-778-4933</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>CDF14-001 STREET LIGHT EL</td>
<td>70.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41-364-0566</td>
<td>1/30/2019</td>
<td>LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>66.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39-859-7088</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>SIGNAL LIGHT ELECTRIC CH_1</td>
<td>66.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-499-9638</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>63.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41-364-1192</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>60.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-777-8042</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>58.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-721-2962</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>46.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41-364-0756</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>37.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-500-0626</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>31.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-500-1276</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LMD STL 5JV VARIOUS</td>
<td>31.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-500-2257</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LMD STL 15JV VARIOUS</td>
<td>31.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-500-2506</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>31.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-507-6613</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>26.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39-507-9736</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>PUMP STATION ELECTRIC</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-500-2852</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>23.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-901-7450</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>23.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39-935-7230</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>SIGNAL LIGHT ELECTRIC CH_1</td>
<td>23.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-499-7938</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-500-1078</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-500-3082</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-448-6672</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38-499-8381</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td>Check Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL ELECTRIC</td>
<td>6,782.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11213</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>02103 EXCLUSIVE DESIGNS</td>
<td>2-34-583-4541</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>CITY HALL ELECTRIC CHARGE</td>
<td>1,434.56</td>
<td>8,217.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-13204</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-6960 PEARL ST.</td>
<td>180.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11214</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>01348 FRONTIER HOMES</td>
<td>BD2016-9460</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-12532 BERYL W</td>
<td>134.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11215</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>02088 GALVEZ, JOSEPH</td>
<td>BD2018-15142</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5784 JENSEN R</td>
<td>462.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11216</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>02092 GARCIA, JESUS</td>
<td>BD2018-16761</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-7486 COTTON T.</td>
<td>326.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11217</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>01236 HD SUPPLY CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>500009610684</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>PW SUPPLIES - DOWNEY PAI</td>
<td>1,903.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td>500009663755</td>
<td>1/22/2019</td>
<td>CITY HALL SUPPLIES</td>
<td>641.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td>50000966405</td>
<td>1/22/2019</td>
<td>CITY HALL SUPPLIES</td>
<td>103.31</td>
<td>2,648.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11218</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>02100 HILL, RANDY</td>
<td>BD2018-15231</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5570 PTOLEMY</td>
<td>416.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11219</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>02095 JR INVESTMENTS LLC</td>
<td>BD2017-14639</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-8830-8920 LINO</td>
<td>199.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11220</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>00199 JURUPA COMMUNITY SERVICE</td>
<td>2019-00001016</td>
<td>1/15/2019</td>
<td>JAN 2019 GRAFFITI ABATEME</td>
<td>8,333.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,333.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11221</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>02098 KERR, DAVID</td>
<td>BD2018-16540</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-6741 HUNTSMA</td>
<td>255.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11222</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>02101 KOK, CHING CHEN</td>
<td>BD2013-3243</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-6623 CITRINE C</td>
<td>28.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11223</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>00718 LANDEROS, TONY</td>
<td>BD2017-14647</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11811 LANDON</td>
<td>273.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11224</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>02085 LOPEZ, ROBERTO</td>
<td>BD2018-16229</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4363 AGATE ST</td>
<td>1,971.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,971.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11225</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>00244 LOWE'S HIW, INC</td>
<td>98004720516</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>CITY HALL SUPPLIES</td>
<td>153.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11226</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>02090 LUNA, CHRIS</td>
<td>BD2018-15900</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5585 BAIN ST.</td>
<td>730.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11227</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>02106 MALDONADO, VICTOR</td>
<td>BD2018-17133</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-7130 ALMANCE</td>
<td>473.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td>Check Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11228</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>MEYER, LARRY</td>
<td>BD2018-16284</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11811 LANDON</td>
<td>775.40</td>
<td>775.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11229</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>MILLER, JAXON</td>
<td>BD2018-16530</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5946 Natchez</td>
<td>650.91</td>
<td>650.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11230</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>NEC FINANCIAL SERVICES</td>
<td>BD2018-16983</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11810 Sandeiri</td>
<td>473.18</td>
<td>473.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11231</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>PAP, KATHLENE</td>
<td>BD2018-16983</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11810 Sandeiri</td>
<td>473.18</td>
<td>473.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11232</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>PULTE HOMES</td>
<td>BD2018-1673</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11078 Duran D</td>
<td>175.14</td>
<td>175.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11584</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-1106 DANE DR</td>
<td>138.93</td>
<td>138.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11581</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11142 DANE DR</td>
<td>138.92</td>
<td>138.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11583</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11118 DANE DR</td>
<td>138.92</td>
<td>138.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11582</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11130 DANE DR</td>
<td>138.92</td>
<td>138.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11586</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11082 DANE DR</td>
<td>71.66</td>
<td>71.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11674</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11090 Duran D</td>
<td>35.45</td>
<td>35.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11675</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11102 Duran D</td>
<td>30.29</td>
<td>30.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-11587</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11070 DANE DR</td>
<td>30.29</td>
<td>30.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-10788</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-1143 Coral D</td>
<td>-12.89</td>
<td>885.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2018-15611</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11200 Little Di</td>
<td>1,710.34</td>
<td>1,710.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11233</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>REY, JAMES</td>
<td>BD2018-16513</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-6513 Smith Ave</td>
<td>236.64</td>
<td>236.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-13684</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11780 63rd St.</td>
<td>74.69</td>
<td>74.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11235</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>ROW CONSTRUCTION INC.</td>
<td>BD2018-15742</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-3477 30th St.</td>
<td>373.32</td>
<td>373.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2018-15741</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-7171 Sedona C</td>
<td>122.40</td>
<td>122.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11236</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>SMART LINK LLC</td>
<td>BD2018-16814</td>
<td>2/4/2019</td>
<td>PORTABLE RENTAL - Downe</td>
<td>911.50</td>
<td>911.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11237</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>SOUTHWEST SITE SERVICES</td>
<td>BD2018-17092</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-3177 Space CE</td>
<td>64.67</td>
<td>64.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11238</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>SPACE CENTER MIRA LOMA</td>
<td>BD2018-17092</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-3177 Space CE</td>
<td>25.91</td>
<td>25.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11239</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>SPS CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>BD2018-16737</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-4705 BrookHC</td>
<td>25.91</td>
<td>25.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td>Check Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11241</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>00103</td>
<td>TUFF SHED INC</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5470 VILLELAA\</td>
<td>232.76</td>
<td>232.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11242</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>01991</td>
<td>VACANT PROPERTY SECURITVPS93306</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>SECURITY EQUIPMENT REN\</td>
<td>183.18</td>
<td>317.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11243</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>01251</td>
<td>WEX BANK</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>SECURITY EQUIPMENT REN\</td>
<td>134.69</td>
<td>2,276.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VPS94442</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>JAN 2019 FUEL CARD</td>
<td>2,276.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub total for CHASE BANK: 336,190.18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Invoice</th>
<th>Inv Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
<th>Check Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11244</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>ALL AMERICAN ASPHALT</td>
<td>183362</td>
<td>12/31/2018</td>
<td>RIV DR PAVE REHAB PROJ-R</td>
<td>66,090.50</td>
<td>66,090.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>00450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11245</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>ALLIED TRAFFIC &amp; EQUIP REI72375</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>PW SUPPLIES-GUARD RAIL F</td>
<td>3,421.89</td>
<td>3,421.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>01237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>00557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11247</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>AMERICAN FORENSIC NURSE 71658</td>
<td>12/31/2018</td>
<td>12/31/2018</td>
<td>LAB WORK - SHERIFF'S DEP*</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>00240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11248</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>BIO-TOX LABORATORIES INC 37258</td>
<td>1/15/2019</td>
<td>1/15/2019</td>
<td>LAB WORK - SHERIFF'S DEP*</td>
<td>525.00</td>
<td>525.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>00233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>01546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11250</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>CHARTER BUSINESS, - COM10984993029019</td>
<td>2/9/2019</td>
<td>2/9/2019</td>
<td>FEB 2019 PHONE &amp; INTERNE</td>
<td>1,404.28</td>
<td>1,404.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>00014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>01383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11252</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>DIGITAL MAP PRODUCTS, INC 35724-IN</td>
<td>10/1/2018</td>
<td>10/1/2018</td>
<td>10/18-9/30/19 GOVCLARITY</td>
<td>36,750.00</td>
<td>36,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>00469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11253</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>ENTERPRISE HOLDING, INC. 20033548</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>CAR RENTAL PAYMENT - JAN</td>
<td>1,879.08</td>
<td>1,879.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>01962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11254</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>EFIC LAND SOLUTIONS, INC. 1218-0634</td>
<td>1/8/2019</td>
<td>1/8/2019</td>
<td>JV LIMONITE AVE PROJECT -</td>
<td>908.75</td>
<td>908.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>02010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11255</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>FAIR HOUSING CNCL OF RIV 6020419</td>
<td>2/4/2019</td>
<td>2/4/2019</td>
<td>FAIR HOUSING &amp; LANDLORD.</td>
<td>1,882.77</td>
<td>1,882.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>01278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11256</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>FASTENAL COMPANY CAJUR 30725</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>PW SUPPLIES</td>
<td>624.75</td>
<td>624.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>CAJUR 30412</td>
<td>1/21/2019</td>
<td>PW SUPPLIES</td>
<td>163.34</td>
<td>163.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAJUR 30542</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>PW SUPPLIES</td>
<td>125.82</td>
<td>125.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAJUR 30641</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>PW SUPPLIES</td>
<td>61.55</td>
<td>61.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAJUR 30719</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>PW SUPPLIES</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11257</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>HCI ENVIRONMENTAL &amp; ENG 27922</td>
<td>1/17/2019</td>
<td>1/17/2019</td>
<td>BIO HAZARD CLEAN UP</td>
<td>2,606.95</td>
<td>2,606.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>00664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>01038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td>Check Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11259</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>JURUPA COMMUNITY SERVICE</td>
<td>25472-003</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>JCSD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>232.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23875-003</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>JCSD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>222.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23828-003</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>JCSD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>207.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23829-003</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>JCSD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>207.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23343-002</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>JCSD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>133.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28035-003</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>9801 FAIRFOR (IRR)</td>
<td>69.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23342-003</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>JCSD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>67.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21933-002</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>JCSD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>64.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40163-003</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>IRR WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>64.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11260</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>12719488</td>
<td>11/30/2018</td>
<td>NOV 2018 LIMONITE TS MOD</td>
<td>2,900.00</td>
<td>1,269.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12946265</td>
<td>12/31/2018</td>
<td>DEC 2018 LIMONITE TS MOD</td>
<td>2,135.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11261</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>MCE CORPORATION</td>
<td>1901007</td>
<td>2/1/2019</td>
<td>JAN 2019 STREET &amp; ROW MA</td>
<td>51,789.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1901040</td>
<td>2/11/2019</td>
<td>JAN 2018 ADD SVCS-ROAD</td>
<td>1,823.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11262</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>MOBILE MODULAR STORAGE</td>
<td>1871528</td>
<td>6/2/2019</td>
<td>#66696 &amp; 68857 RENTAL 2/6/1</td>
<td>211.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1867034</td>
<td>6/2/2019</td>
<td>#64948 RENTAL 2/1/19-3/2/19</td>
<td>112.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11263</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>OFFICE DEPOT, INC</td>
<td>269970719001</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>488.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>271237635001</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>430.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>270965692001</td>
<td>2/7/2019</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>218.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>269037645001</td>
<td>2/4/2019</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>99.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>271254849001</td>
<td>2/7/2019</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>69.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>268519902001</td>
<td>2/1/2019</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>59.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>271254850001</td>
<td>2/7/2019</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>50.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>270246511001</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>49.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>270248388001</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11264</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>ORTIZ, ROGELIO</td>
<td>19049</td>
<td>1/28/2019</td>
<td>BUSINESS CARDS</td>
<td>387.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19051</td>
<td>1/28/2019</td>
<td>BUSINESS CARDS</td>
<td>129.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19050</td>
<td>1/28/2019</td>
<td>BUSINESS CARDS</td>
<td>64.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19059</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>BUSINESS CARDS</td>
<td>64.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11265</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>PSOMAS</td>
<td>148181</td>
<td>1/16/2019</td>
<td>11/23-12/27/18 LIMONITE WID</td>
<td>740.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>740.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td>Check Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11266</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>RUBIDOUX COMMUNITY SVC:1500000000</td>
<td>1505810000</td>
<td>2/10/2019</td>
<td>RCSD LLMD WATER CHARGE</td>
<td>785.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1505800000</td>
<td>2/10/2019</td>
<td>RCSD LLMD WATER CHARGE</td>
<td>611.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1505820000</td>
<td>2/10/2019</td>
<td>RCSD LLMD WATER CHARGE</td>
<td>267.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1506210000</td>
<td>2/10/2019</td>
<td>RCSD LLMD WATER CHARGE</td>
<td>125.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15012980-01</td>
<td>2/10/2019</td>
<td>RCSD LLMD WATER CHARGE</td>
<td>82.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1502671000</td>
<td>2/10/2019</td>
<td>RCSD LLMD WATER CHARGE</td>
<td>79.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1505840000</td>
<td>2/10/2019</td>
<td>RCSD LLMD WATER CHARGE</td>
<td>69.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>352384</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>JAN 2019 CITY HALL MAINTEN</td>
<td>2,994.39</td>
<td>2,994.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11268</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>STATE OF CALIFORNIA DOJ, [352356</td>
<td>352384</td>
<td>1/8/2019</td>
<td>LAB WORK - SHERIFF'S DEPT</td>
<td>245.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>352384</td>
<td>1/8/2019</td>
<td>LAB WORK - SHERIFF'S DEPT</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11269</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>SUPERIOR PAVEMENT MARKI10814</td>
<td>10814</td>
<td>1/9/2019</td>
<td>LIMONITE &amp; MISSION SIGNIN</td>
<td>7,443.25</td>
<td>7,443.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10814</td>
<td>1/9/2019</td>
<td>LIMONITE &amp; MISSION SIGNIN</td>
<td>7,443.25</td>
<td>7,443.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11270</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>VAVRINEK, TRINE, DAY &amp; CO., VT19850</td>
<td>19850</td>
<td>1/29/2019</td>
<td>AUDITING SERVICES</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19850</td>
<td>1/29/2019</td>
<td>AUDITING SERVICES</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11271</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>WEST COAST ARBORISTS, IN144640</td>
<td>144640</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>JAN 2019 TREE MAINT</td>
<td>9,602.00</td>
<td>9,602.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>144640</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>JAN 2019 TREE MAINT</td>
<td>9,602.00</td>
<td>9,602.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11272</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>XCS DOCUMENT MGMT SOLLO50282</td>
<td>50282</td>
<td>1/25/2019</td>
<td>12/11/18-11/19 COPY COSTS</td>
<td>1,555.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50282</td>
<td>1/25/2019</td>
<td>12/11/18-11/19 COPY COSTS</td>
<td>942.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50281</td>
<td>1/25/2019</td>
<td>12/11/18-11/19 COPY COSTS</td>
<td>516.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub total for CHASE BANK: 489,273.29
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 7, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER

BY: VICTORIA WASKO, CMC, CITY CLERK

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 13.C

AMENDMENT TO THE WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (WRCOG) JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT TO MAKE A SERIES OF TECHNICAL CHANGES

RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council authorize the Mayor to execute the Amendment to the Joint Powers Agreement of the Western Riverside Council of Governments to authorize a Series of Technical Changes.

BACKGROUND

Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) has approached the City and expressed their desire to amend the current Joint Powers Agreement. The Amendment includes various updates that were made based on direction by the Administration & Finance Committee. Most of the changes are mostly minor in nature based on staff and legal counsel review.

At their November 5, 2018 meeting, the Western Riverside Council of Governments Executive Committee adopted WRCOG Resolution No. 43-18 amending its Bylaws to make a Series of Technical Changes.

ANALYSIS

WRCOG is governed by a General Assembly with membership consisting of the appropriate representatives from the County of Riverside, each city which is a signatory to the Joint Powers Agreement, the Western Municipal Water District, the Eastern Municipal Water District, and Morongo Band of Mission Indians.

To facilitate review WRCOG staff has identified noteworthy changes to the JPA and Bylaws which are attached to this staff report.
In order to ratify the above-referenced changes, each representative must approve the Amendment to the Joint Powers Agreement.

The Amendment is to become effective upon execution by not less than two-thirds of all the parties that are currently signatories to the JPA.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

There is no fiscal impact.

**ALTERNATIVES**

1. Decline to approve the Amendment to the Joint Powers Agreement of the Western Riverside Council of Governments.

Prepared by:

Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk

Reviewed by:

Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Submitted by:

Gary S. Thompson
City Manager

Reviewed by:

Peter M. Thorson
City Attorney

**Attachments:**

1. WRCOG - Executive Committee Staff Report dated November 5, 2018
Western Riverside Council of Governments
Executive Committee

Staff Report

Subject: Update to WRCOG JPA and Bylaws

Contact: Christopher Gray, Director of Transportation, cgray@wrcog.us, (951) 405-6710

Date: November 5, 2018

The purpose of this item is to present an updated version of the WRCOG Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) and Bylaws. These updates were made based on direction at a previous Administration & Finance Committee meeting to prepare this comprehensive update, and incorporates a variety of changes, mostly minor in nature, based on staff and legal counsel review.

Requested Actions:

1. Adopt WRCOG Resolution Number 43-18; A Resolution of the Executive Committee of the Western Riverside Council of Governments Amending its Bylaws Making a Series of Technical Changes.
2. Direct WRCOG to forward the JPA Amendment to WRCOG member agencies for their approval.

Earlier in 2018, WRCOG was asked by several members of the Executive Committee to research and recommend potential options related to the appointment of alternates for the Board of Supervisors. This topic was discussed at the April 11th and June 13th Administration & Finance Committee meetings. During the course of these discussions, the issue of a larger update to the WRCOG JPA and Bylaws was also discussed. It was determined that it would be appropriate to conduct a comprehensive review of both documents as a significant period of time had lapsed (over five years) since the last comprehensive update of these documents.

The items for consideration today are the result of a comprehensive review of both documents by staff and legal counsel. While numerous changes are recommended, many of these changes reflect minor word changes and/or corrections, or address other minor issues. Red-line versions of both documents are attached to this staff report as a reference.

To facilitate review, staff has identified noteworthy changes to the JPA and Bylaws which are discussed below.

Joint Powers Agreement Changes

1. Sections 2.12, 3.1 and 4.5 of the Agreement updates the JPA to formally recognize that the Treasurer / Auditor of WRCOG is a WRCOG employee appointed pursuant to Section 6505.6 of the Government Code. The language in the current agreement includes outdated language referencing the County Treasurer.
2. Section 2.12 formally adds the position of a Second Vice-Chair to the JPA. Currently the Second Vice-Chair is only listed in the Bylaws.
3. Section 2.4 of the Agreement rewords the language establishing the membership of the General Assembly and Executive Committee to more clearly set forth the voting membership of each Committee. The changes do not impact the current process used by WRCOG. Pursuant to the direction of the Administration & Finance Committee, the process for appointing Executive Committee alternates for the Board of Supervisors has not been revised.
4. Section 2.15 clarifies the bond requirements for WRCOG Committee members.
5. Section 2.13 clarifies that the attendance of Executive Committee members at a standing meeting is subject to the Brown Act.

**Bylaws Changes**

1. Article I expressly clarifies the relationship between the JPA and Bylaws.
2. Article II, Section 2.F specifically empowers the Chair to create and appoint ad hoc committees and members in accordance with WRCOG’s standard practices.
3. Article III, Section 5, Article IV, Section 1.D, and Article IV, Section 2.D, adds language making the Bylaws consistent with the JPA in respect to which agencies can vote on TUMF matters.

Staff also wants to highlight areas where changes were not made to either documents. At previous meetings of the Administration & Finance Committee, there have been extended discussions regarding member representation of the Executive Committee.

The first issue concerns the topic of alternates for the Riverside County Board of Supervisors. Staff previously presented several options for consideration and discussion. Specific direction was provided at the June 13, 2018, meeting to not implement any changes and to maintain the current process for alternates for the Board of Supervisors.

The second issue relates to appointments by member cities to the Executive Committee. Staff and legal counsel also reviewed the overall language in the Bylaws related to the appointment of members to the Executive Committee, which currently states:

“The Executive Committee will be composed of the Mayor from each of the member cities, four members of the Riverside County Board of Supervisors, the President of each water district, and the Tribal Chairman of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians. Any City Council, at its discretion, can appoint a Mayor Pro Tem or other City Council member in place of the Mayor. Each water district Board, at its discretion, can appoint another Board member in place of the President. The Tribal Council of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians, at its discretion, can appoint another Tribal Council member in place of the Tribal Chairman.”

The Administration & Finance Committee centered discussions on whether this section created a potential conflict by noting that the Mayor from any member City was the member of the Executive Committee and then noting that the City Council could appoint a representative in place of the Mayor. Staff and legal counsel reviewed this section and determined that the language seems to clearly note that each City shall have the discretion to establish a process to appoint its own representatives to the Executive Committee. Therefore, no changes were made to the Bylaws related to this item.

**Implementation**

Approval of the Bylaws requires action by the Executive Committee. Once approved, the Bylaws changes take effect immediately. The updated Bylaws will also be brought forward for approval by the WRCOG General Assembly in 2019; however, this approval is a formality as the changes become effective once the Executive Committee acts on them.

The process to approve the updated JPA is more involved. As with the Bylaws, formal action of the Executive Committee is first required. The updated JPA must then be approved by 2/3 of WRCOG member agencies to take effect. Once 2/3 of WRCOG member agencies have approved these changes, the changes become effective. If directed to do so by the Executive Committee, staff will work with each member agency to secure their approval of the updated JPA.
Prior Actions:

October 10, 2018: The Administration & Finance Committee recommended that the Executive Committee 1) approve the updated Bylaws; 2) approve the updated JPA; and 3) direct WRCOG to forward the updated JPA to WRCOG member agencies for their approval.

June 13, 2018: The Administration & Finance Committee directed staff to prepare a comprehensive review of the JPA and Bylaws.

April 11, 2018: The Administration & Finance Committee directed staff to return with options for future consideration and discussion regarding an alternate policy.

Fiscal Impact:

This item is for informational purposes only; therefore, there is no fiscal impact.

Attachments:

2. Bylaws for the Western Riverside Council of Governments.
3. WRCOG Resolution Number 43-18; A Resolution of the Executive Committee of the Western Riverside Council of Governments Amending the WRCOG Bylaws.
Item 5.C
Update to WRCOG JPA and Bylaws

Attachment 1
Redlined Joint Powers Agreement of the Western Riverside Council of Governments
JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT OF
THE WESTERN RIVERSIDE
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

This Agreement is made and entered into on the 1st day of April, 1991, pursuant

R E C I T A L S

A. Each member and party to this Agreement is a governmental entity

B. The purpose of the formation is to provide an agency to conduct studies

C. When authorized pursuant to an Implementation Agreement, the Council

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises and covenants

herin contained, the parties hereto agree as follows:
I. PURPOSE AND POWERS

1.1 Agency Created.

There is hereby created a public entity to be known as the "Western Riverside Council of Governments" ("WRCOG" or "the Council"). WRCOG is formed by this Agreement pursuant to the provision of Government Code Section 6500 et. seq. and other pertinent provision of law. WRCOG shall be a public entity separate from the parties hereto.

1.2 Powers.

1.2.1. WRCOG established hereunder shall perform all necessary functions to fulfill the purposes of this Agreement. Among other functions, WRCOG shall:

a. Serve as a forum for consideration, study and recommendation on area-wide and regional problems;

b. Assemble information helpful in the consideration of problems peculiar to Western Riverside County;

c. Explore practical avenues for intergovernmental cooperation, coordination and action in the interest of local public welfare and means of improvements in the administration of governmental services; and

d. Serve as the clearinghouse review body for Federally-funded projects in accordance with Circular A-95 in conjunction with the Southern California Association of Governments.
1.2.2. The Council shall have the power in its own name to do any of the following:

a. When necessary for the day to day operation of the Council, to make and enter into contracts;

b. To contract for the services of engineers, attorneys, planners, financial consultants and separate and apart therefrom to employ such other persons, as it deems necessary;

c. To apply for an appropriate grant or grants under any federal, state, or local programs.

d. To receive gifts, contributions and donations of property, funds, services and other forms of financial assistance from persons, firms, corporations and any governmental entity;

e. To lease, acquire, construct, manage, maintain, and operate any buildings, works, or improvements;

f. To delegate some or all of its powers to the Executive Committee and the Executive Director of the Council as hereinafter provided.

1.2.3 The association shall have the power in its own name, only with the approval of all affected member agencies to:

a. Acquire, hold and dispose of property by eminent domain, lease, lease purchase or sale.

b. To incur debts, liabilities, obligations, and issue bonds;

II. ORGANIZATION OF COUNCIL
2.1 **Parties.**

The parties to WRCOG shall be the County of Riverside and each city located within Western Riverside County which has executed or hereafter executes this Agreement, or any addenda, amendment, or supplement and agrees to become a member upon such terms and conditions as established by the General Assembly or Executive Committee, and which has not, pursuant to provisions hereof, withdrawn (the “Member Agencies”). Only the parties identified in this section and Associate Members approved under section 8.2 of this Agreement, if any, shall be considered contracting parties to this Agreement under Government Code section 6502, provided that the rights of any Associate Member under this Agreement shall be limited solely those rights expressly set forth in a PACE Agreement authorized in section 8.2 of this Agreement.

2.2 **Names.**

The names, particular capacities and addresses of the parties at any time shall be shown on Exhibit "A" attached hereto, as amended or supplemented from time to time by the Executive Director. If the Executive Director amends or supplements Exhibit “A”, a copy of the revised Exhibit “A” shall be provided to the members.

2.3 **Duties.**

WRCOG shall do whatever is necessary and required to carry out the purposes of this Agreement and when authorized by an Implementation Agreement pursuant to section 1.2.3 as appropriate, to make and enter into such contracts, incur such debts and obligations, assess contributions from the members, and perform such other acts as are necessary to the accomplishment of the purposes of such agreement,
within the provisions of Government Code Section 6500 et seq. and as prescribed by the laws of the State of California.

2.4 Governing Body.

2.4.1. WRCOG shall be governed by a General Assembly with membership consisting of the appropriate representatives from the County of Riverside, each city which is a signatory to this Agreement, the Western Municipal Water District, the Eastern Municipal Water District, and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians ("Morongo"), the number of which shall be determined as hereinafter set forth. The (collectively, the “General Assembly shall meet at least once annually, preferably scheduled in the evening. Each Member Agencies”). Each General Assembly Member Agency of the General Assembly shall have one vote for each mayor, council member, county supervisor, water district board member, and tribal council member present at the General Assembly. The General Assembly shall act only upon a majority of a quorum. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the total authorized representatives, provided that members representing voting representatives of a majority of the General Assembly Member Agencies are present. The General Assembly shall adopt and amend by-laws for the administration and management of this Agreement, which when adopted and approved shall be an integral part of this Agreement. Such by-laws may provide for the management and administration of this Agreement. The General Assembly shall meet at least once annually, preferably scheduled in the evening.

2.4.2. There shall be an Executive Committee which exercises the powers of this Agreement between sessions of the General Assembly. Members of the Executive Committee shall be the Mayor from each of the member cities, four members
of the Riverside County Board of Supervisors, the President of each Water District, and the Tribal Chairman of Morongo; (the remaining member of the Board of Supervisors shall serve as an alternate, except any “Executive Committee Members”). Each City Council, at its discretion, can appoint its Mayor Pro Tem or other City Council member in place of the Mayor. Each water district board, at its discretion, can appoint another Board member in place of the President. The Tribal Council of Morongo, at its discretion, can appoint another Tribal Council member in place of the Tribal Chairman. The Executive Committee shall act only upon a majority of a quorum. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the member agencies’ Executive Committee Members. Membership of Morongo on the General Assembly and Executive Committee of WRCOG shall be conditioned on Morongo entering into a separate Memorandum of Understanding with WRCOG.

2.4.3. Each member of the General Assembly and the Executive Committee shall be a current member of the legislative body such member represents.

2.4.4. Each participating member on the Executive Committee Member shall also have an alternate, who must also be a current member of the legislative body of the party such alternate represents. The remaining member of the Board of Supervisors shall serve as an alternate for the Board of Supervisors. The name of the alternate members shall be on file with the Executive Committee. In the absence of the regular member from an agency, the alternate member from such agency shall assume all rights and duties of the absent regular member.

2.5 Executive Director.
The Executive Director shall be the chief administrative officer of the Council. He shall receive such compensation as may be fixed by the Executive Committee. The powers and duties of the Executive Director shall be subject to the authority of the Executive Committee and include the following:

a. To appoint, direct and remove employees of the Council.

b. Annually to prepare and present a proposed budget to the Executive Committee and General Assembly.

c. Serve as Secretary of the Council General Assembly and of the Executive Committee.

d. To attend meetings of the General Assembly and Executive Committee.

e. To perform such other and additional duties as the Executive Committee may require.

2.6 Principal Office.

The principal office of WRCOG shall be established by the Executive Committee and shall be located within Western Riverside County. The Executive Committee is hereby granted full power and authority to change said principal office from one location to another within Western Riverside County. Any change shall be noted by the Secretary under this section but shall not be considered an amendment to this Agreement.

2.7 Meetings.

The Executive Committee shall meet at the principal office of the agency or at such other place as may be designated by the Executive Committee. The time and place of regular meetings of the Executive Committee shall be determined by
resolution adopted by the Executive Committee; a copy of such resolution shall be furnished to each party hereto. Regular, adjourned and special meetings shall be called and conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act, Government Code Section 54950 et. seq., as it may be amended.

2.8 Powers and Limitations of the Executive Committee.

Unless otherwise provided herein, each Member or participating alternate of the Executive Committee shall be entitled to one vote, and a vote of the majority of those present and qualified to vote constituting a quorum may adopt any motion, resolution, or order and take any other action they deem appropriate to carry forward the objectives of the Council.

2.9 Minutes.

The secretary of the Council shall cause to be kept minutes of regular adjourned regular and special meetings of the General Assembly and Executive Committee, and shall cause a copy of the minutes to be forwarded to each member

and

to each of the members hereto.

2.10 Rules.

The Executive Committee may adopt from time to time such rules and regulations for the conduct of its affairs consistent with this Agreement or any Implementation Agreement.

2.11 Vote or Assent of Members.

The vote, assent or approval of the members in any manner as may be required, hereunder shall be evidenced by a certified copy of the action of the governing
body of such party filed with the Council. It shall be the responsibility of the Executive Director to obtain certified copies of said actions.

### 2.12 Officers.

There shall be selected from the membership of the Executive Committee, a chairperson, a vice chairperson and a second vice chairperson. The Executive Director shall be the secretary. The Treasurer of the County of Riverside shall be the Treasurer of the Council and the Controller or Auditor of the County of Riverside shall be the Auditor of the Council. Such persons and the Auditor shall be appointed by the Executive Director and must be officers or employees of WRCOG. The Executive Director may appoint a single officer or employee of WRCOG to serve in both the Treasurer and Auditor positions. Such person(s) shall possess the powers of, and shall perform the treasurer and auditor functions respectively, for WRCOG and perform those functions required of them by Government Code Sections 6505, 6505.5 and 6505.6, and by all other applicable laws and regulations, including any subsequent amendments thereto.

The chairperson, vice chairperson, and second vice chairperson shall hold office for a period of one year commencing July 1st of each and every fiscal year; provided, however, the first chairperson and vice chairperson appointed shall hold office from the date of appointment to June 30th of the ensuing fiscal year at the close of the General Assembly meeting of their election, and ending one year thereafter, or until his or her successor is elected. Except for the Executive Director, any officer, employee, or agent of the Executive Committee may also be an officer, employee, or agent of any of
the members. The appointment by the Executive Committee of such a person shall be evidence that the two positions are compatible.

2.13 Committees.

The Executive Committee may, as it deems appropriate, appoint establish committees to accomplish the purposes set forth herein. All standing committee meetings of WRCOG, including those of the Executive Committee, shall be open to all Executive Committee Members, in accordance with the Brown Act.

2.14 Additional Officers and Employees.

The Executive Committee shall have the power to authorize such additional officers and employees as may be appropriate. Such officers and employees may also be, but are not required to be, officers and employees of the individual members.

2.15 Bonding Requirement.

The officers or persons who have charge of, handle, or have access to any property of WRCOG shall be the members of the Executive Committee, the Treasurer, the Executive Director, and any other officers or persons to be designated or empowered by the Executive Committee. Each such officer or person shall be required to file an official bond with the Executive Committee in an amount which shall be established by the Executive Committee. Should the existing bond or bonds of any such officer be extended to cover the obligations provided herein, said bond shall be the official bond required herein. The premiums on any such bonds attributable to the coverage required herein shall be appropriate expenses of WRCOG.

2.16 Status of Officers and Employees.
All of the privileges and immunities from liability, exemption from laws, ordinances and rules, all pension, relief, disability, worker's compensation, and other benefits which apply to the activity of officers, agents, or employees of any of the members when performing their respective functions shall apply to them to the same degree and extent while engaged in the performance of any of the functions and other duties under this Agreement. None of the officers, agents, or employees appointed by the Executive Committee shall be deemed, by reason of their employment by the Executive Committee, to be employed by any of the members or, by reason of their employment by the Executive Committee, to be subject to any of the requirements of such members.

2.17 Restrictions.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 6509, for the purposes of determining the restrictions to be imposed by the Council in its exercise of the above-described joint powers, reference shall be made to, and the Council shall observe, the restrictions imposed by state law upon the County of Riverside.

2.18 TUMF Matters – Water Districts and Morongo.

Pursuant to this Joint Powers Agreement, WRCOG administers the Transportation Mitigation Fee (“TUMF”) for cities in Western Riverside County. The fee was established prior to the Water District's and Morongo's involvement with WRCOG and will fund transportation improvements for the benefit of the County of Riverside and the cities in Western Riverside County. As such, the Western Municipal Water District, the Eastern Municipal Water District, and Morongo General Assembly and Executive
Committee Members shall not vote on any matter related to the administration of the TUMF program or the expenditure of TUMF revenues.

III

FUNDS AND PROPERTY

3.1 Treasurer.

The Treasury of the member agency whose Treasurer is the Treasurer for WRCOG shall be the depository for WRCOG. The Treasurer of the Council shall have custody of all funds and shall provide for strict accountability thereof in accordance with Government Code Section 6505.5 and other applicable laws of the State of California. He or she shall perform all of the duties required in Government Code Section 6505 et. seq., and following,—such other duties as may be prescribed by the Executive Committee.

3.2 Expenditure of Funds.

The funds under this Agreement shall be expended only in furtherance of the purposes hereof and in accordance with the laws of the State of California and standard accounting practices shall be used to account for all funds received and disbursed.

3.3 Fiscal Year.

WRCOG shall be operated on a fiscal year basis, beginning on July 1 of each year and continuing until June 30 of the succeeding year. Prior to July 1 of each year, the General Assembly shall adopt a final budget for the expenditures of WRCOG during the following fiscal Year.

3.4 Contributions/Public Funds.
In preparing the budget, the General Assembly by majority vote of a quorum shall determine the amount of funds which will be required from its members for the purposes of this Agreement. The funds required from its members after approval of the final budget shall be raised by contributions 50% of which will be assessed on a per capita basis and 50% on an assessed valuation basis, each city paying on the basis of its population and assessed valuation and the County paying on the basis of the population and assessed valuation within the unincorporated area of Western Riverside County as defined in the by-laws. The parties, when informed of their respective contributions, shall pay the same before August 1st of the fiscal year for which they are assessed or within sixty days of being informed of the assessment, whichever occurs later. In addition to the contributions provided, advances of public funds from the parties may be made for the purposes of this Agreement. When such advances are made, they shall be repaid from the first available funds of WRCOG.

The General Assembly shall have the power to determine that personnel, equipment or property of one or more of the parties to the Agreement may be used in lieu of fund contributions or advances.

All contributions and funds shall be paid to WRCOG and shall be disbursed by a majority vote of a quorum of the Executive Committee, as authorized by the approved budget.

3.5 Contributions from Water Districts and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians.

The provision of section 3.4 above shall be inapplicable to the Western Municipal Water District, the Eastern Municipal Water District, and Morongo. The amount of
contributions from these water districts and Morongo shall be through the WRCOG budget process.

IV

BUDGETS AND DISBURSEMENTS

4.1 Annual Budget.

The Executive Committee may at any time amend the budget to incorporate additional income and disbursements that might become available to WRCOG for its purposes during a fiscal year.

4.2 Disbursements.

The Executive Director shall request warrants from the Auditor in accordance with budgets approved by the General Assembly or Executive Committee subject to quarterly review by the Executive Committee. The Treasurer shall pay such claims or disbursements and such requisitions for payment in accordance with rules, regulations, policies, procedures and bylaws adopted by the Executive Committee.

4.3 Accounts.

All funds will be placed in appropriate accounts and the receipt, transfer, or disbursement of such funds during the term of this Agreement shall be accounted for in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles applicable to governmental entities and pursuant to Government Code Sections 6505 et seq. and any other applicable laws of the State of California. There shall be strict accountability of all funds. All revenues and expenditures shall be reported to the Executive Committee.

4.4 Expenditures Within Approved Annual Budget.
All expenditures shall be made within the approved annual budget. No expenditures in excess of those budgeted shall be made without the approval of a majority of a quorum of the Executive Committee.

4.5 Audit.

The records and accounts of WRCOG shall be audited annually by Auditor shall make or contract with an independent certified public accountant or public accountant to make an annual audit of WRCOG’s accounts and records, and copies of such audit report shall be filed with the County Auditor, State Controller and each party to WRCOG no later than fifteen (15) days after receipt of said audit by the Executive Committee. The Auditor shall perform those functions required of him or her by Government Code Sections 6505, 6505.5 and 6505.6, and by all other applicable laws and regulations, including any subsequent amendments thereto.

4.6 Reimbursement of Funds.

Grant funds received by WRCOG from any federal, state, or local agency to pay for budgeted expenditures for which WRCOG has received all or a portion of said funds from the parties hereto shall be used as determined by WRCOG's Executive Committee.

V

LIABILITIES

5.1 Liabilities.

The debts, liabilities, and obligation of WRCOG shall be the debts, liabilities, or obligations of WRCOG alone and not of the parties to this Agreement.

5.2 Hold Harmless and Indemnity.
Each party hereto agrees to indemnify and hold the other parties harmless from all liability for damage, actual or alleged, to persons or property arising out of or resulting from negligent acts or omissions of the indemnifying party or its employees. Where the General Assembly or Executive Committee itself or its agents or employees are held liable for injuries to persons or property, each party's liability for contribution or indemnity for such injuries shall be based proportionately upon the contributions (less voluntary contributions) of each member. In the event of liability imposed upon any of the parties to this Agreement, or upon the General Assembly or Executive Committee created by this Agreement, for injury which is caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any of the parties in the performance of this Agreement, the contribution of the party or parties not directly responsible for the negligent or wrongful act or omission shall be limited to One Hundred Dollars ($100.00). The party or parties directly responsible for the negligent or wrongful acts or omissions shall indemnify, defend, and hold all other parties harmless from any liability for personal injury or property damage arising out of the performance of this Agreement. The voting for or against a matter being considered by the General Assembly or executive or other committee or WRCOG, or abstention from voting on such matter, shall not be construed to constitute a wrongful act or omission within the meaning of this Subsection.

VI

ADMISSION AND WITHDRAWAL OF PARTIES

6.1 Admission of New Parties.

It is recognized that additional cities other than the original parties, may wish to participate in WRCOG. Any Western Riverside County city may become a party
to WRCOG upon such terms and conditions as established by the General Assembly or Executive Committee. Any Western Riverside County city shall become a party to WRCOG by the adoption by the city council of this Agreement and the execution of a written addendum thereto agreeing to the terms of this Agreement and agreeing to any additional terms and conditions that may be established by the General Assembly or Executive Committee. Special districts which are significantly involved in regional problems and the boundaries of which include territory within the collective area of the membership shall be eligible for advisory membership in the Council by the execution of a separate MOU setting forth the terms of such participation. The representative of any such advisory member may participate in the work of committees of the Council.

6.2 Withdrawal from WRCOG.

It is fully anticipated that each party hereto shall participate in WRCOG until the purposes set forth in this Agreement are accomplished. The withdrawal of any party, either voluntary or involuntary, unless otherwise provided by the General Assembly or Executive Committee, shall be conditioned as follows:

a. In the case of a voluntary withdrawal following a properly noticed public hearing, written notice shall be given to WRCOG, six months prior to the effective date of withdrawal;

b. Withdrawal shall not relieve the party of its proportionate share of any debts or other liabilities incurred by WRCOG prior to the effective date of the party’s notice of withdrawal;
c. Unless otherwise provided by a unanimous vote of the Executive Committee, withdrawal shall result in the forfeiture of that party's rights and claims relating to distribution of property and funds upon termination of WRCOG as set forth in Section VII below;

d. Withdrawal from any Implementation Agreement shall not be deemed withdrawal from membership in WRCOG.

VII

TERMINATION AND DISPOSITION OF ASSETS

7.1 Termination of this Agreement.

WRCOG shall continue to exercise the joint powers herein until the termination of this Agreement and any extension thereof or until the parties shall have mutually rescinded this Agreement; providing, however, that WRCOG and this Agreement shall continue to exist for the purposes of disposing of all claims, distribution of assets and all other functions necessary to conclude the affairs of WRCOG.

Termination shall be accomplished by written consent of all of the parties, or shall occur upon the withdrawal from WRCOG of a sufficient number of the agencies enumerated herein so as to leave less than five of the enumerated agencies remaining in WRCOG.

7.2 Distribution of Property and Funds.

In the event of the termination of this Agreement, any property interest remaining in WRCOG following the discharge of all obligations shall be disposed of as the Executive Committee shall determine with the objective of distributing to each
remaining party a proportionate return on the contributions made to such properties by such parties, less previous returns, if any.

VIII

PACE IMPLEMENTATION AND PARTICIPATION AGREEMENTS; ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP

8.1 Execution of Agreement.

When authorized by the Executive Committee, any affected member agency or agencies enumerated herein, may execute an Implementation Agreement for the purpose of authorizing WRCOG to implement, manage and administer area-wide and regional programs in the interest of the local public welfare. The costs incurred by WRCOG in implementing a program including indirect costs, shall be assessed only to those public agencies who are parties to that Implementation Agreement.

8.2 PACE Agreements; Associate Membership.

WRCOG shall be empowered to establish and operate one or more Property Assessed Clean Energy ("PACE") programs pursuant to Chapter 29 of the Improvement Bond Act of 1911, being Division 7 of the California Streets and Highways Code, and to enter into one or more agreements, including without limitation, participation agreements, implementation agreements and joint powers agreements and amendments thereto to fulfill such programs both within and outside the jurisdictional boundaries of WRCOG.

WRCOG, acting through its Executive Committee, shall be empowered to establish an “Associate Member” status that provides membership in WRCOG to local jurisdictions that are outside WRCOG’s jurisdictional boundaries but within whose
boundaries a PACE program will be established and implemented by WRCOG. Said local jurisdictions shall become Associate Members of WRCOG by adopting one or more agreements (the “PACE Agreement”) on the terms and conditions established by the Executive Committee and consistent with the requirements of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act, being 5 of Division 7, Title 1 of the California Government Code (Sections 6500 et seq.). The rights of Associate Members shall be limited solely to those terms and conditions expressly set forth in the PACE Agreement for the purposes of implementing the PACE program within their jurisdictional boundaries. Except as expressly provided for by the PACE Agreement, Associate Members shall not have any rights otherwise granted to WRCOG’s members by this Agreement, including but not limited to the right to vote, right to amend this Agreement, and right to sit on committees or boards established under this Agreement or by action of the Executive Committee or the General Assembly, including, without limitation, the General Assembly and the Executive Committee.

IX

MISCELLANEOUS

9.1 Amendments.

This Agreement may be amended with the approval of not less than two-thirds (2/3) of all member agencies.
9.2 Notice.

Any notice or instrument required to be given or delivered by depositing the same in any United States Post Office, registered or certified, postage prepaid, addressed to the addresses of the parties as shown on Exhibit "A", shall be deemed to have been received by the party to whom the same is addressed at the expiration of seventy-two (72) hours after deposit of the same in the United States Post Office for transmission by registered or certified mail as aforesaid.

9.3 Effective Date.

This Agreement shall be effective and WRCOG shall exist from and after such date as this Agreement has been executed by any seven or more of the public agencies, including the County of Riverside, as listed on page 1 hereof.
9.4 **Arbitration.**

Any controversy or claim between any two or more parties to this Agreement, or between any such party or parties and WRCH, with respect to disputes, demands, differences, controversies, or misunderstandings arising in relation to interpretation of this Agreement, or any breach thereof, shall be submitted to and determined by arbitration. The party desiring to initiate arbitration shall give notice of its intention to arbitrate to every other party to this Agreement and to the Executive Director of the Council. Such notice shall designate as "respondents" such other parties as the initiating party intends to have bound by any award made therein. Any party not so designated but which desires to join in the arbitration may, within ten (10) days of service upon it of such notice, file with all other parties and with the Executive Director of the Council a response indicating its intention to join in and to be bound by the results of the arbitration, and further designating any other parties it wishes to name as a respondent. Within twenty (20) days of the service of the initial demand for arbitration, the initiating party and the respondent or respondents shall each designate a person to act as an arbitrator. The designated arbitrators shall mutually designate the minimal number of additional persons as arbitrators as may be necessary to create an odd total number of arbitrators but not less than three to serve as arbitrator(s).

The arbitrators shall proceed to arbitrate the matter in accordance with the provisions of Title 9 of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure, Section 1280 et. seq. The parties to this Agreement agree that the decision of the arbitrators will be binding and will not be subject to judicial review except on the ground that the arbitrators have exceeded the scope of their authority.
9.5 **Partial Invalidity.**

If any one or more of the terms, provisions, sections, promises, covenants or conditions of this Agreement shall to any extent be adjudged invalid, unenforceable, void or voidable for any reason whatsoever by a court of competent jurisdiction, each and all of the remaining terms, provisions, sections, promises, covenants and conditions of this Agreement shall not be affected thereby and shall be valid and enforceable to the fullest extent permitted by law.

9.6 **Successors.**

This Agreement shall be binding upon and shall inure to the benefit of the successors of the parties hereto.

9.7 **Assignment.**

The parties hereto shall not assign any rights or obligations under this Agreement without written consent of all other parties.

9.8 **Execution.**

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Riverside and the city councils of the cities enumerated herein have each authorized execution of this Agreement as evidenced by the authorized signatures below, respectively.
EXHIBIT “A”

Original Members Agencies

1. City of Banning
2. City of Beaumont (rejoined June 22, 2017)
3. City of Calimesa
4. City of Canyon Lake
5. City of Corona
6. City of Hemet
7. City of Lake Elsinore
8. City of Moreno Valley
9. City of Murrieta
10. City of Norco
11. City of Perris
12. City of Riverside
13. City of San Jacinto
14. City of Temecula
15. County of Riverside

Additional City Members

1. City of Eastvale (added on 08/02/2010, Resolution 01-11)
2. City of Jurupa Valley (added on 07/29/2011, Resolution 02-12)
3. City of Menifee (added on 10/06/2008, Resolution 03-09)
4. City of Wildomar (added on 08/04/2008, Resolution 01-09)
For Reference Only

THE WESTERN RIVERSIDE
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Participating Agencies

1. Eastern Municipal Water District (membership on the Governing Board of WRCOG, 05/11/2009)

2. Western Municipal Water District (membership on the Governing Board of WRCOG, 05/11/2009)

3. Riverside County Superintendent of Schools (membership as an ex-officio, advisory member of WRCOG, 11/07/2011)

ATTEST:                                      CITY OF CANYON LAKE
City Clerk
City of Canyon Lake
By: ______________________________
Dated: ____________________________

By: ______________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:                                      CITY OF CORONA
City Clerk
City of Corona
By: ______________________________
Dated: ____________________________

By: ______________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:                                      CITY OF EASTVALE
City Clerk
City of Eastvale
By: ______________________________
Dated: ____________________________

By: ______________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:                                      CITY OF HEMET
City Clerk
City of Hemet
By: ______________________________
Dated: ____________________________

By: ______________________________
Mayor
ATTEST:

City of Jurupa Valley

By: ______________________________
Dated: __________________________

By: ______________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:

City of Lake Elsinore

By: ______________________________
Dated: __________________________

By: ______________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:

City of Menifee

By: ______________________________
Dated: __________________________

By: ______________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:

City of Moreno Valley

By: ______________________________
Dated: __________________________

By: ______________________________
Mayor
ATTEST:
City Clerk
City of Murrieta
By: ______________________________
Dated: __________________________

CITY OF MURRIETA
By: ______________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:
City Clerk
City of Norco
By: ______________________________
Dated: __________________________

CITY OF NORCO
By: ______________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:
City Clerk
City of Perris
By: ______________________________
Dated: __________________________

CITY OF PERRIS
By: ______________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:
City Clerk
City of Riverside
By: ______________________________
Dated: __________________________

CITY OF RIVERSIDE
By: ______________________________
Mayor
ATTEST:
City Clerk
City of San Jacinto
By: ______________________________
Dated: __________________________

CITY OF SAN JACINTO
By: ______________________________
Mayor
Dated: ___________________________

ATTEST:
City Clerk
City of Temecula
By: ______________________________
Dated: ___________________________

CITY OF TEMECULA
By: ______________________________
Mayor
Dated: ___________________________

ATTEST:
City Clerk
City of Wildomar
By: ______________________________
Dated: ___________________________

CITY OF WILDOMAR
By: ______________________________
Mayor
Dated: ___________________________

ATTEST:
Council Recording Secretary
Morongo Band of Mission Indians
By: ______________________________
Dated: ___________________________

MORONGO BAND OF MISSION INDIES
By: ______________________________
Tribal Chairman
Dated: ___________________________
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 7, 2019
TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON
BY: ALAN KREIMEIER, ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 13.D
SECOND QUARTER FY 2018-19 FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the City Council receive and file the attached Second Quarter (Through December) Financial Status Report.

ANALYSIS

The attached report on second quarter FY 2018-19 financial activities reflects expenditures and revenues as recorded for the period. Please note that invoices for goods and services received often lag behind a month or two. Consequently many ongoing expenses reflect fewer than six months of paid expenses. Also, many revenues, such as Property Taxes arrive later in the fiscal year.

Staff is requesting that the City Council receive the attached report and file it.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

This second quarter report reflects the City’s revenue and expenditure status for the period of July 1-December 31, 2018.

ALTERNATIVES

N/A

Prepared by: 
Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Submitted by: 
Gary S. Thompson
City Manager
Attachments:

FY 2018-19 Second Quarter Financial Status Report
## City of Jurupa Valley

### GENERAL FUND REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAXES AND FRANCHISES</th>
<th>FY 2018/19 BUDGET</th>
<th>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax- Secured</td>
<td>5,240,000</td>
<td>1,510,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax- Unsecured</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>219,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax- Supplemental</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax- H.O. Exemption</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>8,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax- RDA Pass Thru</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 130 Revenue</td>
<td>7,150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Use Tax</td>
<td>11,000,000</td>
<td>5,681,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Fees - Utilities</td>
<td>1,750,000</td>
<td>543,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Fees - Solid Waste</td>
<td>1,115,000</td>
<td>415,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Fees-Trash Liens</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Transfer Tax</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>225,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Occupancy Tax</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>101,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,623,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,706,477</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LICENSES AND PERMITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018/19 BUDGET</th>
<th>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Registration</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>37,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreclosure Registration</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees</td>
<td>2,219,916</td>
<td>807,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Fees</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>834,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits</td>
<td>1,872,241</td>
<td>720,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfilm Fees</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>35,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Admin Processing Fee</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>56,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIF Admin fees</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>20,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS Fee</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>36,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement Fees</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES Inspection Fees</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines- Parking</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>108,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines- Court</td>
<td>238,000</td>
<td>76,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Impounds</td>
<td>103,500</td>
<td>39,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,160,657</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,775,219</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City of Jurupa Valley

### GENERAL FUND REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018/19 BUDGET</th>
<th>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMR System Fees (County)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle License</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USE OF MONEY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>14,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>14,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Tower Revenue</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>13,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Agreements</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>139,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>289,000</td>
<td>152,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERFUND CHARGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A Project Administration</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLMD Administration</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFD Administration</td>
<td>62,010</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>142,810</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL GENERAL FUND REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>36,170,467</td>
<td>11,649,367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City of Jurupa Valley
### MISCELLANEOUS FUNDS REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018/19 BUDGET</th>
<th>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State HUTA-2103</td>
<td>776,743</td>
<td>151,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State HUTA-2105</td>
<td>583,298</td>
<td>203,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State HUTA-2106</td>
<td>352,977</td>
<td>127,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State HUTA-2107</td>
<td>723,700</td>
<td>231,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State HUTA-2107.5</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-1 RMRA</td>
<td>1,682,442</td>
<td>649,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-1 Loan Repmt.</td>
<td>115,178</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total HUTA</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,247,338</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,375,330</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCTC Measure A- Local</td>
<td>2,015,000</td>
<td>793,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUMF</td>
<td>865,000</td>
<td>80,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Measure A</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,882,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>877,435</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC AQMD</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>34,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total AQMD</strong></td>
<td><strong>121,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,394</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grant</td>
<td>1,189,419</td>
<td>237,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,189,419</strong></td>
<td><strong>237,841</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Grants- SLESF</td>
<td>159,000</td>
<td>100,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>159,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,563</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalRecycle Grant Program</td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td>60,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalRecycle Ongoing Payment</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>128,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,288</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CITY COUNCIL
### GENERAL FUND - 100-1110

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 18/19 BUDGET</th>
<th>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Contribution</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>1,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria Benefits</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Employee Costs</td>
<td>1,806</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel</strong></td>
<td><strong>124,506</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,046</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cmnty Prom/ Econ Devmt</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>18,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings/Conferences</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues/Memberships</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>27,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td><strong>146,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>95,528</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CITY COUNCIL</strong></td>
<td><strong>270,506</strong></td>
<td><strong>137,574</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CITY ATTORNEY
GENERAL FUND - 100-1120

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATING EXPENSES</th>
<th>FY 18/19 BUDGET</th>
<th>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Consulting Services</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>248,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>655,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td><strong>725,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>904,324</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL CITY ATTORNEY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>725,000</td>
<td>904,324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City Manager

### General Fund - 100-1130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Budget</th>
<th>JULY-DEC Actuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>418,859</td>
<td>164,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria Benefit</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>33,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Contribution</td>
<td>29,320</td>
<td>11,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Employee Costs</td>
<td>15,641</td>
<td>7,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel</strong></td>
<td><strong>547,820</strong></td>
<td><strong>217,789</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Budget</th>
<th>JULY-DEC Actuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Binding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books/Subscriptions</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services</td>
<td>248,042</td>
<td>224,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Phone</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings/Conferences</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Training</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues/Memberships</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td><strong>323,492</strong></td>
<td><strong>245,920</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total City Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 18/19 Budget</th>
<th>JULY-DEC Actuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>871,312</td>
<td>463,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 18/19 Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>159,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria Benefit</td>
<td>16,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Contribution</td>
<td>11,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Employee Costs</td>
<td>5,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel</strong></td>
<td>194,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books/Subscriptions</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Notices</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings/Conferences</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Training</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues/Memberships</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td>162,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CITY CLERK</strong></td>
<td>356,591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# City of Jurupa Valley

## ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
**GENERAL FUND - 100-1150**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 18/19 BUDGET</th>
<th>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>403,979</td>
<td>194,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria Benefit</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>43,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Contribution</td>
<td>28,631</td>
<td>13,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Employee Costs</td>
<td>15,574</td>
<td>8,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel</strong></td>
<td>532,184</td>
<td>259,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>145,400</td>
<td>107,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Services</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Service Fees</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>5,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings/Conferences</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Training</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues/Memberships</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td>188,300</td>
<td>127,710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FINANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 18/19 BUDGET</th>
<th>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>720,484</td>
<td>387,004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City of Jurupa Valley

### NON DEPARTMENTAL

**GENERAL FUND - 100-1190**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Budget</th>
<th>JULY-DEC Actuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>19,667</td>
<td>9,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria Benefit</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Contribution</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Employee Costs</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>2,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,259</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,759</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATING EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Budget</th>
<th>JULY-DEC Actuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>8,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying Costs</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>14,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>15,820</td>
<td>2,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>43,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Maint</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>11,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>8,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Internet</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>15,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Phones</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity/Gas</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>24,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewer</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>1,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues/Memberships</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>4,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Neutrality</td>
<td>3,745,350</td>
<td>3,719,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>10,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and Improvements</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>43,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,107,770</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,912,179</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NON-DEPARTMENTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 18/19 Budget</th>
<th>JULY-DEC Actuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4,133,029</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,925,938</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING EXPENSES</td>
<td>FY 18/19 BUDGET</td>
<td>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services</td>
<td>2,219,916</td>
<td>782,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating</td>
<td><strong>2,220,916</strong></td>
<td><strong>782,455</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL ENG/DEV                    | **2,220,916**   | **782,455**      |
## City of Jurupa Valley

### PLANNING
**GENERAL FUND - 100-1220**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 18/19 BUDGET</th>
<th>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>52,965</td>
<td>22,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria Benefit</td>
<td>13,440</td>
<td>6,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Contribution</td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td>1,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Employee Costs</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel</strong></td>
<td><strong>71,723</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,938</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OPERATING EXPENSES</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Stipends</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services-Reimb</td>
<td>1,067,280</td>
<td>719,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services</td>
<td>639,092</td>
<td>114,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Notices</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings/Conferences</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Furniture and Equip.</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,820,972</strong></td>
<td><strong>836,016</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COMM DEV**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1,892,695</strong></td>
<td><strong>866,954</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING EXPENSES</td>
<td>FY 18/19 BUDGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books and Subscriptions</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services</td>
<td>1,872,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Phone</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues/Memberships</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,893,741</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL BUILDING**

1,893,741  900,380
### City of Jurupa Valley

#### CODE ENFORCEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATING EXPENSES</th>
<th>FY 18/19 BUDGET</th>
<th>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>10,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services</td>
<td>1,305,544</td>
<td>652,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weed Abatement</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti Abatement</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Abatement</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Phone</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL CODE ENFORCE                  | **1,424,544**   | **727,191**      |
## ENGINEERING - PW
GENERAL FUND - 100-1310

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 18/19 BUDGET</th>
<th>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>13,241</td>
<td>5,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria Benefit</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Contribution</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Employee Costs</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel</strong></td>
<td>17,931</td>
<td>7,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books/Subscriptions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services-NPDES</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>11,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services</td>
<td>379,253</td>
<td>322,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services NPDES</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>229,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES Permit</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>35,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Notices</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cell Phone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PUBLIC WORKS</strong></td>
<td>1,127,006</td>
<td>599,715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>|                | 1,144,937       | 607,450          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 18/19 BUDGET</th>
<th>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Contract</td>
<td>19,590,511</td>
<td>7,188,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Responsibility Area</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td>19,785,511</td>
<td>7,188,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PUBLIC SAFETY</strong></td>
<td>19,785,511</td>
<td>7,188,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 18/19 BUDGET</td>
<td>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>873,010</td>
<td>363,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td>873,010</td>
<td>363,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERFUND CHARGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ANIMAL SERVICES</td>
<td>873,010</td>
<td>363,728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GAS TAX ROAD MAINTENANCE
SPECIAL REVENUE - 200-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Budget</th>
<th>July-Dec Actuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>220,881</td>
<td>91,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria Benefit</td>
<td>62,160</td>
<td>31,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Contribution</td>
<td>15,461</td>
<td>6,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Employee Costs</td>
<td>25,439</td>
<td>12,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel</td>
<td><strong>323,941</strong></td>
<td><strong>141,337</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Budget</th>
<th>July-Dec Actuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Engineering</td>
<td>114,559</td>
<td>127,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Maintenance</td>
<td>636,700</td>
<td>436,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Maintenance</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>90,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Street Materials</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>18,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti Abatement Services</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric/Gas Cost</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>54,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Trimming</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>67,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Maintenance</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>15,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Call Pvmnt Repair</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>164,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Striping</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>75,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Signs</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>13,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Training</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>167,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,047,259</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,240,778</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXPENSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 18/19</th>
<th>July-Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,371,200</td>
<td>1,382,115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# City of Jurupa Valley

## MEASURE A ROAD MAINTENANCE
SPECIAL REVENUE - 210-2100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 18/19 BUDGET</th>
<th>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Engineering</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>1,426,700</td>
<td>157,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>516,000</td>
<td>165,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Administration</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,973,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>329,214</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>FY 18/19 BUDGET</td>
<td>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Engineering</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>1,725,000</td>
<td>928,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating</td>
<td>1,725,000</td>
<td>928,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXPENSES**  
1,725,000  928,050
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>FY 18/19 BUDGET</th>
<th>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Programs</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>9,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG Administration</td>
<td>142,020</td>
<td>54,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>897,399</td>
<td>23,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,189,419</strong></td>
<td><strong>87,951</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXPENSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 18/19 BUDGET</th>
<th>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1,189,419</strong></td>
<td><strong>87,951</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>FY 18/19 BUDGET</td>
<td>JULY-DEC ACTUALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Premiums</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>90,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>90,989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| TOTAL EXPENSES             | 95,000           | 90,989           |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Budget</th>
<th>JULY-DEC Actuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>34,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware/ Software Support</td>
<td>36,700</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Systems</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfilm/ Scanning</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>19,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>86,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>55,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td><strong>518,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>140,998</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXPENSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 18/19 Budget</th>
<th>JULY-DEC Actuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>518,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>140,998</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTICE OF DECISION FOR MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. MA18141 (TTM37640 WITH EXCEPTION TO SECTION 7.10.080.C OF TITLE 7 & AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO PUD-02 DEVELOPMENT PLAN)
PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT FOR NOTICING THE CITY COUNCIL OF AN APPROVED TENTATIVE TRACT MAP LOCATED SOUTH OF KENWOOD, EAST OF CANAL, WEST OF AVALON, AND NORTH OF SR-60 (APNS: 179-060-004; -006; -007 AND 178-191-001; -002; -004; -015)

RECOMMENDATION
That the City Council receive and file the Notice of Decision.

BACKGROUND
Pursuant to Section 7.15.150 of Title 7 “Subdivisions,” a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision for MA18141 must be filed with the City Council. This notice of decision starts a 10-day appeal period of the Planning Commission’s decision. Any appeals must be filed in writing with the filing fee to the City Clerk.

On February 13, 2019, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution Nos. 2019-02-13-04 approving MA18141(TPM37640). The Planning Commission’s staff report and adopted resolution are attached to this staff report.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Emerald Ridge South is a 24.9-acre residential subdivision for 118 townhome lots and 97 single-family lots located between Canal St. and Avalon St. The northern boundary is Kenwood and the south boundary is State Route 60. This approved tract, MA18141, is meant to replace one of the approved tracts of the Emerald Ridge project.

In 2016, the City Council approved the Emerald Ridge project that consists of two tracts. Emerald Ridge North is a subdivision of 184 single-family lots and Emerald Ridge South
is a subdivision of 118 condominium units and 97 single-family lots. Exhibit A shows the project site “Emerald Ridge South” and the approved Emerald Ridge North. The main differences between the previously approved Emerald Ridge South and the recently approved Emerald Ridge South is as follows:

- Centralized amenities
- Townhomes, instead of condominiums, which allows for the ownership of both the lot and townhome; condominiums only allow for the ownership of the airspace and common ownership of the condominium lot;
- Larger single-family lots with yards versus alley-loaded single-family lots
- New floor plans and architecture
- Enhancements to most access points

EXHIBIT A. PROJECT SITE & APPROVED EMERALD RIDGE NORTH

FINANCIAL IMPACT
Staff time to process these applications will be recovered by a developer application deposit. No additional costs to the City are anticipated.

ALTERNATIVES
1. That the City Council receive and file the Notice of Decision.
2. None.
ATTACHMENTS

2. Planning Commission Staff Report dated February 13, 2019
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-02-13-04


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

Section 1. Project. Jurupa Valley, LLC (the “Applicant”) has applied for an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37640, and Amendment No. 1 to PUD-02 Development Plan (collectively, Master Application No. 18141 or MA No. 18141) to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 24.9 acres into ninety-seven (97) single-family residential lots and one hundred eighteen (118) townhomes with common area lots and private streets on real property located south of Kenwood Place, east of Canal Street, west of Avalon Street, and north of State Route 60 (APNs: 179-060-004, -006, -007; and 178-191-001, -002, -004, and -015) in the Planned Unit Development (PUD) -02 Zone and designated Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) and High Density Residential (HDR) (the “Project”).

Section 2. Exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(a) Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code states, in part: “When lots eighteen thousand (18,000) square feet or less are proposed, the depth of lots shall not exceed two and one-half (2½) times the width.”

(b) The Applicant is seeking approval of an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code for the depth of the townhome lots in the proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37640 to exceed 2½ times the width.

(c) Section 7.10.010.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code states that “[e]xceptions from the requirements of this title [7] relating to the design or improvement of land divisions shall be granted by the appropriate advisory agency or appeal board only when it is determined that there are special circumstances applicable to the property, such as but not limited
to size, shape or topographical conditions, or existing road alignment and width, and that the granting of the modification will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare or be damaging to other property in the vicinity.”

Section 3.  **Tentative Tract Map.**

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37640, a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 24.9 acres into ninety-seven (97) single-family residential lots and one hundred eighteen (118) townhomes with common area lots and private streets on real property located south of Kenwood Place, east of Canal Street, west of Avalon Street, and north of State Route 60 (APNs: 179-060-004, -006, -007; and 178-191-001, -002, -004, and -015) in the Planned Unit Development (PUD) -02 Zone.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 4. Amendment to Final Development Plan.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Amendment No. 1 to PUD-02 Development Plan to change the architectural styles, floor plans, and landscape treatment of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) -02 Zone. The proposed Amended PUD-02 Development Plan, attached as Attachment No. 2.h. to the February 13, 2019 Planning Commission staff report for Agenda Item No. 6.2, is on file with the Planning Department and incorporated herein by this reference.

(b) Section 9.238.090.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that an applicant must submit a final development plan to the Planning Director prior to development, which final development plan must substantially conform to the approved development plan.

(c) On February 7, 2019, the Applicant submitted a Final PUD-02 Development Plan that substantially conformed to the PUD-02 Development Plan approved by the City Council on May 18, 2017.

(d) Section 9.238.090.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the Planning Commission may approve written requests for amendments to a final development
plan after a public hearing, notice of which has been given as provided in Section 9.240.250(2), and provided the amendments: (1) are limited to changes in the size and position of buildings, the number, area or configuration of lots, landscape treatment, phasing, or other minor adjustments; and (2) do not include changes in proposed use, overall density or overall configuration of the land uses and circulation features.

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

(a) The application for MA No. 18141 was processed including, but not limited to, a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

(b) On February 13, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 18141, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing.

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

Section 6. California Environmental Quality Act Findings. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby makes the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Project:

(a) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the City’s local CEQA Guidelines, City staff has considered the potential environmental impacts of MA No. 18141. City staff has also reviewed the Initial Study and the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) prepared for MA Nos. 15072 and 15148 and approved by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on May 18, 2017, including the impacts and mitigation measures identified therein, and prepared a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, attached hereto as Exhibit “B,” in accordance with CEQA for the Project. Based on that review, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department has determined that the Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR prepared for MA Nos. 15072 and 15148. All potential environmental impacts associated with MA Nos. 15072, 15148, and 18141 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for MA Nos. 15072 and 15148, and the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR will reduce certain impacts to a level that is less than significant.

(b) The Planning Commission has independently reviewed the Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, and based upon the whole record before it, the Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, and its independent review and judgment, finds that that the Project, as modified, is not subject to further environmental review pursuant to the Guidelines because:

1) The Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental
effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR prepared for MA Nos. 15072 and 15148; and

2) All potential environmental impacts associated with MA Nos. 15072, 15148, and 18141 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for MA Nos. 15072 and 15148, and the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR will reduce certain impacts to a level that is less than significant.

(c) The custodian of records for the Final EIR prepared for MA Nos. 15072 and 15148, and all other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Planning Commission’s action is based, is the Planning Department of the City of Jurupa Valley. Those documents are available for public review in the Planning Department located at 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509.

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

(a) There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property, such as, but not limited to, size, shape or topographical conditions, or existing road alignment and width, in that the topography and existing road alignment and width influence the design of the townhome lots, location of amenities, and the internal circulation. The irregularly shaped project site is created by Avalon Street, including the extension along SR-60, and Canal Street.

(b) The granting of the modification will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or be damaging to other property in the vicinity, in that the slightly larger lot depth will provide more yard space.

Section 8. Findings for Approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37640. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37640 should be granted because:

(a) The proposed land division will be consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan. The single-family residential lots are designated MHDR, which allows up to eight (8) dwelling units per acre. The land division is proposing a density of 7.5 dwelling units per acre. The townhome lots are designated HDR, which allows up to fourteen (14) dwelling units per acre. The land division is proposing a density of 9.9 dwelling units per acre.

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

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

(e) The design of the proposed land division and proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat with the imposition of the recommended conditions of approval and the mitigation measures imposed under the previously certified Final EIR for MA Nos. 15072 and 15148, including Mitigation Measures Bio-1 through Bio-3. The design of the proposed land division and proposed improvements will reduce potential impacts to any sensitive species on the project site and reduce direct and indirect impacts to the West Riverside Canal and any downtown riparian habitat.

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

(g) The design of the proposed land division and the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed land division. The Project provides increased access to other areas of the community by extending Avalon Street and other street improvements.

Section 9. Approval of Exception, Tentative Tract Map, Development Plan Amendment with Conditions. Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission hereby approves an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37640, and Amendment No. 1 to PUD-02 Development Plan to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 24.9 acres into ninety-seven (97) single-family residential lots and one hundred eighteen (118) townhomes with common area lots and private streets on real property located south of Kenwood Place, east of Canal Street, west of Avalon Street, and north of State Route 60 (APNs: 179-060-004, -006, -007; and 178-191-001, -002, -004, and -015) in the Planned Unit Development (PUD) -02 Zone and designated Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) and High Density Residential (HDR), subject to the recommended conditions of approval attached hereto as Exhibit “A.”

Section 10. Certification. The Planning Director shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 13th day of February, 2019.

[Signature]
Corey Moore
Chair of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

I, Thomas Merrell, Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-02-13-04 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 13th day of February, 2019, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:
Moore, Pruitt, Lopez, Newman

NOES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

THOMAS G. MERRELL
PLANNING DIRECTOR
EXHIBIT A

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. **PROJECT PERMITTED.** MA18141 (TTM37640 with exception to Section 7.10.080.C of Title 7 and Amendment No. 1 to PUD-02 Development Plan) are for the approval for "Emerald Ridge South."

   Tentative Tract Map No. 37640 with exception to Section 7.10.080.C of Title 7 allows for the subdivision of approximately 24.9 acres of vacant land into 97 single-family lots, 118 lots for townhomes, and common lots as shown on the approved map.

   Amendment No. 1 to PUD-02 Development Plan allowed for changes to the landscape treatment, amenities, floor plans, and architectural styles.

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

3. **CONSENT TO CONDITIONS.** Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to the required conditions of approval to the Planning Director or designee.

4. **MITIGATION MEASURES.**
   
   a) This project shall be subject to the mitigation measures in the previously adopted environmental impact report (EIR) prepared for the project and included with these conditions of approval.
b) Suspect Soil Removal Plan of MM-HAZ-1. The required suspect soil removal plan of MM-HAZ-1 shall include testing and it shall meet ASTM Standard Practice for Phase II Environmental Site Assessment.

5. FEES. The approval of MA18141 (TTM37640 & Amendment No. 1 to PUD-02 Development Plan) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

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

7. CONFORMANCE TO APPROVED EXHIBITS. The project shall be in conformance to the approved plans (listed below) with changes in accordance to these conditions of approval:
   a) Tentative Tract Map No. 37640 (Emerald Ridge South)
   b) PUD-02 Development Plan - Amendment No. 1

8. INCORPORATE CONDITIONS. Prior to the issuance of any building permit for the Emerald Ridge PUD-02 Development project, the applicant 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. 30TH STREET ENHANCED PROJECT ENTRY. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a street beautification and landscape plan for 30th Street shall be submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer and Planning Director. Said plan shall provide for street trees planted at 30 feet apart with extensive landscape, new sidewalks adjacent to the right-of-way, and street pavement rehabilitation. Improvements shall be completed prior to the first Certificate of Occupancy of Emerald Ridge South.

10. PUD-02 DEVELOPMENT PLAN SUBMITTAL. Prior to the issuance of any grading permit for the Emerald Ridge PUD-02 Development project, the applicant shall submit a Site Development Permit for the Director’s review and approval of the Development Plan to include following:

Wall & Fence:

1. A solid wall along Avalon Street shall not exceed 42 inches in height so the residents on the east side of Avalon Street will not be facing a tall wall. There shall be landscaping along Avalon Street that will soften the solid wall. The Wall and Fence Plan shall be revised to include a combination of a 42-high split-faced block wall with a 30-inch high open view fence on top along the rear lot line of Lots 198 – 214.

2. All walls and fences shall be located at the top of the slope.

11. EXPANDED PARKWAYS. In addition to the PUD-02 Development requirements for landscape review and approval, the landscape plan shall include a landscape parkway design consistent to the exhibit that is made a part of this condition below.
Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the plan shall be submitted to the Director for review of consistency in design and approval.

12. SDP APPROVAL FOR ARCHITECTURE & FLOOR PLANS. The architecture and floor plan for this tract shall be consistent, in quality and aesthetics, with the PUD-02 Development Plan.

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

The Plotting Plan shall include, at minimum, the following information:

- Location of each unit
- Setbacks of each unit
- Identify the proposed floor plan and elevation

All units must meet the requirements of the Amended PUD-02 Development Plan and these conditions.

Any single-family home with a garage that faces the street shall be setback 20 feet, as oppose to the 10 feet minimum requirement from the PUD-02 Development Plan, from the front property line.

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

14. SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES WITH SIDE-ENTRY GARAGES. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a Plotting Plan for the review and approval of the Planning Director. The Plotting Plan shall include the location of each unit and
setbacks for the entire tract. Thirty-two single-family lots shall have single-family units with side-entry garages.

15. **CC & RS – DISCLOSURE OF POSSIBLE IMPACTS FROM UNION PACIFIC.** The required Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions (CC & Rs) set forth and required in the PUD-02 Development Plan shall include a notice to all property owners within the Emerald Ridge project disclosing possible noise and vibration impacts from the trains traveling between Emerald Ridge North and South.

16. **AMENITIES & MAIN ACCESS.** Prior to the issuance of the first (1st) Certificate of Occupancy for TTM37640 (Emerald Ridge South), the following amenities and access to amenities associate with TTM 37640 shall be constructed and completed:
   a) “Central Park” (Lot OS-B) with the amenities and ancillary parking
   b) Monument Sign
   c) Street “H” (Access from Avalon Street)

17. **IMPACT FEES.** Notwithstanding the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), the applicant shall pay the following impact fees (unless exempt) in accordance to 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.

18. **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.

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

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

1.1. TTM 37640 provides revisions to the previously approved TTM 36948 for Emerald Ridge (South).

1.2. The use hereby conditioned is for Tentative Tract Map No. 37640 being a subdivision of:

APN 179-060-004, APN 179-060-006, and APN 179-060-007, Lot 5, Lot 6, Lot 7 of Arthur Parks Tract, Book 1 Page 21 of Maps, Records of Riverside County,

APN 178-191-001, Lot 2 in Blk 10 of Map of West Riverside, Book 9 Page 34 of Maps, Records of San Bernardino County,

APN 178-191-002, Lot 2 in Blk 10 of Map of West Riverside, Book 9 Page 34 of Maps, Records of San Bernardino County, Excepting those portion lying within “A” Street (Avalon Street) and Canal Street;

APN 178-191-004, Lot 4 in Blk 24, and the Northeasterly 47 feet of Lot 2 in Blk 10, Map of West Riverside, Book 9 Page 34 of Maps, Records of San Bernardino County, Excepting the Northeasterly 559.88 feet of Lot 4, Also Excepting those portions lying within “A” Street (Avalon Street) and Canal Street;

and 178-191-015, Lot 2 in Blk 10, Lot 4 in Blk 24, Map of West Riverside, Book 9 Page 34 of Maps, Records of San Bernardino County, Excepting any portion lying within “A” Street (Avalon Street);

consisting of approximately 25 acres, 118 townhome lots, 97 single family residences for a total of 215 numbered lots, and 16 open space lettered lots for TTM 37640. Tentative Tract Map No. 37640 prepared by West Land Group, Inc. dated October 2018.

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

1.4. The project discharges into an existing basin southeast of the site owned by Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District (RCFC&WCD). An updated hydrology study and Water Quality Management Plan is required to be submitted for RCFC&WCD’s review and approval.

1.5. 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.
2. PRIOR TO GRADING PERMIT (ENGINEERING) 
GRADING AND DRAINAGE

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

2.2. Onsite runoff is to be addressed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

2.3. Developer shall prepare preliminary street improvement plans for Canal Street 
and Avalon Street to include at minimum the line and grade of the curb and 
gutter along the project frontage for review and concurrence of the City Engineer.

2.4. Prior to approval of the grading plan, the Developer shall prepare a detailed 
hydrology and hydraulics report corresponding with the detailed plans for 
grading, site development and street improvements for approval of the City 
Engineer.

2.5. A preliminary drainage study dated March 2016 was reviewed. An updated 
hydrology study is required to be submitted and approved by the Engineering 
Department prior to approval of any plans.

3. PRIOR TO MAP RECORDATION (ENGINEERING) 
FINAL MAP

3.1. No Final Map shall be recorded until the Tentative Tract Map (TTM), Covenants, 
Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs), including the necessary Home Owner's 
Association(s) (HOA); and Community Facilities District(s) (CFD) and/or Lighting 
& Landscape Maintenance District (LLMD), if any, associated with this 
subdivision are approved.

3.2. Phased units will be permitted with the City's further consideration of the phase 
designations and limits.

3.3. Lot access shall be restricted along the public rights-of-way. On the Final Map, 
the Owner shall dedicate abutter's right of access along Canal Street, Avalon 
Street, and 28th Street, with the exception of access points as shown on the site 
plan exhibit and as approved by the City Engineer.

3.4. Canal Street along and beyond the project boundary is a paved city maintained 
street. Owner shall implement the following:

3.4.1. Street improvements shall be per Standard No. 107A, Collector Frontage 
Road modified as approved by the City Engineer. The roadway cross 
section shall include a 10-foot wide painted eastbound left-turn lane at the 
Canal Street/Avalon Street intersection and 1 travel lane in each direction. 
A "no stopping" restriction will be imposed on both sides adjacent to and 
with Tract No. 37640, or as determined by the City Engineer.

3.4.2. Dedicate half-width right-of-way for public street and utility purposes for 
Avalon Street. Avalon Street shall be developed with an ultimate right of 
way width of 74 feet to the west, starting at the southerly right of way width 
of the railroad and laying out the width to the south.

3.4.3. Existing Canal Street (between the easterly boundary of TTM 36947 and 
the westerly boundary of TTM 37640 and Kenwood Place) shall be
vacated on the Final Map(s) as shown in Exhibit 1 that is made a part of Condition No. 3.4.3 "Limits of Abandonment."

**CONDITION NO. 3.4.3: EXHIBIT 1 “LIMITS OF ABANDONMENT”**

![Map Diagram](image)

3.4.4. An easement shall be reserved for public utility purposes, including SAWPA, over existing Canal Street between the limits of the vacated Canal Street.

3.4.5. An access road or alternative path for maintenance shall be provided to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and SAWPA between over this easement between Alta Drive and Kenwood Place.

3.5. Avalon Street along the project boundary shall be dedicated as a public street, with a right-of-way width of 80 feet (between "H" Street and Kenwood Place of TTM 37640), and a right-of-way width of 74 feet westerly of "H" Street.

3.5.1. Street improvements shall be per Standard No. 103, Collector Street, and Standard No. 107A, Collector Frontage Road modified as approved by the City Engineer. The roadway cross section shall include a 10-foot wide painted left-turn lane at the Tract driveways and 1 travel lane in each direction. A “no stopping” restriction will be imposed on both sides in the vicinity of the driveways and along the Frontage Road section of the roadway. Additional traffic lanes and right-of-way width may be required at intersections as determined by the City Engineer. The Developer shall at the time of construction improve all legs of all intersections with 30th Street to the limits of the curb returns.

3.6. In-tract streets within TTM 37640 shall be private streets and designed to meet federal and local standards and will require approval by the City Engineer.
3.6.1. All in-tract streets shall be privately maintained.

3.6.2. An easement for public utility purposes shall be dedicated on all in-tract streets.

3.6.3. When street parking is proposed:

   3.6.3.1. On one side of the street: 8-ft minimum.

   3.6.3.2. On both sides of the street: 8-ft minimum parking space. 20 ft wide minimum travel way width.

3.7. Alta Street between Avalon Street and Canal Street shall be vacated on the Final Map as shown in the “Limits of Abandonment” exhibit on Tentative Tract Map No. 37640

   3.7.1. An easement shall be reserved for public utility purposes within the limits of the vacated Alta Street.

3.8 Developer shall obtain owner’s consent of APN: 179-060-005, acquire and dedicate to the City for road purposes at no cost to the City.

IMPROVEMENT PLANS

3.9. The applicant shall provide improvement plans for the required improvements for Canal Street, Avalon Street, 30th Street, and all other public streets within this project. Construction of Canal Street is not required with this map. All Improvement Plans are subject to detail review and approval by the City Engineer. Improvements shall include:

   3.9.1. Construction of roadway; curb and gutter, AC pavement, and street lighting.

   3.9.2 Parkway and landscaping in enhanced parkway. Parkway improvements shall include sidewalk compliant with current ADA standards.

   3.9.3 PCC sidewalk per Riverside County standard 401.

   3.9.4 PCC driveway approaches per County Standard No. 207A for commercial and 207 for residential approaches.

3.10. The Developer shall be responsible for any match up asphalt concrete (AC); paving, and reconstruction or resurfacing of existing paving as determined by the City Engineer.

3.11. Separate traffic signing, striping and pavement marking plans for the required improvements shall be prepared based on extending a minimum of 300 feet beyond the project limits, or the limits of work necessary to join existing improvements. The Developer shall be responsible for any additional paving and/or removal of existing striping that might be required by the approved plan. The geometric improvements listed in Table A of these conditions shall be included on the plans.

   Note: ’) Any offsite roadway widening required to provide the above geometrics shall be the responsibility of the Developer, or as approved by the City Engineer.

3.12. Separate streetlight plans shall be prepared for the frontage of the project for
approval of the City Engineer. LED luminaires shall be provided with lighting performance equivalent to that required per County standards for HPS type.

3.13. For landscaping within public road rights-of-way, separate landscape and irrigation plans shall be provided for review and approval by the City Engineer.

If landscaping maintenance (and/or trails) is to be included in a Community Facilities District (CFD) or Landscaping and Lighting Maintenance District (LLMD), landscaping plans shall depict ONLY such landscaping, irrigation and related facilities as are to be placed within the public rights-of-way.

3.14. Developer shall design other various and miscellaneous improvements as shown on the final map, per City standards at various locations shown on the final map, and in accordance with the Table A of these conditions, not otherwise included in the fair share payments.

3.15. Developer shall, at no expense to the City, obtain dedications for all off-site right-of-way to construct improvements as shown on final map and Table A, not otherwise included in fair share payments. The dedication documents shall be recorded concurrent with recordation of the Final (Tract) Map and, where applicable, recording data shall be shown on the final map.

3.16. Prior to issuance of the first building unit permit, a Site Development Traffic Management Plan (SDTMP) shall be submitted the City Engineer and Planning Director for approval. The SDTMP shall include, but not be limited to, approve routes for site development construction traffic to access the construction site, appropriate points of ingress/egress to the site, and staging areas. Approval of such plan may include restrictions, requirements and conditions to mitigate related impacts as determined by the City Engineer and Planning Director.

L&LMD, CFD AND SPECIAL DISTRICTS

3.17. The Developer shall form, or annex to, if one already exists, a Community Facilities District (CFD) for operation and maintenance purposes of various improvements in the public right-of-way, as approved by the City Engineer. The formation or annexation to a CFD shall be in a manner approved by the City Engineer and City Attorney.

3.18. If a City-wide Community Facilities District (CFD) exists for City Public Safety Services, the Developer shall annex into the City-wide Community Facilities District (CFD) in order to provide funding for City Public Safety Services. The annexation to a City-wide CFD for Public Safety Services shall be in a manner approved by the City Engineer and City Attorney.

UTILITIES

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

Necessary easements for sewer and water systems on-site, as determined by RCSD, shall be shown on the Final Map “to be dedicated by separate instrument".
4. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF PERMIT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS (ENGINEERING)

4.1. All applicable required environmental mitigation measures shall be satisfied in accordance with the Environmental Impact Report.

4.2. A Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) shall be submitted to the City Engineer and Planning Director for approval. The CTMP shall include, but not be limited to, approved routes for construction traffic to access the construction area, construction hours, staging areas, and appropriate points of ingress/egress to that area.

5. PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION

5.1. The street lights shall be fully operational.

5.2. Developer shall pay a fair-share amount of $2,200 per single-family residential (SFR) dwelling unit toward mitigation of various intersection and roadway segment improvements as listed in Table A (pages 11 to 14) that is included with these conditions.

5.3. Prior to the issuance of the first (1st) Certificate of Occupancy of Final Map of TTM37640 (Emerald Ridge South):

5.3.1. Full improvements for Avalon Street extension, including parkways, to Canal Street (westerly project limits).

5.4. Prior to the issuance of the first (1st) Certificate of Occupancy of a Townhome Unit of TR37640, the following amenities and access to amenities shall be constructed and completed: tot lots, open space, community plaza, and dog park.

5.5. Prior to the issuance of the first (1st) Certificate of Occupancy of TTM37640 (Emerald Ridge South), the following amenities and access to amenities associate with TTM 37640 shall be constructed and completed:

5.5.1.1. "Central Park" (Lot OS-B) with the amenities and ancillary parking

5.5.1.2. Monument Sign

5.5.1.3. Street "H" (Access from Avalon Street)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geometric Modification</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project-Specific Intersection Mitigation for</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Ridge PUD-02 Project MA18141 (TTM 37640)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Avalon Street (NS) and 30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Street (EW)</td>
<td>Modify geometries to provide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NB: one shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SB: one shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EB: one shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WB: one shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Canal Street (NS) and Avalon Street (EW)</td>
<td>Modify geometries to provide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NB: N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SB: one left-turn lane, one right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EB: one left-turn lane, one through lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WB: one through lane, one right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project-Specific Intersection Mitigation for</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Ridge South (MA18141 &amp; TTM 37640)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Canal Street (NS) and Kenwood Place (EW) (Knuckle)</td>
<td>Install geometries to provide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NB: N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SB: One left-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EB: N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WB: One right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Avalon Street (NS) and Project Driveway #2 (EW)</td>
<td>Install geometries to provide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NB: one left-turn lane, one through lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SB: one shared through/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EB: one shared left-turn lane/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WB: N/A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection of Avalon Street (NS) and Project Driveway #3 (EW)</th>
<th>Install geometries to provide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NB: one left-turn lane, one through lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SB: one shared through/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EB: one shared left-turn lane/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WB: N/A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fair-Share Payments for Emerald Ridge PUD-02 Project MA18141 (TTM 37640)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (NS) and 30th Street/ SR-60 WB Off-Ramp (EW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection of Pacific Avenue (NS) and Mission Boulevard (EW)</th>
<th>Install geometries to provide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NB: one left-turn lane, one through lane, one right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SB: one left-turn lane, one shared through/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EB: one left-turn lane, two through lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WB: one left-turn lane, two through lanes, one right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (NS) and Market/20th Street (EW)

Install geometries to provide:

- **NB:** one left-turn lane, two through lanes, one right-turn lane with overlap.
- **SB:** one left-turn lane, two through lanes, one right-turn lane.
- **EB:** one left-turn lane, two through lanes, one right-turn lane.
- **WB:** one left-turn lane, one through lane, one free flow right-turn lane.

### Fair-Share Payments for Emerald Ridge PUD-02 Project MA18141 (TTM 37640)

#### Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (NS) and SR-60 WB On-Ramp (EW)

Install geometries to provide:

- **NB:** one left-turn lane, two through lanes.
- **SB:** two through lanes, one right-turn lane.
- **EB:** N/A.
- **WB:** N/A.

#### Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (NS) and SR-60 EB Ramps (EW)

Install geometries to provide:

- **NB:** two through lanes, one right-turn lane.
- **SB:** one left-turn lane, two through lanes.
- **EB:** one left-turn lane, one right-turn lane.
- **WB:** one left-turn lane, one right-turn lane.

#### Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (NS) and Mission Boulevard (EW)

Install geometries to provide:

- **NB:** one left-turn lane, one shared through/ right-turn lane.
- **SB:** one left-turn lane, one through lane, one right-turn lane.
- **EB:** two left-turn lanes, two through lanes.
- **WB:** one left-turn lane, two through lanes, one right-turn lane.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection of Valley Way (NS) and Mission Boulevard (EW)</th>
<th>Install geometries to provide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NB: one left-turn lane, one shared through/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SB: two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, two right-turn lanes with overlap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EB: one left-turn lane, two through lanes, one right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WB: two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, one right-turn lane with overlap.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Applicant's name (Print Form): ________________________________

Applicant's name (Signature): ________________________________

Date: ________________
Previous Environmental Document Review Determination

City of Jurupa Valley Master Application 18141

Lead Agency

City of Jurupa Valley
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Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
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(951) 332-6464
atam@jurupavalley.org

Applicant:

Jurupa Valley, LLC
17538 Rowland Street, #218
City of Industry, CA 91748

January 29, 2019
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

A. Document Purpose.

This document is a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination 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.).

This document has been prepared to determine if the Proposed Project is within the scope of the analysis contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report, Emerald Ridge Residential Project, SCH #2016041020, ("EIR") certified by the City of Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2017-15 on May 18, 2017, and to ensure the Proposed Project does not create new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously analyzed impacts as compared to those identified previously.

B. Project Location.

North of SR-60, between Canal Street and Avalon Street; and south of Kenwood Place. APNS: 179-060-004; -006; -007; and 178-191-001; -002; -004; -015.

C. Project Description.

Approved Project

In 2017, the City Council approved two tentative tracts (TTM36948 & TTM36947) with other entitlements (GPA, CZ and EIR) on approximately 68 acres of land. The project was called Emerald Ridge. Emerald Ridge South, TTM36948, was approved for 97 single-family lots, 118 condominium units, and several open space lots. Emerald Ridge North, TTM36947, was approved for 184 single-family lots with several open space lots. This tract is located between Rio Vista SP and Canal Street. It is south of 28th Street and north of SR-60.

Proposed Project

The new owner of TTM36948 (Emerald Ridge South) has submitted a new TTM. The main differences between the proposed TTM37640 and the approved TTM36948 are as follows:

- Multi-family Area of the tract: Instead of the 118 condominium units, the applicant has proposed 118 townhomes.

- Single-Family Area of the tract:
  - Internal circulation changes to the single-family portion of the tract;
Eliminated the alley-loaded homes and proposed conventional single-family units with garages fronting the street or side-entry garages.

Increased lot size.

- Open Space Area: Combined the open space park and other amenities into one “Central Park” location.

- Avalon Street Re-alignment: The applicant proposes a new re-alignment as shown on the TTM.

2.0 USE OF PREVIOUS EIR

The EIR was certified by the City of Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2017-15 on May 18, 2017. The EIR evaluated the above described entitlements.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) allows a previously certified EIR to be used as the environmental assessment for a project if it is determined that the project currently under review is “within the scope” of the earlier EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 (a) which states:

“When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
(D) **Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.**

The EIR is on file with the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department (8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509) and is hereby incorporated by reference pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15150.
3.0 DETERMINATION:

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

[Signature]

City of Jurupa Valley
Agency
January 29, 2019
Date

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director
Printed Name/Title
4.0 ANALYSIS

Table 1-1: Summary of Project Impacts of the Draft EIR identified the following environmental issues would be impacted by the Approved Project.

**Air Quality**

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant air quality impacts as follows:

**Impact 4.3-2:** Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Mitigation Measure MM AQ-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Conclusion**

The Project does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. MM AQ-1 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

**Biological Resources**

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to biological resources as follows:

**Impact 4.4-1:** May 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. Mitigation Measure MM BIO-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.4-2:** Would the project 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. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-2 and BIO-3 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts.*** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Project. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-3 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.
Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (vacant land). The Project does not propose any changes that would impact biological resources than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-3 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysts above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Cultural Resources

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to cultural resources as follows:

Impact 4.5-2: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 through MM CR-3 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact 4.5-3: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Mitigation Measure MM CR-4 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts. Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Project. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 through MM CR-4 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (vacant land). The Project does not propose any changes that would impact cultural resources than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 through MM CR-4 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Geology and Soils

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to geology and soils as follows:
Impact 4.6-1: 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 based on other substantial evidence of as known fault. (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42); strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landslides. Mitigation Measures MM GEO-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts. Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Project. Mitigation Measure MM GEO-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (vacant land). The Project does not propose any changes that would impact geology and soils than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measure MM GEO-1 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials as follows:

Impact 4.8-2: 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. Mitigation Measure MM HAZ-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts: Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Project. Mitigation Measure MM HAZ-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (vacant land). The Project does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions
made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

**Land Use and Planning**

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to land use and planning as follows:

**Impact 4.10-3:** Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Conclusion**

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (vacant land). The Project does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measure MM BIO-1 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

**Noise**

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to noise as follows:

**Impact 4.12-1:** Expose 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. Mitigation Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-5 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts:** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Project. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-5 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Conclusion**

The Project does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM NOI-1 through NOI-5 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions
made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Transportation/Traffic

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to transportation/traffic as follows:

Impact 4.16-1: 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. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through MM TRA-9 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts: Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Project. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through MM TRA-9 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. The trip generation rates are based upon data collected by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The ITE trip generation rates for condominiums and townhomes are the same, so traffic will not be increased by changing the units from condominiums to townhomes. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through TRA-9 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.
DATE: FEBRUARY 13, 2019
TO: CHAIR MOORE AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR
BY: ANNETTE TAM, SENIOR PLANNER
SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 6.2

MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 18141 (TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 37640 WITH EXCEPTION TO SECTION 7.10.080.C OF TITLE 7 & AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO PUD-02 DEVELOPMENT PLAN)

PROPOSAL: “EMERALD RIDGE SOUTH” – RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION OF 24.9 ACRES INTO 97 SINGLE-FAMILY LOTS & 118 TOWNHOMES

LOCATION: SOUTH OF KENWOOD, EAST OF CANAL, WEST OF AVALON, AND NORTH OF SR-60

APPLICANT: JURUPA VALLEY, LLC

RECOMMENDATION
Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-02-13-04, (1) adopting a Previous Environmental Document Determination, (2) approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37640, (3) Exception to Section 7.10.080.C of Title 7, (4) and Amendment No. 1 to PUD-02 Development Plan in order to allow a Planned Unit Development with 97 single-family lots and 118 townhomes on a 24.9-acre project site.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The applicant, who is also the property owner, is proposing to subdivide approximately 24.9 acres into two communities of 118 lots for townhomes and 97 lots for single-family homes. See Attachment 2 for tentative tract map. The project is proposed to be located north of State Route 60, west of Avalon Street, east of Canal Street, and south of the homes fronting Kenwood Place. See Exhibit A for the project location. This residential addition has the potential of increasing property values and revitalizing this older neighborhood. Table 1 presents the requested entitlements for this proposed project for the residential community, Emerald Ridge South.

The proposed project is to replace a previously approved tentative tract map which is a part of a larger approved project named Emerald Ridge. The background of Emerald Ridge is in the next section.
EXHIBIT A. PROJECT SITE (SOURCE: COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE GIS)

**TABLE 1. REQUESTED ENTITLEMENTS**

| Tentative Tract Map (TTM) with Exception to Section 7.10.080.C of Title 7 | TTM: Subdividing approximately 24 acres of land into 97 single-family lots and 118 townhomes with common area lots and private streets  
Exception: Allow the lots for the townhomes to have lot depth a few feet greater allowed (requirement: lot depth cannot exceed 2 ½ times greater than the lot width) |
|---|---|

| Amendment to PUD-02 Development Plan | Minor amendments to architectural style, floor plans, landscape treatment, and changing the condominium requirements to townhome requirements |

**TABLE 2: GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

| Accessor’s Parcel Number(s) | 179-060-004; -006; -007  
178-191-001; -002; -004; -015 |
|---|---|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Acreage of Project Site</th>
<th>24.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing General Plan Land Use Designation(s)</th>
<th>Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) allows up 8 units per acre (single family home community) &amp; High Density Residential allows up to 14 units per acre (townhome community)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Existing Zoning Classification(s) | PUD-02 |
BACKGROUND.

Approved Emerald Ridge North & South. In 2017, the City Council approved the Emerald Ridge residential community (MA15072 & MA15148) in the Belltown area (see Exhibit B). The approval consists of a total of 281 single-family lots and 118 condominium units on approximately 68 acres of land.

The majority of the project site was zoned for industrial use which would allow for incompatible and undesirable uses within the existing residential community. With the approval of Emerald Ridge, the City Council changed the land use designations and zones for residential use. A summary of the approved entitlements is listed below:

- **APPROVED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA15004):** Changed from Light Industrial (LI) to Medium Density Residential (MDR), Medium High Density Residential (MDHR), and High Density Residential (HDR)

- **APPROVED CHANGE OF ZONE (CZ15003):** Changed from Light Agriculture (A-1), Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC), and One-Family Dwellings (R-1) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) -02 Zone

- **APPROVED TENTATIVE TRACT MAPS (TTM):**
  - **Emerald Ridge North (TTM36947):** 184 single-family lots on approximately 43 acres west of Canal Street
  - **Emerald Ridge South (TTM36948):** 97 single-family lots and 118 condominium units on approximately 24 acres east of Canal Street.

EXHIBIT B. APPROVED EMERALD RIDGE PROJECT SITE (399 UNITS)
Comparison between Approved and Proposed Emerald Ridge South. Instead of constructing the approved Emerald Ridge South (TTM36948) as it was approved, the applicant has proposed a new tentative tract map with the following differences:

- Consolidating amenities to the center of the community;
- Townhomes, instead of condominiums, which allows for the ownership of both the lot and townhome; condominiums only allow for the ownership of the airspace and common ownership of the condominium lot;
- Changing the design of the single-family community from alley-loaded homes to homes with garages located in the front yard
- Architectural styles and floor plans
- Additional enhancements to most of the access points of the tract

2018 Planning Commission Work Session

In September 2018, the Planning Commission held a work session. The staff introduced this project and provided a background on the approved Emerald Ridge South. The Planning Commission provided feedback to the applicant which included the following:

1. The consolidation of the amenities and open space areas to the center of the tract is good.
2. The architectural styles / elevations should be revised to provide higher quality and design
3. Consider traffic calming street improvement for the single-family community within the project site

2019 Planning Commission Work Session

In January 2019, the Planning Commission held a follow-up work session. The staff provided a presentation of how the applicant considered and addressed the Planning Commission's feedback. Table 3 presents a summary of the Planning Commission's feedback and the applicant’s responses to the feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3. APPLICANT’S RESPONSES TO PLANNING COMMISSION FEEDBACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The consolidation of the amenities and open space areas to the center of the tract is good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The architectural styles / elevations should be revised to provide higher quality and design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider traffic calming street improvement(s) for the single-family community within the project site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The applicant clarified some of the Planning Commission’s questions on the following topics:

- Gated community
- Potential Home Prices

At the conclusion of the 2019 work session, the Planning Commission was satisfied with the revised architectural styles, amenities, and landscaping.

**ANALYSIS**

I. **PROJECT DESIGN & MAINTENANCE.**

A. **Project Design Overall.** The tentative tract map consists of two neighborhoods that are connected by a 1.5-acre park named Central Park. Because there are privately-owned common areas (such as private streets, amenities, open space areas), the community must be gated to secure them. The previously approved Emerald Ridge South was also gated and had these commonly owned areas and amenities.

The 97 single-family lots are located at the north portion of the project site so it is adjacent to the existing single-family neighborhood. The 118 townhomes are located at the southern portion of the tract map along the future extension of Avalon Street that will abut State Route 60. The entire tract is surrounded by landscaped areas.

The project provides multiple amenities in Central Park for all of the residents to use:

- Children’s play area or playground
- Dog park
- Full Basketball Court
- Pool and spa with shaded areas and restrooms
- Paseos and walkways
- Picnic and BBQ areas
- Open space for passive use

B. **Circulation.** There are three access points to the tract via Avalon Street. The north access point is at 30th Street and Avalon Street and is the access point for the single-family home community. As opposed to the original approved design of this access point, the applicant is proposing to enhance the internal street, Street M, by providing additional landscaping and locating a pocket park at the end of the street (as opposed to a home). Additionally, as a condition of approval, the applicant will enhance 30th Street (public street) by providing sidewalks and landscaping. The combination of the nice streetscape of the internal and public streets will be a great benefit to the community and the residents.

The south access point is located close to Canal Street and is the access point for the townhome community. It is off of the new Avalon extension which will be connected to Canal Street. No change to the design of this entrance.
The main access point, Street H, is located near the middle of the tract. This main entrance to the tract was originally approved with parking spaces at the entrance. The applicant has proposed to replace the parking spaces with a large landscaped area with a monument sign. It is more welcoming and appealing.

C. Architecture & Floor Plans. The proposed architectural styles and floor plans are in the proposed Amendment to the approved PUD-02 Development Plan.

- **Single-Family Homes.** The original approval for this community was to provide the character of a more traditional neighborhood. In order to create a more walkable neighborhood, the homes with porches were located closer to the sidewalk; garages located next to the alleys; streets are narrower; and the blocks are shorter. The homes did not have backyards. Instead, garages were located at the rear of the homes along the alleys.

The applicant has proposed to slightly change the character of the neighborhood to a more typical suburban neighborhood with garages in the front yard. Because the garages will be located in the front yards, the residents will have backyards to enjoy. Furthermore, the lots are larger than the original approval because of the elimination of the alleys.

Per staff’s recommended condition of approval, the front entry garages will be setback 20 feet from the street, leaving enough space in the driveway that vehicles will not block the sidewalk. Also the emphasis will be the home at the sidewalk. The front door will be located facing the street with direct access to the sidewalk.

Because the community is designed to be a walkable neighborhood, the homes are proposed to close to the property line. In an effort to reduce the presence of two-story home close to the sidewalk, the applicant has proposed architecture styles and guidelines that encourage the second story to be setback from the first story.

Furthermore, instead of having all the garages face the street, the applicant has proposed approximately 1/3 of the single-family homes to have side-entry garages. These garages can be setback 10 feet from the street since the view of the garage is not shown to the street. In order to provide side-entry garages on small lots, the applicant has proposed shared driveways.

The proposed floor plans provide for 3 bedrooms and 3 bathrooms. Table 4 presents the details of the floor plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF FLOOR PLAN DETAILS FOR SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Townhomes.** The overall design of the townhome neighborhood has not changed as the homes face a landscaped area or a green belt and the garages are located at the rear facing a street. There are guest parking spaces located throughout the community. The main change is the enhanced architectural style, reminiscent of Spanish Revival, and type of floor plans. The applicant is proposing three floor plans: four-unit, six-unit, and eight-unit buildings. The original approval had five floor plans ranging between two-unit and eight-units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Floor Plan</th>
<th>Total Area (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Bathrooms</th>
<th>Stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Walls & Fences.** The proposed walls and fences are similar to the original approval. The townhome community is visible from the street. A proposed 6-foot high black tubular fence with split-face columns is proposed to be located along Canal Street and southern portion of Avalon Street.

For the single-family home community, the staff is recommending a condition of approval that would require a combination of a solid wall and an open view fence on top of the wall along Avalon Street. The intent is to prevent a high wall along Avalon Street since the single-family home community will be about five feet higher than Avalon Street and the existing homes on Avalon Street.

The requirement would be for a 42-inch high split-faced block wall with split-faced pilasters and a 30-inch high open tubular steel fence instead of a 6-foot high block wall. The combination wall will provide privacy to the residents in their backyards and will not present a closed community.

For the interior fence (not in public view) of the single-family lots along the side and rear lot lines, the applicant has proposed vinyl fence. The original proposal is also vinyl fence.

**E. Maintenance of Project.** Table 5, Maintenance, presents a summary of the maintenance information. The recodation of Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions (CC & Rs) and the formation of a Homeowner’s Association (HOA) are required for this project for the maintenance of all privately owned common areas. Additionally, Community Facilities District (CFD) or Lighting & Landscape Maintenance District (L&LMD) is required to be formed for the maintenance the public rights-of-way.
II. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA). The City of Jurupa Valley has previously adopted an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Project. The City has prepared a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination 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.).

The document has been prepared to determine if the Proposed Project is within the scope of the analysis contained in the EIR adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2017-15 on May 18, 2017, and to ensure the Proposed Project does not create new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously analyzed impacts as compared to those identified previously.

On the basis of the evaluation in the Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR, pursuant to all applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures are imposed upon the Proposed Project. Nothing further is required.

III. GENERAL PLAN. The project has two land use designations: Medium High Density Residential and High Density Residential. The applicant has not changed the total number of units for the project.

The single-family lot community is Medium High Density Residential which allows up to 8 dwelling units per acre. The proposed density is 7.5 dwelling units per acre. The townhome community is High Density Residential, which allows up to 14 dwelling units per acre. The proposed density is 9.9 dwelling units per acre. The project meets the intent, characteristics and policies of the land use designations.

IV. TITLE 9 ZONING ORDINANCE.

A. PUD-02 ZONE. The tract meets the applicable provisions of the PUD-02 zone. Table 6 presents a summary of the applicable standards.
TABLE 6. PUD-02 ZONE’S APPLICABLE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>Does the Project Comply?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE-FAMILY LOTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area: 2,300 square-feet</td>
<td>Yes – as shown on the TTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width: 40 feet</td>
<td>Yes – as shown on the TTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Depth: 60 feet</td>
<td>Yes – as shown on the TTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Frontage on cul-de-sacs &amp; knuckles: 25 feet</td>
<td>Yes – as shown on the TTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Ground Floor Living Area: 644 square-feet</td>
<td>Yes – as shown on the floor plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWNHOME LOTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area: 1,200 square-feet</td>
<td>Yes – as shown on the TTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width: 20 feet</td>
<td>Yes – as shown on the TTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Depth: 60 feet</td>
<td>Yes – as shown on the TTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Floor Living Area: 1,300 square-feet</td>
<td>Yes – as shown on the floor plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. AMENDMENT TO PUD-02 DEVELOPMENT PLAN. Prior to any request for amendments, a “Final Development Plan” that is in substantial conformance with the original approval must be approved by the Planning Director. This requirement has been completed. Planning Director has approved a Final Development Plan that is in substantial conformance with the original approval.

For the proposed Amendment to the PUD-02 Development Plan, the applicant has proposed the following changes to the Development Plan:

- architectural style
- floor plans
- landscape treatment
- requirements for townhomes

The staff has reviewed the proposed changes and do not have any concern for the changes. The architectural style and floor plans are aesthetically pleasing. The landscape plans was modified to reflect the proposed consolidation of open space area and proposed landscape enhancements to the two entry ways into the tract. References of condominiums have been changed to townhomes.

V. TITLE 7 SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE. The tentative tract map, Schedule “A”, complies with the all applicable provisions of Title 7 and the Subdivision Map Act for standards and process with the exception to Section 7.10.080 (C). Engineering Department has reviewed the project for access, circulation, grading, and drainage. Staff is recommending the attached conditions which address areas such as subdivision, circulation, access, grading, drainage, and water quality.
The exception would allow the townhome lots to have lots depth greater than 2.5 times than the lot width. It is slightly greater than allowed by 2.5 feet to 8 feet. The greater depth allows for several feet of green space in the front yard.

The topography and existing road alignment and width influence the design of the townhome lots, location of amenities, and the internal circulation. The irregularly shaped project site is created by Avalon Street, including the extension along SR-60, and Canal Street.

The granting of the exception to have a great lot depth than the maximum will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare or be damaging to other property in the vicinity. The slightly larger lot depth will provide more yard space.

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

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

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

The project is consistent with the general plan. The single-family lot community is Medium High Density Residential which allows up to 8 dwelling units. The proposed density is 7.5. The townhome community is High Density Residential which up to 14 dwelling units per acre. The proposed density is 9.9.

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

The proposed design of the subdivision with improvements is consistent with the General Plan including the characteristics and allowed densities. There is no specific plan for the project site.

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

The site is physically suitable for the development as designed.

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

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

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

The project will not cause any substantial environmental damage or impacts to wildlife and their habitats with recommended conditions and adopted mitigation measures, including Mitigation Measures Bio-1 through Bio-3, from the previously certified Environmental Impact Report under MA15072 and MA15148. It will reduce potential impacts to any sensitive species on the project site and reduce direct and indirect impacts to the West Riverside Canal and any downtown riparian habitat. Staff has prepared a Previous Environmental Determination Document for this project. The document is attached to this staff report.
F. That the design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements are likely to cause serious public health problems.

It will not cause serious public health problems. The project will not be a danger to the welfare of the general public as it is a residential community in a residential neighborhood.

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

This project provides increased access to other areas of the community by extending Avalon Street and other street improvements.

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

Staff has prepared a Previous Environmental Determination Document for this project. The document is attached to this staff report. A Final EIR has been previously prepared and certified.

**CONCLUSION**

This project will bring quality housing and street improvements to this existing older neighborhood. The project would develop an irregularly-shaped project site and complete the vacant area in this neighborhood. For these reasons and the findings, the staff recommends approval of the project.

*Prepared by:*

Annette Tam
Senior Planner

*Submitted by:*

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director
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2. Tentative Tract Map No. 37640
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ATTACHMENT NO. 1

Resolution No. 2019-02-13-04
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-02-13-04

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY APPROVING AN EXCEPTION TO SECTION 7.10.080.C. OF THE JURUPA VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 37640 TO PERMIT A SCHEDULE “A” SUBDIVISION OF APPROXIMATELY 24.9 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED SOUTH OF KENWOOD PLACE, EAST OF CANAL STREET, WEST OF AVALON STREET, AND NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60 (APNS: 179-060-004, -006, -007; AND 178-191-001, -002, -004, AND -015) INTO 97 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS AND 118 TOWNHOMES WITH COMMON AREA LOTS AND PRIVATE STREETS, APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO PUD-02 DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND DETERMINING NO FURTHER CEQA REVIEW REQUIRED

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

Section 1. Project. Jurupa Valley, LLC (the “Applicant”) has applied for an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37640, and Amendment No. 1 to PUD-02 Development Plan (collectively, Master Application No. 18141 or MA No. 18141) to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 24.9 acres into ninety-seven (97) single-family residential lots and one hundred eighteen (118) townhomes with common area lots and private streets on real property located south of Kenwood Place, east of Canal Street, west of Avalon Street, and north of State Route 60 (APNs: 179-060-004, -006, -007; and 178-191-001, -002, -004, and -015) in the Planned Unit Development (PUD) -02 Zone and designated Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) and High Density Residential (HDR) (the “Project”).

Section 2. Exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(a) Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code states, in part: “When lots eighteen thousand (18,000) square feet or less are proposed, the depth of lots shall not exceed two and one-half (2½) times the width.”

(b) The Applicant is seeking approval of an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code for the depth of the townhome lots in the proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37640 to exceed 2½ times the width.

(c) Section 7.10.010.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code states that “[e]xceptions from the requirements of this title [7] relating to the design or improvement of land divisions shall be granted by the appropriate advisory agency or appeal board only when it is determined that there are special circumstances applicable to the property, such as but not limited
to size, shape or topographical conditions, or existing road alignment and width, and that the granting of the modification will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare or be damaging to other property in the vicinity.”

Section 3. **Tentative Tract Map.**

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37640, a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 24.9 acres into ninety-seven (97) single-family residential lots and one hundred eighteen (118) townhomes with common area lots and private streets on real property located south of Kenwood Place, east of Canal Street, west of Avalon Street, and north of State Route 60 (APNs: 179-060-004, -006, -007; and 178-191-001, -002, -004, and -015) in the Planned Unit Development (PUD) -02 Zone.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 4. Amendment to Final Development Plan.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Amendment No. 1 to PUD-02 Development Plan to change the architectural styles, floor plans, and landscape treatment of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) -02 Zone. The proposed Amended PUD-02 Development Plan, attached as Attachment No. 2.b. to the February 13, 2019 Planning Commission staff report for Agenda Item No. 6.2, is on file with the Planning Department and incorporated herein by this reference.

(b) Section 9.238.090.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that an applicant must submit a final development plan to the Planning Director prior to development, which final development plan must substantially conform to the approved development plan.

(c) On February 7, 2019], the Applicant submitted a Final PUD-02 Development Plan that substantially conformed to the PUD-02 Development Plan approved by the City Council on May 18, 2017.

(d) Section 9.238.090.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the Planning Commission may approve written requests for amendments to a final development
plan after a public hearing, notice of which has been given as provided in Section 9.240.250(3), and provided the amendments: (1) are limited to changes in the size and position of buildings, the number, area or configuration of lots, landscape treatment, phasing, or other minor adjustments; and (2) do not include changes in proposed use, overall density or overall configuration of the land uses and circulation features.

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

(a) The application for MA No. 18141 was processed including, but not limited to, a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

(b) On February 13, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 18141, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing.

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

Section 6. **California Environmental Quality Act Findings.** The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby makes the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Project:

(a) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and the City’s local CEQA Guidelines, City staff has considered the potential environmental impacts of MA No. 18141. City staff has also reviewed the Initial Study and the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) prepared for MA Nos. 15072 and 15148 and approved by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on May 18, 2017, including the impacts and mitigation measures identified therein, and prepared a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, attached hereto as Exhibit “B,” in accordance with CEQA for the Project. Based on that review, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department has determined that the Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR prepared for MA Nos. 15072 and 15148. All potential environmental impacts associated with MA Nos. 15072, 15148, and 18141 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for MA Nos. 15072 and 15148, and the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR will reduce certain impacts to a level that is less than significant.

(b) The Planning Commission has independently reviewed the Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, and based upon the whole record before it, the Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, and its independent review and judgment, finds that that the Project, as modified, is not subject to further environmental review pursuant to the Guidelines because:

1) The Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental
effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR prepared for MA Nos. 15072 and 15148; and

2) All potential environmental impacts associated with MA Nos. 15072, 15148, and 18141 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for MA Nos. 15072 and 15148, and the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR will reduce certain impacts to a level that is less than significant.

(c) The custodian of records for the Final EIR prepared for MA Nos. 15072 and 15148, and all other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Planning Commission’s action is based, is the Planning Department of the City of Jurupa Valley. Those documents are available for public review in the Planning Department located at 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509.

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

(a) There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property, such as, but not limited to, size, shape or topographical conditions, or existing road alignment and width, in that The topography and existing road alignment and width influence the design of the townhome lots, location of amenities, and the internal circulation. The irregularly shaped project site is created by Avalon Street, including the extension along SR-60, and Canal Street.

(b) The granting of the modification will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or be damaging to other property in the vicinity, in that the slightly larger lot depth will provide more yard space.

Section 8. Findings for Approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37640. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37640 should be granted because:

(a) The proposed land division will be consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan. The single-family residential lots are designated MHDR, which allows up to eight (8) dwelling units per acre. The land division is proposing a density of 7.5 dwelling units per acre. The townhome lots are designated HDR, which allows up to fourteen (14) dwelling units per acre. The land division is proposing a density of 9.9 dwelling units per acre.

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

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

(e) The design of the proposed land division and proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat with the imposition of the recommended conditions of approval and the mitigation measures imposed under the previously certified Final EIR for MA Nos. 15072 and 15148, including Mitigation Measures Bio-1 through Bio-3. The design of the proposed land division and proposed improvements will reduce potential impacts to any sensitive species on the project site and reduce direct and indirect impacts to the West Riverside Canal and any downtown riparian habitat.

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

(g) The design of the proposed land division and the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed land division. The Project provides increased access to other areas of the community by extending Avalon Street and other street improvements.

Section 9. Approval of Exception, Tentative Tract Map, Development Plan Amendment with Conditions. Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission hereby approves an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37640, and Amendment No. 1 to PUD-02 Development Plan to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 24.9 acres into ninety-seven (97) single-family residential lots and one hundred eighteen (118) townhomes with common area lots and private streets on real property located south of Kenwood Place, east of Canal Street, west of Avalon Street, and north of State Route 60 (APNs: 179-060-004, -006, -007; and 178-191-001, -002, -004, and -015) in the Planned Unit Development (PUD) -02 Zone and designated Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) and High Density Residential (HDR), subject to the recommended conditions of approval attached hereto as Exhibit “A.”

Section 10. Certification. The Planning Director shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 13th day of February, 2019.

Corey Moore
Chair of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission
ATTEST:

_______________________________

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

I, Thomas Merrell, Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-02-13-04 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 13th day of February, 2019, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

NOES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

____________________________________  
THOMAS G. MERRELL  
PLANNING DIRECTOR
EXHIBIT A OF ATTACHMENT NO. 1

Conditions
1. **PROJECT PERMITTED.** MA18141 (TTM37640 with exception to Section 7.10.080.C of Title 7 and Amendment No. 1 to PUD-02 Development Plan) are for the approval for “Emerald Ridge South.”

   Tentative Tract Map No. 37640 with exception to Section 7.10.080.C of Title 7 allows for the subdivision of approximately 24.9 acres of vacant land into 97 single-family lots, 118 lots for townhomes, and common lots as shown on the approved map.

   Amendment No. 1 to PUD-02 Development Plan allowed for changes to the landscape treatment, amenities, floor plans, and architectural styles.

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

3. **CONSENT TO CONDITIONS.** Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to the required conditions of approval to the Planning Director or designee.

4. **MITIGATION MEASURES.**

   a) This project shall be subject to the mitigation measures in the previously adopted environmental impact report (EIR) prepared for the project and included with these conditions of approval.
b) Suspect Soil Removal Plan of MM-HAZ-1. The required suspect soil removal plan of MM-HAZ-1 shall include testing and it shall meet ASTM Standard Practice for Phase II Environmental Site Assessment.

5. FEES. The approval of MA18141 (TTM37640 & Amendment No. 1 to PUD-02 Development Plan) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

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

7. CONFORMANCE TO APPROVED EXHIBITS. The project shall be in conformance to the approved plans (listed below) with changes in accordance to these conditions of approval:
   a) Tentative Tract Map No. 37640 (Emerald Ridge South)
   b) PUD-02 Development Plan - Amendment No. 1

8. INCORPORATE CONDITIONS. Prior to the issuance of any building permit for the Emerald Ridge PUD-02 Development project, the applicant 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. 30TH STREET ENHANCED PROJECT ENTRY. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a street beautification and landscape plan for 30th Street shall be submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer and Planning Director. Said plan shall provide for street trees planted at 30 feet apart with extensive landscape, new sidewalks adjacent to the right-of-way, and street pavement rehabilitation. Improvements shall be completed prior to the first Certificate of Occupancy of Emerald Ridge South.

10. PUD-02 DEVELOPMENT PLAN SUBMITTAL. Prior to the issuance of any grading permit for the Emerald Ridge PUD-02 Development project, the applicant shall submit a Site Development Permit for the Director’s review and approval of the Development Plan to include following:

   Wall & Fence.
   1. A solid wall along Avalon Street shall not exceed 42 inches in height so the residents on the east side of Avalon Street will not be facing a tall wall. There shall be landscaping along Avalon Street that will soften the solid wall. The Wall and Fence Plan shall be revised to include a combination of a 42-high split-faced block wall with a 30-inch high open view fence on top along the rear lot line of Lots 198 – 214.
   2. All walls and fences shall be located at the top of the slope.

11. SDP APPROVAL FOR ARCHITECTURE & FLOOR PLANS. The architecture and floor plan for this tract shall be consistent, in quality and aesthetics, with the PUD-02 Development Plan.
Prior to the issuance of the first Building permit for a unit, a Site Development Permit (SDP) shall be submitted for the review and approval of plotting plan, architectural styles, and floor plans by the Planning Director.

The Plotting Plan shall include, at minimum, the following information:

- Location of each unit
- Setbacks of each unit
- Identify the proposed floor plan and elevation

All units must meet the requirements of the Amended PUD-02 Development Plan and these conditions.

Any single-family home with a garage that faces the street shall be setback 20 feet, as oppose to the 10 feet minimum requirement from the PUD-02 Development Plan, from the front property line.

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

13. SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES WITH SIDE-ENTRY GARAGES. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a Plotting Plan for the review and approval of the Planning Director. The Plotting Plan shall include the location of each unit and setbacks for the entire tract. Thirty-two single-family lots shall have single-family units with side-entry garages.

14. CC & RS – DISCLOSURE OF POSSIBLE IMPACTS FROM UNION PACIFIC. The required Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions (CC & Rs) set forth and required in the PUD-02 Development Plan shall include a notice to all property owners within the Emerald Ridge project disclosing possible noise and vibration impacts from the trains traveling between Emerald Ridge North and South.

15. AMENITIES & MAIN ACCESS. Prior to the issuance of the first (1st) Certificate of Occupancy for TTM37640 (Emerald Ridge South), the following amenities and access to amenities associate with TTM 37640 shall be constructed and completed:

   a) “Central Park” (Lot OS-B) with the amenities and ancillary parking
   b) Monument Sign
   c) Street “H” (Access from Avalon Street)

16. IMPACT FEES. Notwithstanding the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), the applicant shall the pay the following impact fees (unless exempt) in accordance to 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.

17. 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.

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

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

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

1. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (ENGINEERING)

1.1. TTM 37640 provides revisions to the previously approved TTM 36948 for Emerald Ridge (South). Previous conditions on approved resolution shall remain valid.

1.2. The use hereby conditioned is for Tentative Tract Map No. 37640 being a subdivision of:

APN 179-060-004, APN 179-060-006, and APN 179-060-007, Lot 5, Lot 6, Lot 7 of Arthur Parks Tract, Book 1 Page 21 of Maps, Records of Riverside County,

APN 178-191-001, Lot 2 in Blk 10 of Map of West Riverside, Book 9 Page 34 of Maps, Records of San Bernardino County,

APN 178-191-002, Lot 2 in Blk 10 of Map of West Riverside, Book 9 Page 34 of Maps, Records of San Bernardino County, Excepting those portion lying within “A” Street (Avalon Street) and Canal Street;

APN 178-191-004, Lot 4 in Blk 24, and the Northeasterly 47 feet of Lot 2 in Blk 10, Map of West Riverside, Book 9 Page 34 of Maps, Records of San Bernardino County, Excepting the Northeasterly 559.88 feet of Lot 4, Also Excepting those portions lying within “A” Street (Avalon Street) and Canal Street;
and 178-191-015, Lot 2 in Blk 10, Lot 4 in Blk 24, Map of West Riverside, Book 9 Page 34 of Maps, Records of San Bernardino County, Excepting any portion lying within “A” Street (Avalon Street); consisting of approximately 25 acres, 118 townhome lots, 97 single family residences for a total of 215 numbered lots, and 16 open space lettered lots for TTM 37640. Tentative Tract Map No. 37640 prepared by West Land Group, Inc. dated October 2018.

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

1.4. The project discharges into an existing basin southeast of the site owned by Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District (RCFC&WCD). An updated hydrology study and Water Quality Management Plan is required to be submitted for RCFC&WCD’s review and approval.

1.5. 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.

2. PRIOR TO GRAADING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)
GRADING AND DRAINAGE

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

2.2. Onsite runoff is to be addressed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

2.3. Developer shall prepare preliminary street improvement plans for Canal Street and Avalon Street to include at minimum the line and grade of the curb and gutter along the project frontage for review and concurrence of the City Engineer.

2.4. Prior to approval of the grading plan, the Developer shall prepare a detailed hydrology and hydraulics report corresponding with the detailed plans for grading, site development and street improvements for approval of the City Engineer.

2.5. A preliminary drainage study dated March 2016 was reviewed. An updated hydrology study is required to be submitted and approved by the Engineering Department prior to approval of any plans.

3. PRIOR TO MAP RECORDATION (ENGINEERING)
FINAL MAP

3.1. No Final Map shall be recorded until the Tentative Tract Map (TTM), Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs), including the necessary Home Owners
Association(s) (HOA); and Community Facilities District(s) (CFD) and/or Lighting & Landscape Maintenance District (LLMD), if any, associated with this subdivision are approved.

3.2. Phased units will be permitted with the City’s further consideration of the phase designations and limits.

3.3. Lot access shall be restricted along the public rights-of-way. On the Final Map, the Owner shall dedicate abutter’s right of access along Canal Street, Avalon Street, and 28th Street, with the exception of access points as shown on the site plan exhibit and as approved by the City Engineer.

3.4. Canal Street along and beyond the project boundary is a paved city maintained street. Owner shall implement the following:

3.4.1. Street improvements shall be per Standard No. 107A, Collector Frontage Road modified as approved by the City Engineer. The roadway cross section shall include a 10-foot wide painted eastbound left-turn lane at the Canal Street/Avalon Street intersection and 1 travel lane in each direction. A “no stopping” restriction will be imposed on both sides adjacent to and with Tract No. 37640, or as determined by the City Engineer.

3.4.2. Dedicate half-width right-of-way for public street and utility purposes for Avalon Street. Avalon Street shall be developed with an ultimate right of way width of 74 feet to the west, starting at the southerly right of way width of the railroad and laying out the width to the south.

3.4.3. Existing Canal Street (between the easterly boundary of TTM 36947 and the westerly boundary of TTM 37640 and Kenwood Place) shall be vacated on the Final Map(s) as shown in Exhibit 1 that is made a part of Condition No. 3.4.3 “Limits of Abandonment.”

CONDITION NO. 3.4.3: EXHIBIT 1 “LIMITS OF ABANDONMENT”
3.4.4. An easement shall be reserved for public utility purposes, including SAWPA, over existing Canal Street between the limits of the vacated Canal Street.

3.4.5 An access road or alternative path for maintenance shall be provided to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and SAWPA between over this easement between Alta Drive and Kenwood Place.

3.5. Avalon Street along the project boundary shall be dedicated as a public street, with a right-of-way width of 80 feet (between "H" Street and Kenwood Place of TTM 37640), and a right-of-way width of 74 feet westerly of "H" Street.

3.5.1. Street improvements shall be per Standard No. 103, Collector Street, and Standard No. 107A, Collector Frontage Road modified as approved by the City Engineer. The roadway cross section shall include a 10-foot wide painted left-turn lane at the Tract driveways and 1 travel lane in each direction. A "no stopping" restriction will be imposed on both sides in the vicinity of the driveways and along the Frontage Road section of the roadway. Additional traffic lanes and right-of-way width may be required at intersections as determined by the City Engineer. The Developer shall at the time of construction improve all legs of all intersections with 30th Street to the limits of the curb returns.

3.6. In-tract streets within TTM 37640 shall be private streets and designed to meet federal and local standards and will require approval by the City Engineer.

3.6.1. All in-tract streets shall be privately maintained.

3.6.2. An easement for public utility purposes shall be dedicated on all in-tract streets.
3.6.3. When street parking is proposed:
   3.6.3.1. On one side of the street: 8-ft minimum.
   3.6.3.2. On both sides of the street: 8-ft minimum parking space. 20-ft wide minimum travel way width.

3.7. Alta Street between Avalon Street and Canal Street shall be vacated on the Final Map as shown in the “Limits of Abandonment” exhibit on Tentative Tract Map No. 37640.
   3.7.1. An easement shall be reserved for public utility purposes within the limits of the vacated Alta Street.

IMPROVEMENT PLANS

3.8. The applicant shall provide improvement plans for the required improvements for Canal Street, Avalon Street, 28th Street, and all other public streets within this project. All Improvement Plans are subject to detail review and approval by the City Engineer. Improvements shall include:
   3.8.1. Construction of roadway; curb and gutter, AC pavement, and street lighting.
   3.8.2. Parkway and landscaping in enhanced parkway. Parkway improvements shall include sidewalk compliant with current ADA standards.
   3.8.3. PCC sidewalk per Riverside County standard 401.
   3.8.4. PCC driveway approaches per County Standard No. 207A for commercial and 207 for residential approaches.

3.9. The Developer shall be responsible for any match up asphalt concrete (AC) paving, and reconstruction or resurfacing of existing paving as determined by the City Engineer.

3.10. Separate traffic signing, striping and pavement marking plans for the required improvements shall be prepared based on extending a minimum of 300 feet beyond the project limits, or the limits of work necessary to join existing improvements. The Developer shall be responsible for any additional paving and/or removal of existing striping that might be required by the approved plan. The geometric improvements listed in Table A of these conditions shall be included on the plans.
   Note: 1) Any offsite roadway widening required to provide the above geometrics shall be the responsibility of the Developer, or as approved by the City Engineer.

3.11. Separate streetlight plans shall be prepared for the frontage of the project for approval of the City Engineer. LED luminaires shall be provided with lighting performance equivalent to that required per County standards for HPS type.

3.12. For landscaping within public road rights-of-way, separate landscape and irrigation plans shall be provided for review and approval by the City Engineer.
   If landscaping maintenance (and/or trails) is to be included in a Community Facilities District (CFD) or Landscaping and Lighting Maintenance District
(LLMD), landscaping plans shall depict ONLY such landscaping, irrigation and related facilities as are to be placed within the public rights-of-way.

3.13. Developer shall design other various and miscellaneous improvements as shown on the final map, per City standards at various locations shown on the final map, and in accordance with the Table A of these conditions, not otherwise included in the fair share payments.

3.14. Developer shall, at no expense to the City, obtain dedications for all off-site right-of-way to construct improvements as shown on final map and Table A, not otherwise included in fair share payments. The dedication documents shall be recorded concurrent with recordation of the Final (Tract) Map and, where applicable, recording data shall be shown on the final map.

3.15. Prior to issuance of the first building unit permit, a Site Development Traffic Management Plan (SDTMP) shall be submitted the City Engineer and Planning Director for approval. The SDTMP shall include, but not be limited to, approved routes for site development construction traffic to access the construction site, appropriate points of ingress/egress to the site, and staging areas. Approval of such plan may include restrictions, requirements and conditions to mitigate related impacts as determined by the City Engineer and Planning Director.

L&LMD, CFD AND SPECIAL DISTRICTS

3.16. The Developer shall form, or annex to, if one already exists, a Community Facilities District (CFD) for operation and maintenance purposes of various improvements in the public right-of-way, as approved by the City Engineer. The formation or annexation to a CFD shall be in a manner approved by the City Engineer and City Attorney.

3.17. If a City-wide Community Facilities District (CFD) exists for City Public Safety Services, the Developer shall annex into the City-wide Community Facilities District (CFD) in order to provide funding for City Public Safety Services. The annexation to a City-wide CFD for Public Safety Services shall be in a manner approved by the City Engineer and City Attorney.

UTILITIES

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

Necessary easements for sewer and water systems on-site, as determined by RCSD, shall be shown on the Final Map “to be dedicated by separate instrument”.

4. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF PERMIT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS (ENGINEERING)

4.1. All applicable required environmental mitigation measures shall be satisfied in accordance with the Environmental Impact Report.

4.2. A Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) shall be submitted to the City
Engineer and Planning Director for approval. The CTMP shall include, but not be limited to, approved routes for construction traffic to access the construction area, construction hours, staging areas, and appropriate points of ingress/egress to that area.

5. PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION

5.1. The street lights shall be fully operational.

5.2. Developer shall pay a fair-share amount of $2,200 per single-family residential (SFR) dwelling unit toward mitigation of various intersection and roadway segment improvements as listed in Table A that is included with these conditions.

5.3. Prior to the issuance of the first (1st) Certificate of Occupancy of Final Map of TTM37640 (Emerald Ridge South):

5.3.1. Full improvements for Avalon Street extension, including parkways, to Canal Street (westerly project limits).

5.4. Prior to the issuance of the first (1st) Certificate of Occupancy of a Townhome Unit of TR37640, the following amenities and access to amenities shall be constructed and completed: tot lots, open space, community plaza, and dog park.

5.5. Prior to the issuance of the first (1st) Certificate of Occupancy of TTM37640 (Emerald Ridge South), the following amenities and access to amenities associate with TTM 37640 shall be constructed and completed:

5.5.1.1. “Central Park” (Lot OS-B) with the amenities and ancillary parking

5.5.1.2. Monument Sign

5.5.1.3. Street “H” (Access from Avalon Street)

| TABLE A FOR EMERALD RIDGE PUD-02 |
| TTM 37640 (MA18141) |
| INTERSECTION AND ROADWAY SEGMENT GEOMETRY IMPROVEMENT AND MITIGATION LIST |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geometric Modification</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project-Specific Intersection Mitigation for</strong> Emerald Ridge PUD-02 Project MA18141 (TTM 37640)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Avalon Street (NS) and 30th Street (EW)</td>
<td>Modify geometries to provide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>NB</strong>: one shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>SB</strong>: one shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>EB</strong>: one shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>WB</strong>: one shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project-Specific Intersection Mitigation for Emerald Ridge South (MA18141 & TTM 37640)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection of Canal Street (NS) and Avalon Street (EW)</th>
<th>Modify geometries to provide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>NB</strong>: N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>SB</strong>: one left-turn lane, one right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>EB</strong>: one left-turn lane, one through lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>WB</strong>: one through lane, one right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection of Canal Street (NS) and Kenwood Place (EW) (Knuckle)</th>
<th>Install geometries to provide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>NB</strong>: N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>SB</strong>: One left-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>EB</strong>: N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>WB</strong>: One right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection of Avalon Street (NS) and Project Driveway #2 (EW)</th>
<th>Install geometries to provide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>NB</strong>: one left-turn lane, one through lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>SB</strong>: one shared through/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>EB</strong>: one shared left-turn lane/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>WB</strong>: N/A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection of Avalon Street (NS) and Project Driveway #3 (EW)</th>
<th>Install geometries to provide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>NB</strong>: one left-turn lane, one through lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>SB</strong>: one shared through/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>EB</strong>: one shared left-turn lane/right-turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>WB</strong>: N/A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fair-Share Payments for**

Emerald Ridge PUD-02 Project MA18141 (TTM 37640)
| Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (NS) and 30th Street/ SR-60 WB Off-Ramp (EW) | Install geometries to provide:  
| • NB: One left-turn lane, two through lanes.  
| • SB: Two through lanes.  
| • EB: One left-turn lane, one right-turn lane.  
| • WB: Two left-turn lanes, one shared through/right-turn lane. |
| Intersection of Pacific Avenue (NS) and Mission Boulevard (EW) | Install geometries to provide:  
| • NB: One left-turn lane, one through lane, one right-turn lane.  
| • SB: One left-turn lane, one shared through/right-turn lane.  
| • EB: One left-turn lane, two through lanes.  
| • WB: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, one right-turn lane. |
| Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (NS) and Market/20th Street (EW) | Install geometries to provide:  
| • NB: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, one right-turn lane with overlap.  
| • SB: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, one right-turn lane.  
| • EB: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, one right-turn lane.  
| • WB: One left-turn lane, one through lane, one free flow right-turn lane. |

**Fair-Share Payments for Emerald Ridge PUD-02 Project MA18141 (TTM 37640)**

| Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (NS) and SR-60 WB On-Ramp (EW) | Install geometries to provide:  
| • NB: One left-turn lane, two through lanes.  
| • SB: Two through lanes, one right-turn lane.  
| • EB: N/A.  
| • WB: N/A. |
| Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (NS) and SR-60 EB Ramps (EW) | Install geometries to provide:  
| |  
| | • NB: two through lanes, one right-turn lane.  
| | • SB: one left-turn lane, two through lanes.  
| | • EB: one left-turn lane, one right-turn lane.  
| | • WB: one left-turn lane, one right-turn lane.  
| Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (NS) and Mission Boulevard (EW) | Install geometries to provide:  
| |  
| | • NB: one left-turn lane, one shared through/ right-turn lane.  
| | • SB: one left-turn lane, one through lane, one right-turn lane.  
| | • EB: two left-turn lanes, two through lanes.  
| | • WB: one left-turn lane, two through lanes, one right-turn lane.  
| Intersection of Valley Way (NS) and Mission Boulevard (EW) | Install geometries to provide:  
| |  
| | • NB: one left-turn lane, one shared through/ right-turn lane.  
| | • SB: two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, two right-turn lanes with overlap.  
| | • EB: one left-turn lane, two through lanes, one right-turn lane.  
| | • WB: two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, one right-turn lane with overlap.  

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

Applicant’s name (Print Form): __________________________________________

Applicant’s name (Signature): ___________________________________________
Date: ________________
EXHIBIT B OF ATTACHMENT NO. 1

Previous Environmental Document Review Determination
Previous Environmental Document Review Determination

City of Jurupa Valley Master Application 18141

Lead Agency
City of Jurupa Valley
8390 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
Contact: Annette Tam, Senior Planner
(951) 332-6464
atam@jurupavalley.org

Applicant:
Jurupa Valley, LLC
17538 Rowland Street, #218
City of Industry, CA 91748

January 29, 2019
1.0 INTRODUCTION

A. Document Purpose.

This document is a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination 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.).

This document has been prepared to determine if the Proposed Project is within the scope of the analysis contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report, Emerald Ridge Residential Project, SCH #2016041020, ("EIR") certified by the City of Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2017-15 on May 18, 2017, and to ensure the Proposed Project does not create new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously analyzed impacts as compared to those identified previously.

B. Project Location.

North of SR-60, between Canal Street and Avalon Street; and south of Kenwood Place. APNS: 179-060-004; -006; -007; and 178-191-001; -002; -004; -015.

C. Project Description.

Approved Project

In 2017, the City Council approved two tentative tracts (TTM36948 & TTM36947) with other entitlements (GPA, CZ and EIR) on approximately 68 acres of land. The project was called Emerald Ridge. Emerald Ridge South, TTM36948, was approved for 97 single-family lots, 118 condominium units, and several open space lots. Emerald Ridge North, TTM36947, was approved for 184 single-family lots with several open space lots. This tract is located between Rio Vista SP and Canal Street. It is south of 28th Street and north of SR-60.

Proposed Project

The new owner of TTM36948 (Emerald Ridge South) has submitted a new TTM. The main differences between the proposed TTM37640 and the approved TTM36948 are as follows:

- Multi-family Area of the tract: Instead of the 118 condominium units, the applicant has proposed 118 townhomes.

- Single-Family Area of the tract:
  - Internal circulation changes to the single-family portion of the tract;
  - Eliminated the alley-loaded homes and proposed conventional single-family units with garages fronting the street or side-entry garages.
Increased lot size.

- Open Space Area: Combined the open space park and other amenities into one “Central Park” location
- Avalon Street Re-alignment: The applicant proposes a new re-alignment as shown on the TTM.

2.0 USE OF PREVIOUS EIR

The EIR was certified by the City of Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2017-15 on May 18, 2017. The EIR evaluated the above described entitlements.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) allows a previously certified EIR to be used as the environmental assessment for a project if it is determined that the project currently under review is “within the scope” of the earlier EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 (a) which states:

“When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.”
The EIR is on file with the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department (8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509) and is hereby incorporated by reference pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15150.
3.0 DETERMINATION:

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

[Signature]

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director
Printed Name/Title

City of Jurupa Valley
Agency

January 29, 2019
Date
4.0 ANALYSIS

Table 1-1: Summary of Project Impacts of the Draft EIR identified the following environmental issues would be impacted be the Approved Project.

**Air Quality**

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant air quality impacts as follows:

**Impact 4.3-2:** Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Mitigation Measure MM AQ-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Conclusion**

The Project does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. MM AQ-1 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

**Biological Resources**

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to biological resources as follows

**Impact 4.4-1:** May 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. Mitigation Measure MM BIO-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.4-2:** Would the project 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. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-2 and BIO-3 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts.** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Project. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-3 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.
Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (vacant land). The Project does not propose any changes that would impact biological resources than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-3 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Cultural Resources

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to cultural resources as follows:

**Impact 4.5-2:** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 through MM CR-3 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.5-3:** Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Mitigation Measure MM CR-4 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts. Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Project. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 through MM CR-4 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (vacant land). The Project does not propose any changes that would impact cultural resources than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 through MM CR-4 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Geology and Soils

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to geology and soils as follows:
Impact 4.6-1: 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 based on other substantial evidence of as known fault. (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42); strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landslides. Mitigation Measures MM GEO-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts. Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Project. Mitigation Measure MM GEO-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (vacant land). The Project does not propose any changes that would impact geology and soils than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measure MM GEO-1 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials as follows:

Impact 4.8-2: 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. Mitigation Measure MM HAZ-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts: Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Project. Mitigation Measure MM HAZ-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (vacant land). The Project does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.
Land Use and Planning

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to land use and planning as follows:

Impact 4.10-3: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (vacant land). The Project does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measure MM BIO-1 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Noise

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to noise as follows:

Impact 4.12-1: 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. Mitigation Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-5 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts: Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Project. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-5 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM NOI-1 through NOI-5 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.
Transportation/Traffic

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to transportation/traffic as follows:

**Impact 4.16-1:** 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. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through MM TRA-9 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts:** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Project. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through MM TRA-9 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Conclusion**

The Project does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. The trip generation rates are based upon data collected by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The ITE trip generation rates for condominiums and townhomes are the same, so traffic will not be increased by changing the units from condominiums to townhomes. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through TRA-5 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.
ATTACHMENT NO. 3

Amendment to Final Development Plan
Emerald Ridge

Residential Planned Unit Development Zone
PUD-02 Amendment to Development Plan

Case Number: MA15072, MA15148 and MA18141
Tentative Tract Map-36947
Tentative Tract Map-37640

Lead Agency
City of Jurupa Valley
8930 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509

Developer
Jurupa Valley, LLC
17800 Castleton St. Suite 566
City of Industry, CA 91748

Prepared By
Vincent Zou – Project Manager
Allen Compton - Landscape Architecture
Westland Group - Civil Engineering
Creative Design & Associates - Architectural

Revision Date
February 2019
Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION .................................................................................................................. 1
   Project Location .................................................................................................................. 1
   Project Description ............................................................................................................. 1
   Required Project Approvals ............................................................................................. 1
   The Development Plan ....................................................................................................... 4
   Approved Development Plan ............................................................................................ 4
   Intent of the Development Plan ........................................................................................ 5
   City of Jurupa Goals .......................................................................................................... 5
   Emerald Ridge Theme ........................................................................................................ 6
   Emerald Ridge Standards and Guidelines ....................................................................... 6
   Emerald Ridge Permitted Uses & Housing Plan ............................................................... 6
   Section 8.93(a) Calculation: Area Devoted to Each Residential Unit ............................. 7

II. SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES ........................................... 10
   Residential Standards ....................................................................................................... 10
   Neighborhood I ................................................................................................................. 10
   Neighborhood II ............................................................................................................... 10
   Residential Guidelines .................................................................................................... 13
   Architectural Styles ......................................................................................................... 13
   Form and Massing ............................................................................................................ 13
   Plotting ............................................................................................................................... 14
   Roofs ................................................................................................................................. 14
   Garages ............................................................................................................................... 15
   Windows and Doors ......................................................................................................... 16
   Outdoor Lighting ............................................................................................................... 16
   Mechanical Equipment ..................................................................................................... 16

III. TOWNHOME STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES ........................................................................ 17
   Architectural Style ........................................................................................................... 17
   Townhome Standards ...................................................................................................... 17
   Townhome Guidelines ..................................................................................................... 19
   Massing ............................................................................................................................. 19
   Single Story Elements .................................................................................................... 19
   Entries ............................................................................................................................... 19
   Windows ............................................................................................................................ 20
Balconies

Garages

Guest Parking

Trash Enclosures

IV. LANDSCAPE DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

General Landscape Standards

On-site Landscaping

Required Planting and Irrigation Plan

Slopes

Irrigation

Outdoor Lighting

Landscape Guidelines

Plant Palette

Entry Monuments

Streetscapes

V. WALL AND FENCE PLAN

Masonry Block Wall

Decorative Tubular Steel Perimeter Fencing

Vinyl Privacy Fence

VI. RECREATIONAL AMENITIES AND OPEN SPACE

Pool and Spa

Outdoor Trails and Paseos

Community Park and Passive Parks

Maintenance of Common Areas and Recreational Amenities

VII. APPENDIX A
I. INTRODUCTION

This document, known formally as the Emerald Ridge Development Plan ("Plan"), has been prepared as part of the City of Jurupa’s requirements for the approval of land use entitlements for the Emerald Ridge residential project. The document is part of the entitlement record and provides the vision and direction for the development of the Emerald Ridge neighborhood.

Project Location

The Emerald Ridge project is comprised of two areas generally located in the Northeast section of the City Jurupa of Valley, Riverside County, California. As shown in the Figure I-1, Vicinity Map, the project is situated along both sides of Canal Street, between the State Route 60 Freeway and 28th Street. The project site is currently vacant and abuts beautiful rural hills and an established residential area.

Project Description

The Emerald Ridge residential project involves the subdivision of approximately 69.9 acres of property and the development of approximately 399 high-end single family homes and townhomes. The development includes various landscaped common areas and recreational amenities to provide opportunities for social interaction, healthy outdoor activities, and neighborhood identity.

Required Project Approvals

In order to develop the Emerald Ridge project a series of approvals will need to be obtained from the City of Jurupa. The approvals required for the development of Emerald Ridge include two general plan amendments, two change of zones, and two tentative tract maps. Each of these approvals will accomplish the following:

Emerald Ridge North-Case Number MA 15148

1. The General Plan Amendment (GPA 15004) changes the land use from light industrial to medium density residential (MDR 2-5 du/ac).

2. The approved Change of Zone applications changed the zoning from M-SC, A-1 and R-1 to PUD-02.

3. Tentative Tract Map 36947, located at west of Canal Street, subdivides the property into 184 single-family residential lots and include water quality basins, recreational amenities, open space (including natural, graded, and community open space), as well as roadways and other supporting infrastructure.

Emerald Ridge South-Case Number MA 18141

1. The General Plan Amendment (GPA 15004) changes the land use from light industrial to medium high density residential (MHDR 5-8 du/ac) and high density residential (8-15 du/ac).
2. The Change of Zone (CZ15003) converts the current zoning from Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC), A-1, R-1 to Planned Unit Development zoning (PUD-2).

3. Tentative Tract Map 37640, located east of Canal Street, subdivides the property into 97 single-family residential lots and 118 townhome units, and include water quality basins, various recreational amenities, open space (including natural, graded, and community open space), as well as roadways and other supporting infrastructure.
Figure I-1
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The Development Plan

As previously stated, one of the submittals required to obtain the above mentioned approvals is the preparation of this Plan. The Plan is required as part of the conditions of development and further explained in the City of Jurupa Zoning Ordinance No. 348, Article IIId, Section 8.95 (b), Conditions of Development. The ordinance states that a development plan must conform to the requirements therein, and contain the following minimum information:

1. Location of each existing and each proposed structure in the development area, the use or uses to be contained therein. Typical plans indicating use on a lot may be used.

2. Location of all pedestrian walks, malls, recreation and other open areas for the use of occupants and members of the public.

3. Location and height of all walls, fences and screen planting, including a plan for the landscaping of the development, types of surfacing such as paving, turving, or other landscaping to be used at various locations.

4. Plans and elevations of typical structures to indicate architectural type and construction standards.

Approved Development Plan

Once approved, the final development plan will be required to comply with the following provisions of Ordinance Ordinance No. 2015-12:

17.121b: The applicant shall record the final development plan in accordance with Section 18.30.c (3) of this ordinance. After recording of a final development plan, nonmaterial changes consistent with the purpose or intent of this Section may be approved by the Planning Director.

17.121 Written requests for amendments to the final development plan may be approved by the Planning Commission after a public hearing, notice of which has been given as provided in Section 18.26c.

   (1) Amendments shall be limited to changes in the size and position of buildings; the number, area or configuration of lots; landscape treatment; phasing, and other minor adjustments.

   (2) Amendments shall not include changes in proposed use, overall density or overall configuration of the land uses and circulation features. Amendments to these aspects of an approved final development plan shall be accomplished only by reapplication and submittal of a new preliminary development plan.

17.121e: Material changes affecting the overall design, density or intensity, location, areas devoted to recreational amenities, including parks and open space, purpose or intent of the PUD shall require the filing of a new PUD application.

17.121f: After the PUD is adopted, City staff will consult the PUD’s final development plan and
conditions of approval to determine the site entitlements, and only the adopted final development plan will be allowed on the site, unless either an amended development plan is approved by the Planning Commission or a new development plan is approved by the City Council.

**Intent of the Development Plan**

Through a series of guidelines, standards, and illustrations, this document provides the minimum requirements that must be followed when designing the different housing types and the neighborhood landscaping in the Emerald Ridge neighborhood. The content in the Development Plan is to be used as reference information and visual aids to understand the overall intent of Emerald Ridge’s vision, theme, and its key implementing design elements. An exact re-creation of the graphic representations included in this document is not intended or required. The guidelines and standards merely provide a palette of character, materials, and other defining elements that should be reflected in the construction of the Emerald Ridge community.

Development of the Emerald Ridge residential neighborhood shall substantially conform to the physical characteristics and design concepts set forth in this Plan. The City has the discretion to determine if implementing actions substantially conform to the information contained in the Plan. If any portion of the development does not substantially conform, a formal modification to this Plan may be required as provided for in the City of Jurupa Zoning Ordinance 348, Article XVIII, Section 18.43 Application to Modifications to Approved Permits.

**City of Jurupa Goals**

The City of Jurupa Valley is committed to advancing the quality and visually distinctiveness of residential development that is responsive to the natural and built environment. Based on the Design Strategies outlined in the RCIP and Riverside County General Plan, which have been adopted by the City, it is the City’s desire to advance several specific development goals including:

- Ensure that homes are constructed in neighborhoods that are interesting and varied in appearance
- Utilize building materials and enhanced landscaping to promote a look of quality
- Encourage the efficient use of land and high quality communities that maintain their economic value and desirability as places to live
- Incorporate conveniently located and accessible neighborhood parks, trails, and open space
- Provide functional public access to recreational opportunities in relation to the overall open space system

The Development Guidelines and Standards provided in this document are intended to respond to the above goals and to reflect the City of Jurupa’s vision for the development of new residential communities that are vibrant, desirable to live in, and provide visual and physical variety. The guidelines and standards in this document accomplish these goals by providing a framework of design elements that emphasizes eye-catching housing design that avoids monotony and repetitiveness between adjacent homes.
Emerald Ridge Theme
Because of its adjacent proximity to the Jurupa Hills recreational open space areas, the Emerald Ridge residential development is designed to complement and support the preservation of this significant natural open space, while addressing the City’s residential development goals. As such, the neighborhood theme is a pedestrian friendly neighborhood, encourages social interaction, healthy activities and residential design that is diverse and interesting. It aims to do this by mixing various housing and landscaping design elements, along with various recreational amenities and common spaces that are located throughout the development. Amongst the amenities provided are a community park, tot lots, dog parks, passive parks, paseos with trails, and a swimming pool and spa.

Emerald Ridge Standards and Guidelines
In order to build the Emerald Ridge residential project as envisioned, a set of standards and guidelines have been prepared and are provided in the body of this document. The purpose of these standards and guidelines is to provide the information that is necessary to direct and guide the design of a high quality living environment for the Emerald Ridge residential development. They address the design elements that help achieve the vision and environment that is planned for the projects housing and neighborhood. Through these guidelines, the homes in Emerald ridge will demonstrate individuality, high quality of design and construction, and value-added appeal.

The following pages provide standards, guidelines, floor plans, elevation drawings, and other information needed to understand the design of homes and Townhome in the Emerald Ridge project. A pallet of the most common character-defining elements are addressed, including home plotting, form and massing, roofs, garages, doors and windows, and mechanical subjects such as outdoor lighting and mechanical equipment, etc. It is expected that builders and their architects will prepare architectural building plans that substantially conform to these standards and guidelines, while also applying creativity and innovation in response to housing design trends, homebuyer expectations, and other market conditions. Where design elements are not expressly addressed or design issues arise, the applicable sections of the City of Jurupa’s zoning standards and regulations in effect at the time will be utilized for direction. Standards and guidelines for single-family homes are presented first, followed by those for townhomes.

Prior to the recordation of the final maps of TTM36947 and TTM37640, the applicant shall submit Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) for the Planning Director and City Engineer’s review and approval. The CC&Rs shall include, but not limited to, the provisions relating to the following items:

1. The formation of Home Owner’s Association to own, operate, and maintain common areas including the green belts.
2. Identity common areas and facilities (including private streets, perimeter community wall, pocket parks, landscaped slopes, drainage facilities, parking areas, on-site exterior lighting fixtures, trash enclosures, etc.
3. Shared parking, circulation, and access.
4. Include approved Landscape exhibit.
5. Include approved Maintenance exhibit. Maintenance Plan shall indicate the responsible agency for common areas such as basins, pocket parks, etc.
6. Identity allowed users of the common areas.
7. Maintenance of any on-site community signage in a clean, legible condition at all times. All graffiti and vandalism shall be removed on a regular basis.

8. Any additional item that may be required by the Planning Director or City Engineer.

**Emerald Ridge Permitted Uses & Housing Plan**

Permitted uses for the Emerald Ridge residential project are single-family residential and multi-family residential dwelling types as described in this and other section of this document. The plan for the Emerald Ridge neighborhood is a mix of single family homes and townhomes that are clustered in a pleasantly landscaped neighborhood pattern that is pedestrian friendly and visually appealing. The residential stock will be located in three different areas located above and below Canal Street. These three areas provide a range of home sizes, home styles and floor plans to suit different households.

The Emerald Ridge Site Plan (Figure I – 2) shows the overall scheme of the development. As Illustrated, there are three areas identified as neighborhoods in the site plan. Neighborhood I contain the larger single-family homes with floor plans that range from 1,750 square feet to 2,667 square feet. Neighborhood II also include single-family homes with floor plans that range from 1,817 square feet to 2,251 square feet. Floor plans vary from three to five bedrooms and three bathrooms. Neighborhood III has townhomes with four, six, and eight unit buildings. Townhome floor plans range between 1,507 square feet and 2,159 square feet. Each of these neighborhoods is connected to each other and the surrounding area via a visually appealing landscape framework. Figure I – 3 provides a rendering of the Emerald Ridge project. Floor plans, elevations, and plotting diagrams for the various home models and townhomes are provided in the Appendix A. A Site Development Permit is required for any proposed Residential Home Models and office

**Section 8.93(a) Calculation: Area Devoted to Each Residential Unit**

Land use regulations require compliance with the amount of overall area provided to each dwelling unit. Article VIIId, Section 8.93(a) of the City’s Zoning Ordinance, states that the minimum overall area for each dwelling unit, exclusive of the area used for commercial purposes and area set aside for street right of way, but including recreation and services areas shall be 6,000 square feet.

The Emerald Ridge neighborhood provides approximately 59.21 acres of residential, recreational, open space land uses, and service areas which corresponds to approximately 6,464 square feet per residential unit. As such, Emerald Ridge complies with Article VIIId, Section 8.93(a) of the City’s Zoning Ordinance.
Figure I-3
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II. SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

The residential standards and guidelines that follow shall apply to Neighborhoods I and II of the Emerald ridge community. These are the two single family neighborhoods located on both sides of Canal Street. As can be seen in Figure II-1, the single family housing is designed to provide a high level of quality and attractive design. It is the intent of the standards and guidelines to provide the direction needed to achieve that objective.

Residential Standards

Neighborhood I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Requirement</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area sf</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Width ft</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Depth ft</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Residence Height ft</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yard Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yard Requirements</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard ft</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard ft</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner/reversed lot ft</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard ft</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

Minimum Ground Floor Living Area 635

Neighborhood II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Requirement</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area sf</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Width ft</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum lot frontage on cul-de-sacs &amp; knuckles ft</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Depth ft</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Residence Height ft</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yard Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yard Requirements</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard ft</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard ft</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner/reversed lot ft</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard ft</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

Minimum Driveway length ft 10

Minimum Ground Floor Living Area sf 644
Figure II-1 Typical Residential Unit
Plan 1
TTM - 37640, Emerald Ridge South SFR
Figure II-1 Typical Residential Unit
TTM - 37640, Emerald Ridge South SFR
Plan 2
Figure II-1 Typical Residential Unit
Plan 3  TTM - 37640, Emerald Ridge South SFR
Residential Guidelines
Residential development within Neighborhoods I and II of the Emerald ridge community shall comply with the development guidelines listed below. The guidelines discussed below include architectural styles, form and massing, plotting, roofs, garages, windows and doors, outdoor lighting, and mechanical equipment.

Architectural Styles
The design of the Emerald Ridge neighborhood features a cohesive mix of architectural styles that include Craftsman, Italian Tuscan, and Spanish Colonial Revival. While the architectural style guidelines do not expressly limit architectural styles, any styles employed in Emerald Ridge should be complementary and compatible with the styles mentioned in this document, and amongst the City’s preferred styles. The defining features of the selected architectural styles must be consistently implemented across the neighborhood to visually identify and differentiate each style. These guidelines allow for both traditional/historical styles and contemporary interpretations of these styles, provided that the style’s defining features can be visually identified, consistently applied, and differentiated from the character-defining features of other styles implemented in the neighborhood.

The selection of architectural styles should be compatible with the massing of their floor plans; as such, a certain style should not be forced onto every floor plan if it is not compatible. By emphasizing the use of distinct and identifiable styles, these guidelines discourage monotony. Street scenes shall incorporate multiple architectural styles and should be diverse as to form, massing, features, windows, front doors, garage doors, materials, colors, etc. All walls, including building walls, shall have graffiti coating or protection for the exterior side.

Form and Massing
Creating streets that provide a high-level of variety in building forms is a primary objective of these guidelines. An important aspect of this objective is the massing and scale of the neighborhood layout and the various types of residences within it. In Emerald Ridge, these residences have been designed with particular attention to compatibility with the size, form, and volume of the various home models, and careful consideration for the neighborhoods various architectural styles. For the most part, the homes on Emerald Ridge are meant to be simple, and elegant in their massing, and concurrently reflect the recognizable elements of the homes architectural style. Although techniques for managing form and massing are well known, the following guidelines are presented to provide direction and guidance for the massing and scale of the homes in Emerald Ridge.

- Homes are to be arranged in a manner that creates a harmonious, varied appearance of building heights and setbacks.

- The exterior massing of the home should reflect the room layouts of the home and organized to create a positive street environment.


- Avoid creating overly complicated massing in a neighborhood where the typical character of nearby houses has much simpler forms.
• The permitted height of a structure should minimize the visual impact on neighboring back yards and limit the loss of privacy of residents of neighboring lots.

• Homes built on lots that are larger than neighboring lots shall not be significantly larger in size and scale relative to neighboring houses.

• Three sides of a two-story house, excluding the rear elevation, should have at least one plane break at the first and/or second-story in order to avoid monolithic elevations. A plane break must be offset in an appropriate and pleasing manner.

• Creatively use setbacks, high-end designs, outdoor spaces, varied garage treatments, landscaping, and innovative streetscape design to form a visually appealing and interesting neighborhood scene.

Overall, the intent of the above guidelines is to stress the use of the above and similar techniques to create a residential neighborhood that is visually appealing and compatible in size, form, and volume with neighboring structures and street layout.

Floor Plan
Master Suite on First Floor in Emerald Ridge North: Include one home model with a master suite on the first floor

Plotting
Rows of homes seen from a distance or along arterial roads are perceived visually by their contrast against the skyline or background and their relationship to adjacent homes. Therefore, the plotting of each neighborhood and the assignment of elevations and color schemes play an important role in creating visually interesting street scenes. To achieve this, the following guideline are provided:

• All units shall be plotted in compliance with the adopted standards including setbacks in the Development Plan.

• Floorplans for each lot should be selected to provide a diverse and deliberate mixture of plans throughout the neighborhood.

• Plans should also be mixed to avoid a repetitious pattern within the same street and along adjacent streets.

• When plotting of the same plan cannot be avoided, the adjacent plan should be assigned a significantly different elevation style and/or color scheme to create a distinction between the two homes.

• Color schemes and elevations should also be assigned to provide a diverse and deliberately haphazard mix of plans throughout the neighborhood.

• In no instance shall the same color scheme be combined immediately adjacent to one another, i.e., across the street, next door, or on the lot behind.

Roofs
interior and exterior of the neighborhood and should contribute positively to the character of the place. A variety of roof forms and pitches will create a positive public realm. The following roof design criteria will be emphasized in Emerald Ridge:

- Roofs shall be composed of a series of simple roof forms.
- Roof design shall avoid to the extent feasible repetition in continuous gable ends and similar ridge heights. Where not feasible design elements should be used to create variety.
- Roofs shall vary in massing along street scene and open spaces.
- Roof forms shall reinforce the architectural style of the home and be appropriate to that style.
- Roof pitches are encouraged to range from not less than 4:12 and not more than 5:12.
- Roofing materials should be consistent with the architectural style of the home.
- Roof materials and colors selected for an architectural style must reflect the elements that are typically used in that style.
- Roofing materials shall be non-combustible.
- Solar panels, if used, should be integrated into the roof design as an unobtrusive element.

**Garages**

All residential units shall not have less than two parking spaces in a garage with roll-up door and shall be maintained at all times. To achieve attractive streetscapes throughout the Emerald Ridge neighborhood, particular attention must be given to the design and placement of garages.

- Garage door style, color and design shall reflect the architectural character of the home and shall vary between adjacent homes, when appropriate. Acceptable garage door styles include, but are not limited to raised panel, recessed panel, flush panel in both roll-up and carriage swing door designs.
- Architectural treatments, including but not limited to, trellises, corbels, and arches maybe be incorporated into the garage design to de-emphasize the garage and achieve an attractive street scene.
- Windows may be incorporated into the garage door design. Where provided, garage door window styles shall correspond to the window forms of the house.
- Architectural features, such as varied rooflines (including height and pitch) and second-story setbacks, when incorporated into the garage design reduce building mass and scale and create a visually interesting streetscape, when appropriate for the selected architectural style.
- Two-car garage configurations may be divided into one/one configurations with individual doors to provide visual variety along the streetscape.
• As additional options to provide an enhanced streetscape, driveways may include accent paving and a maintenance-free decorative strip, such as pavers, artificial grass or other pervious materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood II Single Family Parking Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces per unit required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spaces Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage spaces provided (2 per unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street parking spaces provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total spaces provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Windows and Doors**

Window and door details are architectural components that carry a strong visual impact through their placement and design.

• Front door details shall be consistent with the architectural style.

• Feature window shapes shall be consistent with the architectural style.

• Accent shutters are not required; however, when used, shutter size shall be proportional to the window and shall reflect the architectural style.

• Window trim details used on the front elevation should also be applied to the sides and rear of the house for continuity.

• Windows and/or doors with silver or gold frames or reflective glass are prohibited.

**Outdoor Lighting**

Lighting standards throughout Emerald Ridge shall be similar in style, color and materials, embracing a natural and minimal lighting approach.

• To the extent feasible and permissible under City standards, all outdoor lighting shall incorporate measures to aid in reducing light pollution. Such measures include: wattage reduction, directing lighting downward, shielding lights (or using "cut-off lights" that only illuminate the side or underside of a fixture, rather than shining skyward) and lowering the height of light poles to reduce the illumination radius.

• All outdoor lighting fixtures shall be focused, directed, and arranged to minimize glare and illumination on public streets and adjoining property.

**Mechanical Equipment**

Mechanical equipment such as air conditioners, heaters, evaporative coolers, and other such devices shall not be mounted on any roof and must be located behind privacy walls or landscaping. Solar panels are permitted, but not required, on roofs.
III. TOWNHOME STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

The townhome development is located in the southwest section of the Emerald Ridge development. It is currently proposed to include 118 units in four, six, and eight unit models. Figure III – 1 provides a rendering of a typical townhome building. Additional renderings, floor plans, and elevations are provided in the Plan’s Appendix A.

By the very nature of the product, townhomes home neighborhoods are much like small villages, or communities. Each should be designed for compatibility within itself and the architectural styles of neighboring residential structures, and with a tastefully balanced palette of colors and materials to avoid clashing and achieve a restful uniformity within each community. To achieve this balance and compatibility, the following design standards and guidelines are prescribed.

Architectural Style
The architectural style for the design of the Emerald Ridge townhome is Spanish Colonial revival. This architectural style is not only compatible with the styles for the single family homes, but it also adds to the distinctiveness of the neighborhood. Although this architectural style is suggested, designers are encouraged to use architectural styles that are compatible with those of the adjacent single-family homes in Emerald Ridge. The idea is to keep the Emerald Ridge neighborhood diverse and compatible with the architectural styles of the entire neighborhood.

Townhome Standards

Townhome development, including the plotting of such dwellings, within Neighborhoods III of the Emerald ridge community shall comply with the development standards listed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Requirement</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area sf</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Width ft</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Depth ft</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setback Requirements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front ft</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear ft</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side ft</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Regulations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max. Residence Height ft</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min Floor Living Area</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure III -1 Typical Townhome Building
TTM - 37640, Emerald Ridge South Townhome
Townhome Guidelines

In the case of townhome buildings there is a tendency to “build out” to the maximum building envelope without articulated treatment on wall planes. This is to be avoided, as it results in a multi-story box, usually all stucco, without vertical or horizontal relief. To avoid such situations, townhome development within Neighborhoods III of the Emerald ridge community shall utilize the development guidelines listed below:

Massing
The Emerald Ridge buildings should achieve a varied building mass through varied articulation, massing, and creative floorplan arrangement. The following criteria should be followed to the greatest extent possible:

- Project a front door image and access to the street front. Articulation of end unit elevations is encouraged to achieve an aesthetically attractive four sided design.
- Minimize blank, singular planes oriented toward public views. Provide some architectural elements on all sides of the building.
- Vary setbacks on building elements/facades
- Vary Roof pitches and directions
- Consider intended styles in conjunction with the development of building plans, massing forms, elements, details, and color.
- Carefully consider the building massing, details, and color, in developing an appropriate architectural character for the project.
- Design buildings to define outdoor spaces, with floor plans that have a logical and functional relationship between indoor spaces and outdoor spaces.

Single Story Elements
Single story elements are encouraged on all townhomes to establish pedestrian scale and add variety to the street scene. This is especially important on larger buildings where inadequate articulation of mass tends to produce monotonous, single planes. Townhome buildings provide multiple opportunities for single story elements such as interior living spaces, porches and entries. The addition of such elements helps to provide a transitional space between public and private space.

Entries
Entries should create an initial impression, locate and frame the doorway, act as an interface between public and private spaces and further identify individual unit entries.
• Wherever possible, site plans should orient the front door image and principal access toward the public street or entry courtyard.

• Incorporate appropriate roof elements, columns, feature windows and/or architectural forms in the entry statement to emphasize the building character and the location of individual doorways.

• If front entry location is not immediately obvious due to building configuration, direct and draw the observer to it with added elements such as signs, lighting and landscape.

**Windows**

Typically the location of windows is determined by the practical considerations of room layout, furniture placement, views and privacy. Design emphasis here should be of particular concern as windows play an important role in the exterior architectural character of townhome buildings.

• Within the appropriate style requirements, group and coordinate windows with other design elements to create a composition and sense of order.

• Where appropriate to style and window form, use of multi-paned windows is encouraged.

• Use appropriate scale and proportion in window design to enhance the elevation style.

**Balconies**

The inclusion of balconies is encouraged for both aesthetic and practical purposes. They are useful in breaking up large wall planes, offsetting floors, creating visual interest and adding human scale to the building. They provide the practical advantage of creating outdoor living areas and elevated open space.

• Balconies may be covered or open. They may be either recessed into the mass of the building or serve as a projecting element.

• Design balconies as an integral elements of the building with details, eaves, supports, and railings in keeping with the architectural style and other elements of the building’s design.

**Garages**

All townhome units shall not have less than two parking spaces in a garage with roll-up door and shall be maintained at all times. With garages the intent is to tie these facilities into the overall project design while reducing their visual emphasis. To achieve this these structures shall incorporate the following:

• Utilize the same architectural style, massing elements, wall materials and finish, design details and colors as the residential dwelling units.

• Use similar or compatible roof forms.

• End wall conditions that are visually prominent from the street should receive special architectural attention.
• The relationship of the garage face to the building may be projecting, flush or recessed provided that it is compatible to the mass and style of the building.

• Provide sectional garage doors with automatic door openers. Garage door windows are permissible.

Guest Parking
Guest parking for the Townhome section of Emerald Ridge will incorporate interior oriented parking solutions and use the following design techniques to enhance the architecture of the street scene:

• Provide sufficient and convenient guest parking appropriately dispersed on site.

• Provide on-site guest parking along streets via parallel or perpendicular parking wherever possible rather than in parking lots.

• Where parking areas are visible from public streets, there view should be softened landscape or architectural solutions.

• Group unassigned or guest parking in convenient locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Townhome Parking Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces required per each three bedroom unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spaces Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage spaces provided (2 per unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street parking spaces provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total spaces provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trash Enclosures

• Enclosures shall be provided to accommodate the numbers and types of trash containers as required by the disposal company. These enclosures shall be positioned in a centrally convenient area for residents. Try to minimize impact on adjacent residences and neighborhood developments by keeping enclosures from the edges of the community.

• Trash enclosures shall be substantially constructed in a style, color, material, and wall finish that is consistent and compliments the overall architectural character of the development. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit a plan to include trash collection details and specification to the Planning Director for review and approval.

• All trash enclosures shall be equipped with complementary gates of durable construction, hinged to self-supporting steel posts and a trellis or other covered structure overhead.

• Lighted person access is required at each enclosure.

• All trash enclosures shall have a trellis or other overhead structure.
IV. LANDSCAPE DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

The Landscape Design Standards and Guidelines provide the information and direction needed to create the various elements of the landscape framework for the Emerald Ridge neighborhood. The framework includes the streetscape, recreational amenities, open spaces, and entry monuments. The design of the landscape framework is intended to complement the panoramic views of rural hillsides, foothills, and working ranches as well as the distant downtown Riverside area vistas. A key function of the landscape framework is that it provides a pedestrian friendly environment in its mass and scale, and seamlessly connects the various landscape features and amenities within the neighborhood and the surrounding area.

Emerald Ridge is envisioned as a residential area where trees, plants, and natural materials are located throughout the perimeter and interior of the neighborhood, providing a natural setting that encourages healthy outdoor activity, establishes a sense a place for the residents, and gives Emerald Ridge its unique identity amongst the various neighborhoods in the City of Jurupa. The Conceptual Landscape Plan (Figure IV - 1) illustrates the Emerald Ridge landscape framework; its various design elements, and the connections between the residential areas and open spaces. A full set of landscape drawings and information are provided in Appendix A. As illustrated, the framework provides a pedestrian friendly environment with ample sidewalks, and multiple opportunities to connect the recreational amenities with the open spaces throughout the neighborhood and the adjacent Jurupa Mountains. General landscape standards are provided below followed by landscape guidelines for key landscape elements.

General Landscape Standards

General landscape standards for the Emerald Ridge neighborhood are provided below and on the following pages:

**On-site Landscaping**

Prior to the issuance of any Building permit, the applicant shall submit a “Professional Services (PROS)” application (with current fees) and the following items for Planning Director review and approval:

1. The total cost estimate of landscaping, irrigation, and one-year of maintenance.
2. Completed City Faithful Performance Bond for Landscape Improvements form with original signatures after the City provides the applicant with the required amount of bond.
3. Completed City Landscape Agreement with original signatures after the City has reviewed the submitted cost estimate.
4. Final landscape, maintenance, planting, and irrigation plans and digital copies (CD format). The plans shall be modified to include a parking lot shade exhibit which demonstrates compliance with the shading requirements of Section 18.12 of Ordinance 348.
5. Air Quality – Plant trees. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit landscape plans that include trees that have been proven to reduce the levels of PM 2.5 to be planted along Avalon Street and within the townhome community such as Afghan Pine and Aleppo Pine.
Prior to the final inspection of any Building permit, the Landscape Architect of Record shall conduct an inspection and submit a letter to the City of Jurupa Valley once s/he has deemed the installation is in conformance to the approved plans. Following the inspection of the Landscape Architect of Record, the applicant shall schedule a City inspection with the City's landscape architect.

**Landscape Plans for Green Belt (including vacated portion of Canal Street)**
Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the applicant shall submit landscape plans for TR36948 (Emerald Ridge South) for the review and approval of the Planning Director and Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority.

**Required Planting and Irrigation Plan**
A landscape architect licensed in California shall be retained to prepare planting and irrigation plans for all public areas. Arrangement of plants should be relatively informal; plants should be placed to allow them to grow to their natural sizes and forms, and sheared hedges should be kept to a minimum.

**Trail located along the western boundary of Emerald Ridge North**
Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for Emerald Ridge North, the applicant shall obtain perpetual maintenance agreement from the property owner which the trail is partially located. The applicant shall submit evidence of such perpetual maintenance agreement to the Planning Director.

**Slopes**
- Cut slopes equal to or greater than eight feet (8') in vertical height and fill slopes equal to or greater than five feet (5') in vertical height shall be planted with drought tolerant shrubs, grasses, and/or ground cover to protect the slope from erosion and instability.

- Slopes exceeding fifteen feet (15') in vertical height shall be planted with drought tolerant shrubs, spaced not more than ten feet (10') average on center or trees spaced not to exceed thirty feet (30') average on center or a combination of shrubs and trees at equivalent spacing, in addition to the low spreading shrubs, grasses, and/or groundcover.

- Grading: 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.
Conceptual Landscape Plan

Figure IV-1

TTM - 36947 and 37640
**Irrigation**
- Proper consideration of irrigation system design and installation in the extreme climate of the Emerald Ridge neighborhood is critical to the landscape investment. In particular, the combined summer elements of heat and wind must be carefully considered in proper irrigation design and equipment selection.
- All landscaped areas shall be watered with a permanent irrigation system, with the goal of minimizing water use and runoff.
- Irrigation systems that adjoin a separate maintenance responsibility area shall be designed in a manner to ensure complete water coverage between the areas.
- All irrigation systems shall have automatic controllers designed to properly water plants given the site’s soil conditions.
- Irrigation systems for all public landscapes shall have automatic rain shut-off devices.
- At minimum, overhead spray irrigation systems shall be designed with head to head 100% coverage with consideration to over spray and runoff.
- Southern California native and drought tolerant shrub areas shall be watered using a combination of spray and drip or bubbler irrigation to shrubs and trees. In addition, irrigation controllers should be evapotranspiration based and be capable of providing multiple repeat starttimes.
- All irrigation heads adjacent to walks, drives and curbs (including curbs with car overhangs) shall be of the pop-up type.
- Irrigation backflow prevention devices and controllers shall be located with minimum public visibility or shall be screened with appropriate plant materials.
- Irrigation systems shall be designed per current drought guidelines and comply with City of Jurupa Valley ordinances.

**Outdoor Lighting**
Sufficient outdoor lighting after dusk shall be provided. Pedestrian level lighting shall be provided within parks or open space area including vehicle parking lot for residents. All lighting fixtures shall be maintained in good condition. Light fixtures shall be designed to prevent any light to flood onto adjacent properties.

**Landscape Guidelines**

**Plant Palette**
A key landscape guideline is the extensive use of low and medium water-use California native plants or plants that have naturalized to Southern California’s arid climate. The recommended plant selection that adorns the framework and its various elements includes colorful plant materials, as well as evergreen and deciduous trees that do not require extensive irrigation and compliment the residential stock.
The recommended planting materials for the Conceptual Landscape Plan are provided in the Plant Palette (Table IV - 1) on the following page. This listing of plants is not proposed to be a rigid inventory of requirements. Instead, it is meant to provide guidance in the type of plant materials that maintain the spirit of the neighborhoods design theme and ensure that streetscapes, walls, and parks are compatible with the neighborhood’s landscape design framework. It is intended that when direction is needed, these guidelines will be used as a resource for the landscape planning and design of the Emerald Ridge neighborhood. Street trees and related security and agreements are required pursuant to Section 14 of Ordinance No. 460.

Depending on their exposure, the suggested plants to be used in the Emerald Ridge development may not be suitable for every location; however, the palette provides an extensive list to choose from. Other plants may be substituted provided they are water-efficient and maintain the neighborhood landscape theme. Each plant zone shall have similar watering requirements so irrigation systems can be designed to minimize water use and plants can thrive in the best possible conditions. As with the development standards and guidelines, any landscape design elements or topics that are not expressly addressed in this Plan will be governed by the City’s standards and regulations in effect at the time.

Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit landscape plans that include trees that have been proven to reduce the levels of PM2.5 to be planted along Avalon Street and within the Townhome lot of TTM 37640 such as Afghan Pine and Aleppo Pine.

**Entry Monuments**

Entry monuments are provided at two primary entry points to identify the Emerald Ridge neighborhood and create a distinctive entrance statement that establishes the character of the neighborhood. Specifically, entry monuments are provided on the northwest corner of Avalon Street and Street H, and at the northwest corner of Street A and 28th Street. The entry monuments incorporate many of the design elements in the fence plan and the landscaping on the streetscape. They incorporate a community sign, stone veneer, pilasters with pre-cast concrete caps a mix of colorful shrubs and groundcover in the foreground and evergreen trees in the background. Monument drawings are provided in the Appendix A.

**Streetscapes**

A beautifully landscaped environment is an important mark of any high quality neighborhood. In addition to creating a sense of place, it also invites residents to explore, enjoy the neighborhood, and socialize. The landscaping along the various residential streets is meant to reinforce Emerald Ridge’s goal to create an environment that encourages healthy activities and social interaction. As the street pattern within the development is primarily residential, the scale and mass of the landscaping will be pedestrian friendly and proportionate to the street’s character. It will reflect the volume of traffic on the street, provide a sense of safety and reinforce the separation between vehicles and pedestrians.

To achieve the above mentioned objectives, the streetscapes throughout Emerald Ridge will be planted with a combination of street trees, low shrubs, and masses of groundcovers suggested in the Plant Palette. As previously stated, the palette provides a selection of plants that are recommended for the Emerald Ridge development, but does not prohibit the use of substitute plants that are similar in water efficiency and adhere to the neighborhood’s landscape theme.
## PLANT PALETTE

Table IV-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIVE USE</th>
<th>WATER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PASEO / TRAIL TREES

- **AESCULUS CALIFORNICA / CALIFORNIA BUCKEYE**
- **PROSOPIS GLANDULOSA 'THORNLESS AZT' / THORNLESS HONEY MESQUITE**
- **QUERCUS AGRIFOLIA / COAST LIVE OAK**

### STREET TREES

- **CERCIS CANADENSIS 'FOREST PANSY' TM / FOREST PANSY REDBUD**
- **CHIONANTHUS RETUSUS / CHINESE FRINGE TREE**

### OPEN SPACE TREES

- **AESCULUS CALIFORNICA 'CANYON PINK' / CALIFORNIA BUCKEYE**
- **PINUS ELDARICA / AFGHAN PINE**
- **QUERCUS AGRIFOLIA / COAST LIVE OAK**
- **SCHINUS MOLLE / CALIFORNIA PEPPER**

### FLOWERING ACCENT TREE

- **ARBUTUS X 'MARINA' / ARBUTUS STANDARD**
- **CERCIS OCCIDENTALIS / WESTERN REDBUD**
- **CHIONANTHUS RETUSUS / CHINESE FRINGE TREE**
- **PYRUS CALLERYANA 'CAPITAL' / CAPITAL CALLERY PEAR**

### DROUGHT TOLERANT SHRUBS AND GROUNDCOVERS

- **ACHILLEA MILLEFOLIUM 'MOONWALKER' / MOONWALKER YARROW**
- **ACHILLEA MILLEFOLIUM 'PAPRIKA' / RED YARROW**
- **ACHILLEA X 'MOONSHINE' / MOONSHINE YARROW**
- **AGAVE AMERICANA / CENTURY PLANT**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Name</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGAVE ATTENUATA / AGAVE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAVE X ‘BLUE FLAME’ / BLUE FLAME AGAVE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALOE PLICATILIS / FAN ALOE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALOE X ‘BLUE ELF’ / ALOE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALOE X SPINOSISSIMA / ALOE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCTOSTAPHYLOS DENSIFLORA ‘HOWARD MCMINN’ / HOWARD MCMINN MANZANITA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCTOSTAPHYLOS X ‘EMERALD CARPET’ / EMERALD CARPET MANZANITA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERBERIS THUNBERGII ‘CRIMSON PYGMY’ / CRIMSON PYGMY BARBERRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEANOTHUS GRISEUS HORIZONTALIS ‘YANKEE POINT’ / CALIFORNIA LILAC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEANOTHUS X ‘CONCHA’ / CALIFORNIA LILAC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEANOTHUS X ‘DARK STAR’ / CALIFORNIA LILAC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISTUS X HYBRIDUS / WHITE ROCKROSE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPILOBium CANUM / HUMMINGBIRD TRUMPET</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPILOBium CANUM LATIFOLIUM ‘EVERETT’S CHOICE’ / HUMMINGBIRD TRUMPET</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESTUCA CALIFORNICA / CALIFORNIA FESCUE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNCUS PATENS ‘ELK BLUE’ / SPREADING RUSH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEYMUS CONDENSATUS ‘CANYON PRINCE’ / NATIVE BLUE RYE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAHONIA AQUIFOLIUM ‘COMPACTA’ / COMPACT OREGON GRAPE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUHLENBERGIA CAPILLARIS / PINK MUHLY</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUHLENBERGIA LINDHEIMERI / LINDHEIMER’S MUHLY</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUHLENBERGIA RIGENS / DEER GRASS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASSELLA PULCHRA / PURPLE NEEDLE GRASS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>VL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASSELLA TENUISSIMA / TEXAS NEEDLE GRASS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>VL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNISETUM SETACEUM ‘EATON CANYON’ / EATON CANYON FOUNTAIN GRASS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRUNUS CAROLINIANA ‘COMPACTA’ / CAROLINA CHERRY</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHUS INTEGRIFOLIA / LEMONADE BERRY</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHUS OVATA / SUGAR BUSH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSMARINUS OFFICINALIS ‘PROSTRATUS’ / DWARF ROSEMARY</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALVIA CLEVELANDII / CLEVELAND SAGE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALVIA CLEVELANDII ‘POZO BLUE’ / CLEVELAND SAGE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENEcio MANDRACLISCAE ‘BLUE CHALK STICKS’ / SENEcio</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DETENTION BASIN SHRUBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Name</th>
<th>Native Use</th>
<th>Water Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achilles millefolium 'Paprika' / Red Yarrow</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agave americana / Century Plant</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calamagrostis nutkaensis / Reed Grass</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex pansa / Sanddune Sedge</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex praegracilis / Slender Sedge</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceanothus grieseus horizontalis 'Yankee Point' / California Lilac</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cistus x hybridus / White Rockrose</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiobium canum canum 'Catalina' / Hummingbird Trumpet</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juncus effusus / Soft Rush</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juncus patens / California Gray Rush</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juncus patens 'Elk Blue' / Spreading Rush</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leymus condensatus 'Canyon Prince' / Native Blue Rye</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennisetum setaceum 'Eaton Canyon' / Eaton Canyon Fountain Grass</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosmarinus officinalis 'Prostratus' / Dwarf Rosemary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvia clevelandii / Cleveland Sage</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvia greggii 'Deep Red' / Autumn Sage</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DROUGHT TOLERANT TURF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Name</th>
<th>Native Use</th>
<th>Water Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cynodon dactylon 'Santa Ana' / Santa Ana Bermuda</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. WALL AND FENCE PLAN

Walls and fences serve a number of important functions in a neighborhood. They provide enclosure, screening, security, and privacy, separate areas, serve as a backdrop, focus a view, and retain water and earth. Fence designs and materials shall be functional and compatible with the neighborhood architecture and streetscape. Fences should be designed as an integral component and extension of the building design and surrounding landscape. Periphery walls can be integrated into the adjacent structure and extended into the landscape to help integrate the building into its environment. Gates should be complementary in style and color to its fence or wall.

The Fence and Wall Plan for the Emerald Ridge neighborhood is provided in Figure V - 1. Two types of walls and fences are proposed in the Emerald Ridge neighborhood development. They will be constructed of materials, colors, and textures that are compatible with neighborhood design and architectural scheme. The walls and fences are described below.

**Masonry Block Wall**
Tan split-face masonry block walls shall be constructed at the interface between roadways and the side and rear yards of residential lots to maximize privacy and provide noise attenuation. The masonry block walls shall be up to six feet (6’) tall adjacent to primary interior streets and off-streets. At interior neighborhood streets, masonry walls shall be a minimum of five feet (5’) tall. Where the wall face is visible from public viewing areas, tan split-face block shall be used. Tan split-face block pilasters and concrete shall be used as needed, and crawling vines may be used to soften the view and add to the street landscape.

**Decorative Tubular Steel Perimeter Fencing**
This type of fencing will be installed primarily along north sides of the train track easement and the paseo that parallels Canal Street. Along the paseo, the fencing will be six feet in height and include split-face pilasters with pre-cast concrete caps. On the railroad easement it will be four (4”) in height.
VI. RECREATIONAL AMENITIES AND OPEN SPACE

An essential feature of the Emerald Ridge development is the various recreational and open space facilities that are located throughout the neighborhood as illustrated in the Recreational Amenities Plan in Figure VI - 1. Emerald Ridge provides slightly over 21 acres of recreational facilities and open space. Approximately, seven and a half acres are recreational facilities that include landscaped paseos with walking trails and shade portals, a pool and spa, various passive parks with outdoor furniture, and a community park. The facilities not only provide opportunities for healthy activities and socializing, they also add visual diversity and interest to the area. Like the other structures in the neighborhood, there design and appearance is of the utmost importance, as they contribute to the neighborhood appearance and give Emerald Ridge its unique and identifiable character. The following general guidelines shall be utilized in their design:

- Common recreation facilities shall be key character elements for the neighborhood and each shall be designed with consideration for different recreational uses in view of the overall number of facilities and their particular use.

- All architectural and community elements, such as street furnishings, benches, lighting standards and trash receptacles, shall be consistent with the selected overall architectural character for the neighborhood.

- Pool house and other common buildings shall exhibit 360 degree architecture.

- Colors, massing, roof pitch and materials shall be compatible with residential buildings or project theme.

Plans and further information for each of the recreational amenities are provided in the landscape exhibits in the Appendix A.

Pool and Spa

Pool and Spa are an extension of residential space, making a neighborhood more connected and encouraging social interaction and healthy activities. It greatly reduces the trouble of travelling out and provides a point for residents to gather, socialize, and foster well-being and friendships. The Emerald Ridge Pool and Spa is in the Central Park section of the neighborhood across from the community park and walking distance from some of the other passive parks. It is designed to complement the various residential architectural styles and the landscape motif of the surrounding area. Figure VI – 2 provides a rendering of the Pool and Spa.

Outdoor Trails and Paseos

Walking, hiking, and jogging opportunities are an important focus of the recreational amenities in the Emerald Ridge neighborhood. These opportunities are provided via a comprehensive, interconnected public trail and walkway system that also provides residents and visitors with convenient access to the neighborhood’s passive parks, open space, as well as the links to existing dirt trails that run along the
recreational rural hills next to the northern part of Emerald Ridge. There is a trails/walkway that is located within the landscaped paseo that runs along Canal Street on the upper side of the train tracks. The trail starts at 28th Street and ends at Alta Street within convenient distance to the existing trail at the base of the rural hills.

The paseo in which the trail/walkway is located parallel to the length of Canal Street and creates a greenbelt that visually buffers the train tracks, creates a point of interest, creatively utilizes the space next to the tracks, and provides security for the residents. Design guidelines used for the paseos include the following:

- The trails and paseo shall be designed with active pedestrian uses and where appropriate, landscaping, along their edges.
- Like streets, the paseo should accommodate a variety of leisure needs while providing for a safe and comfortable pedestrian environment.
- Considerations should be given to adding effective lighting to enhance visibility and safety.
- To increase pedestrian safety, comfort, and interest, portions of the paseo facade should be developed in response to the unique conditions of the site or project.

Two entry portals will be located at specific points in the paseo. One is on 28th Street, and the second is near Alta Street on the north side of Canal Street. The entry portal will be designed with outdoor lighting, outdoor furniture, shade structures, gabion columns, security fencing, and distinctive drought landscaping such as clump grasses, spread flowing shrubs, succulent plants, and gravel ground cover. Figure VI – 3 through 7, illustrate the trail plan and paseos for Emerald Ridge.

**Community Park and Passive Parks**

There are seven parks in the Emerald Ridge development and are meant to complement the adjacent recreational hills as well as nearby Avalon Park. They include a community park and six passive parks that are located throughout Emerald Ride. The community park is located between the Townhome and Single Family sections of Emerald Ridge South and is over an acre in size. It is conveniently located near the pool and spa and has a full-court basketball court, picnic tables, benches, decorative lighting.

The passive parks are recreation areas that require minimal development with emphasis placed on the preservation or creation of a natural landscaped environment that eventually matures to include some wildlife. These parks provide residents with neighborhood-level recreational amenities and open space to enjoy a variety of outdoor activities. The six passive parks are designed for different uses including two dog parks, two tot lots, a picnic park, and a community plaza. Depending on their use these parks may include shade structures, benches, picnic tables, playground structures, and meandering concrete walkways. Landscaping will include warm season turf, drought tolerant shrubs and ground cover, flowering accent trees, and open space trees. Further information and plans for each of the parks mentioned above are provided in the Appendix A.
POOL AND SPA
FIGURE VI-2

TTM - 37640, Emerald Ridge South
Maintenance of Common Areas and Recreational Amenities

Maintenance responsibilities for common areas and recreational amenities within Emerald Ridge are described below. Individual homeowners shall be responsible for the maintenance of the public street landscape along their property frontage unless otherwise identified within their legal ownership documents. Private homeowners shall also be responsible for all maintenance within their private lot area as well as fences and wall faces on their internal boundaries. For all other areas of the neighborhood, maintenance responsibilities shall be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TTM 36947 Single Family Homes</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>HOA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot A</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot B</td>
<td>Passive Open Space</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot C</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot D</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot E</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot F</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot G</td>
<td>Basin/Park</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot H</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TTM 37640 Townhome            |               | X    |     |
| Park, Passive Parks           |               | X    |     |
| Pool and Spa                  |               | X    |     |
| Private Streets               |               | X    |     |
| Avalon Street                 |               | X    |     |

| Single Family Homes           |               | X    |     |
| Open Space                    |               | X    |     |
| Private Streets               |               | X    |     |
OVER 1.5 ACRE OF PARK, OPEN SPACE, TOT LOT, TRAILS, PASEOS, DOG PARK AND POOL WITH SPA

COMMUNITY PLAZA

PASSIVE OPEN SPACE/PARK

EXISTING TRAIL

EXISTING WATER TANK

EXISTING MAJOR ROCK OUTCROPPING

DETENTION BASIN

FULLY LANDSCAPED PASSIVE OPEN SPACE

COMMUNITY PLAZA

FULLY LANDSCAPED PASSIVE OPEN SPACE

NORTH COMMUNITY PASEO TRAIL

OVER 1.5 ACRE OF PARK, OPEN SPACE, TOT LOT, TRAILS, PASEOS, DOG PARK AND POOL WITH SPA

TRAIL / PASEO PLAN

FIGURE VI-3
TRAIL/PASEO PLAN

Figure VI-6
TRAIL/PASEO PLAN

Figure VI-7
VII. APPENDIX A

This appendix is intended to supplement the project development information provided in the Plan’s various sections. In addition to illustrations provided in the previous sections of the Plan, it also contains additional drawings and information that provide further guidance, direction, and detail on the vision and plan for the development of the Emerald Ridge residential development. The information covers housing, landscaping, and recreational amenities. Exhibits include the following:

- Emerald Ridge Vicinity Map
- Emerald Ridge Site Plan
- Emerald Ridge Renderings
- General Plan Amendment
- Change of Zone
- Tentative Tract Maps and TTM 37640 Lot Table Matrix
- Phasing Maps
- Residential Plotting Diagrams
- Residential Floor Plans and Elevations
- Townhome Plotting Diagrams
- Townhome Floor Plans and Elevations
- Landscape, Wall & Fence, Recreational Amenities, Monument Signs
- Plant Palette
TTM 37640 Plan 1 Craftsman
TTM 37640 Plan 2 Spanish Colonial Revival
TTM 37640 Plan 2 Italian Tuscan
TTM 37640 Plan 2 Craftsman
TTM 37640 Plan 3 Spanish Colonial Revival
TTM 37640 Plan 3 Italian Tuscan
TTM 37640  TOWNHOME 4-Plex
TTM 37640 TOWNHOME 6-Plex
TTM 37640 TOWNHOME 8-Plex
TTM 37640  Community Pool and Spa
Lot Table
Matrix TTM
37640
Lot Number
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Square Feet
1402
1262
1262
1262
1262
1262
1262
1402
1413
1279
1285
1418
1407
1262
1262
1262
1262
1402
1402
1262
1262
1402
1402
1262
1262
1402
1406
1272
1278
1283
1287
1413
1402
1262
1262
1262
1262
1402
1402
1262
1262
1402
1402
1262
1262
1262
1262
1262
1262
1402
1402
1262
1262
1262
1262
1262
1262
1402
1402
1262

Lot Number
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120

Square Feet
1262
1262
1262
1402
1402
1262
1262
1262
1262
1262
1262
1402
1402
1262
1262
1262
1262
1262
1262
1402
1402
1262
1262
1402
1262
1262
1262
1262
1262
1262
1262
1402
1402
1262
1262
1262
1262
1262
1262
1402
1403
1262
1262
1262
1262
1262
1262
1403
1404
1262
1262
1403
1402
1262
1262
1262
1262
1403
3147
3140

Lot Number
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180

66

Square Feet
3239
3173
3607
6845
6534
4869
4787
4696
4608
4595
4385
3951
3849
4051
4316
4338
4397
4456
6674
3150
3150
3150
3150
3150
3150
3150
3712
3326
3159
3150
3150
3150
3150
2993
2790
2790
2790
3305
2974
2970
2970
2970
2970
2953
3331
3330
3330
3330
3325
3332
3658
3330
3330
3330
3330
2970
2970
2970
2970
2970

Lot Number
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
OS-A
OS-B
OS-C
OS-D
OS-E
OS-F
OS-G
OS-H
OS-I
OS-J
OS-K
OS-L
OS-M
OS-O
OS-V
OS-W
OS-Z

Square Feet
3229
2970
2970
2970
2970
2970
3330
3330
3330
3330
3330
3426
3330
3330
3330
3330
3330
4638
3153
3152
3151
3150
3150
3150
3150
3150
3229
3482
3760
4036
4292
3684
4110
5995
3868
63476
53154
28553
16074
1845
553
2980
2197
2763
2145
3508
1524
2743
4215
15841
6064
20902


TTM 37640 Townhome Phasing Map
Emerald Ridge North SFR

Plan 1699 - 1st Floor Plan

- 1ST FLOOR = 644 SF
- 2ND FLOOR = 1,055 SF
- TOTAL = 1,699 SF

Plan 1699 - 2nd Floor Plan

Date: 3/10/16  Scale: NTS  Project No. 915034
Emerald Ridge
Site Planning and Design

Emerald Ridge North SFR
TTM 36947

Plan 1894 - Heritage

Plan 1894 - 1st Floor Plan

Plan 1894 - 2nd Floor Plan

Date: 3/10/16
Scale: NTS

Project No. 915034

Neighborhood 1
Emerald Ridge South TTM 37640 SFR
Plot Plan
Emerald Ridge South TTM 37640 SFR
Plan 1 Floor Plan

1ST FLOOR
778 SF

2ND FLOOR
1039 SF

TOTAL LIVING AREA: 1,817 S.F
Emerald Ridge South TTM 37640 SFR
Plan 1 Elevation
Emerald Ridge South TTM 37640 SFR
Plan 2 Floor Plan

1ST FLOOR
912 SF

2ND FLOOR
1129 SF

TOTAL LIVING AREA: 2,041 S.F
Emerald Ridge South TTM 37640 SFR
Plan 2 Elevations

SPANISH–LEFT
SPANISH–FRONT
SPANISH–RIGHT
SPANISH–REAR

ITALIAN–LEFT
ITALIAN–FRONT
ITALIAN–RIGHT
ITALIAN–REAR

CRAFTSMAN–LEFT
CRAFTSMAN–FRONT
CRAFTSMAN–RIGHT
CRAFTSMAN–REAR
Emerald Ridge South TTM 37640 SFR
Plan 3 Floor Plan

1ST FLOOR
973 SF

2ND FLOOR
1278 SF

TOTAL LIVING AREA: 2,251 S.F
Emerald Ridge South TTM 37640 SFR
Plan 3 Elevations
Emerald Ridge South TTM 37640 Townhome Plot Plan

Emerald Ridge
8 Unit Town Home

Neighborhood III - 8plex
Emerald Ridge South TTM 37640  Townhome
Interior 2-stories unit Floor Plan

1ST FLOOR
549 SF

2ND FLOOR
958 SF

TOTAL LIVING AREA: 1,507 S.F
Emerald Ridge South TTM 37640  Townhome
Corner unit Floor Plan

1ST FLOOR
695 SF
TOTAL LIVING AREA: 1,808 S.F

BEDROOM 1
11'-3"x12'-5"

BEDROOM 2
10'-10"x12'-5"

MASTER BEDROOM
12'-10"x14'-10"

2ND FLOOR
1,113 SF

LOFT
15'-7"x11'-2"

MASTER BEDROOM
12'-10"x14'-10"

Emerald Ridge South TTM 37640  Townhome
Corner unit Floor Plan
Emerald Ridge South TTM 37640  Townhome
4-Plex Elevations
Emerald Ridge South TTM 37640 Townhome
6-Plex Elevations
Emerald Ridge South TTM 37640  Townhome
8-Plex Elevations
Conceptual Landscape Plan

Figure IV-1
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### PLANT PALETTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE IV-1</th>
<th>WATER USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NATIVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PASEO /Trail Trees

- **Aesculus Californica** / California Buckeye
- **Prosopis glandulosa 'Thornless Azt'** / Thornless Honey Mesquite
- **Quercus agrifolia** / Coast Live Oak

#### Street Trees

- **Cercis canadensis 'Forest Pansy' TM** / Forest Pansy Redbud
- **Chionanthus retusus** / Chinese Fringe Tree

#### Open Space Trees

- **Aesculus Californica 'Canyon Pink'** / California Buckeye
- **Pinus eldarica** / Afghan Pine
- **Quercus agrifolia** / Coast Live Oak
- **Schinus molle** / California Pepper

#### Flowering Accent Tree

- **Arbutus x 'Marina'** / Arbutus Standard
- **Cercis occidentalis** / Western Redbud
- **Chionanthus retusus** / Chinese Fringe Tree
- **Pyrus calleryana 'Capital'** / Capital Callery Pear

#### Drought Tolerant Shrubs and Groundcovers

- **Achillea millefolium 'Moonwalker'** / Moonwalker Yarrow
- **Achillea millefolium 'Paprika'** / Red Yarrow
- **Achillea x 'Moonshine'** / Moonshine Yarrow
- **Agave Americana** / Century Plant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Use</th>
<th>Water Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>VL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>VL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DETENTION BASIN SHRUBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
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<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
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</tbody>
</table>

**ACHILLEA MILLEFOLIUM `PAPRIKA` / RED YARROW**
**AGAVE AMERICANA / CENTURY PLANT**
**CALAMAGROSTIS NUTKAENSIS / REED GRASS**
**CAREX PANSA / SANDDUNE SEDGE**
**CAREX PRAEGRACILIS / SLENDER SEDGE**
**CEANOTHUS GRISEUS HORIZONTALIS `YANKEE POINT` / CALIFORNIA LILAC**
**CISTUS X HYBRIDUS / WHITE ROCKROSE**
**EPILOBIUM CANUM CANUM `CATALINA` / HUMMINGBIRD TRUMPET**
**JUNCUS EFFUSUS / SOFT RUSH**
**JUNCUS PATENS / CALIFORNIA GRAY RUSH**
**JUNCUS PATENS `ELK BLUE` / SPREADING RUSH**
**LEYMUS CONDENSATUS `CANYON PRINCE` / NATIVE BLUE RYE**
**PENNISETUM SETACEUM `EATON CANYON` / EATON CANYON FOUNTAIN GRASS**
**ROSMARINUS OFFICINALIS `PROSTRATUS` / DWARF ROSEMARY**
**SALVIA CLEVELANDII / CLEVELAND SAGE**
**SALVIA GREGGII `DEEP RED` / AUTUMN SAGE**

### DROUGHT TOLERANT TURF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CYNODON DACTYLON `SANTA ANA` / SANTA ANA BERMUDA**
ATTACHMENT NO. 5

Landscape Plan
FOREGROUND SHRUBS AND GROUNDCOVER

VARIOUS GRASSES

WALKWAYS

5’ VINYL FENCE

6’ PERIMETER BLOCK WALL

3’ WIDE GATE

FOREGROUND SHRUBS AND GROUNDCOVER

VARIOUS GRASSES

DRIVEWAY
EMERALD RIDGE
TRACT NO. 37640
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

MONUMENT SIGN AND GATE

C.I.P. BOARDFORM CONCRETE RETAINING WALL FOR RAMPED PLANTER
BOULDERS

EMERALD RIDGE

SCALE: 1/2"=1'-0"

STEEL ENTRY GATE

ENTRY SIGN

C.I.P. BOARDFORM CONCRETE RETAINING WALL FOR RAMPED PLANTER
BOULDERS

EMERALD RIDGE

SCALE: 1/2"=1'-0"
NOTICE OF DECISION FOR MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NOS. 19003 AND 19004 PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT FOR NOTICING THE CITY COUNCIL OF AN APPROVED EXTENSION OF TIME FOR HIGHLAND PARK’S TENTATIVE TRACT AND PARCEL MAPS AT ALONG SIERRA AVE. BETWEEN 20TH ST. AND CANAL ST. (APNS: 175-080-011; 177-020-004; 177-020-016; 177-020-017; 177-030-001; 177-030-002; 177-030-004; 177-030-006; 177-030-010; 177-030-016; 177-110-006; 177-110-007; 177-110-008)

RECOMMENDATION

That the City Council receive and file the Notice of Decision.

BACKGROUND

Pursuant to Section 7.15.150 of Title 7 “Subdivisions,” a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision for MA19003 and MA19004 must be filed with the City Council. This notice of decision starts a 10-day appeal period of the Planning Commission’s decision. Any appeals must be filed in writing with the filing fee to the City Clerk.

On February 13, 2019, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution Nos. 2019-02-13-01 approving MA19003 (TPM36812EOT) and adopted Resolution No. 2019-02-13-02 approving MA19004 (TTM31894EOT). The Planning Commission’s staff report and adopted resolutions are attached to this staff report.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Highland Park 1 is an approved 398-single-family lot subdivision of 168 acres located generally along Sierra Avenue between 20th Street and Canal Street. See Exhibit A “Project Site” map. The City Council approved a tentative tract map and a tentative parcel map along with other entitlements on March 17, 2016. The maps’ expiration date
is March 17, 2019. The applicant needs more time to record the final maps so he has requested a one-year extension for both tentative maps.

**EXHIBIT A. PROJECT SITE**

---

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

Staff time to process these applications will be recovered by a developer application deposit. No additional costs to the City are anticipated.

**ALTERNATIVES**

1. That the City Council receive and file the Notice of Decision.
2. None.

Prepared by:  

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP  
Planning Director

Submitted by:  

Gary S. Thompson  
City Manager
ATTACHMENTS:

3. Planning Commission Staff Report dated February 13, 2019
4. Adopted Conditions (2016 approval)
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-02-13-01

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY APPROVING A ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 36812 FOR A SCHEDULE “F” SUBDIVISION FOR FINANCING PURPOSES OF APPROXIMATELY 168.3 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED NORTH OF CANAL STREET AND UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD LINE, EAST OF SIERRA AVENUE, SOUTH OF KAREN LANE, AND WEST OF RIO VISTA SPECIFIC PLAN (APNs: 175-080-011; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007, and 008) INTO 4 PARCELS, AND DETERMINING NO FURTHER CEQA REVIEW REQUIRED

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

Section 1. Project. Richland Communities, Inc. (the “Applicant”) has applied for a one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812 (TPM No. 36812) (Master Application No. 19003 or MA No. 19003) for a Schedule “F” subdivision, for financing purposes, of approximately 168.3 gross acres into 4 parcels on real property located north of Canal Street and Union Pacific Railroad Line, east of Sierra Avenue, south of Karen Lane, and west of the Rio Vista Specific Plan (APNs: 175-080-11; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007 and 008) in the Planned Residential (R-4) Zone and designated Community Development Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR) (the “Project”).

Section 2. Extension of Time.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of a one-year Extension of Time for TPM No. 36812, a Schedule “F” subdivision, for financing purposes, of approximately 168.3 gross acres into 4 parcels on real property located north of Canal Street and Union Pacific Railroad Line, east of Sierra Avenue, south of Karen Lane, and west of the Rio Vista Specific Plan (APNs: 175-080-11; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007 and 008).

(b) The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley originally approved TPM No. 36812 on March 17, 2016, with an expiration date of March 17, 2019.

(c) The Applicant filed an application for a one-year extension of time for TPM No. 36812 on December 28, 2018, prior to the March 17, 2019 expiration date.

(d) Section 7.15.230.B. of Chapter 7.15 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that prior to the expiration date, the land divider may apply in writing for an extension
of time. Each application shall be made to the Planning Director thirty (30) days prior to the expiration date of the tentative map and shall be accompanied by the applicable fee.

(e) Section 7.15.230.B.(1) of Chapter 7.15 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that for a Schedule “F” map, the Planning Director is the Advisory Agency and may extend the date on which the map expires for one (1) year and, on further application thereof, may further extend it for a second year, and on further application thereof may extend it for a third year, and on further application before expiration thereof, may further extend it for a fourth year, and on further application before expiration thereof, may further extend it for a fifth year. The Planning Director shall report its action directly to the land divider and the City Council. If the Planning Director denies the request for an extension, the applicant may appeal that decision to the Advisory Agency which has jurisdiction on the land division within ten (10) days following the date the notice of decision appears on the City Council’s agenda by filing an appeal with the Planning Department accompanied by the applicable fee.

(f) Section 7.05.020.B. of Chapter 7.05 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that if any such tentative map land division includes a policy implication or the proposed use is the subject of concern for the public interest, as expressed by the City Council, the Planning Director may refer review of the tentative map land division subject to the Planning Director’s review to the Planning Commission and the division shall be heard by the Planning Commission, as the Advisory Agency, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 6.05.

(g) Section 7.05.020.A. of Chapter 7.05 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the Commission is authorized to approve, conditionally approve or disapprove all such tentative map land divisions and report the action directly to the City Council and the land divider.

(h) Government Code Section 66452.6(e) provides that upon application of the subdivider filed prior to the expiration of an approved or conditionally approved tentative map, the time at which the map expires pursuant to Section 66452.6(a) may be extended by the legislative body or by an advisory agency authorized to approve or conditionally approve tentative maps for a period or periods not exceeding a total of six years. The period of extension specified in this subdivision shall be in addition to the period of time provided by Section 66452.6(a). Prior to the expiration of an approved or conditionally approved tentative map, upon an application by the subdivider to extend that map, the map shall automatically be extended for 60 days or until the application for the extension is approved, conditionally approved, or denied, whichever occurs first. If the advisory agency denies a subdivider’s application for an extension, the subdivider may appeal to the legislative body within 15 days after the advisory agency has denied the extension.

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

(a) The application for MA No. 19003 was processed including, but not limited to a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.
(b) On February 13, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 19003, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing.

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

Section 4. California Environmental Quality Act Findings. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby makes the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Project:

(a) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the City's local CEQA Guidelines, City staff has considered the potential environmental impacts of the one-year Extension of Time for TPM No. 36812. City staff has also reviewed the Initial Study and the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) prepared for TPM No. 36812 and approved by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on March 17, 2016, including the impacts and mitigation measures identified therein, and prepared a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, attached hereto as Exhibit "A," in accordance with CEQA for the Project. Based on that review, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department has determined that the Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR prepared for TPM No. 36812. All potential environmental impacts associated with TPM No. 36812 and the one-year Extension of Time for TPM No. 36812 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for TPM No. 36812, and the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR will reduce certain impacts to a level that is less than significant.

(b) The Planning Commission has independently reviewed the Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, and based upon the whole record before it, the Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, and its independent review and judgment, finds that that the Project, as modified, is not subject to further environmental review pursuant to the Guidelines because:

1) The Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR prepared for TPM No. 36812; and

2) All potential environmental impacts associated with TPM No. 36812 and the one-year Extension of Time for TPM No. 36812 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for TPM No. 36812, and the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR will reduce certain impacts to a level that is less than significant.

(c) The custodian of records for the Final EIR prepared for TPM No. 36812, and all other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Planning
Commission's action is based, is the Planning Department of the City of Jurupa Valley. Those documents are available for public review in the Planning Department located at 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509.

Section 5. **Findings for Approval of Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812.** The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that the proposed one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812 should be granted because:

(a) The proposed Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812 continues to meet all requirements of Title 7 (Subdivisions) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(b) The proposed Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812 is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan in that it allows for residential subdivision.

(c) The design or improvement of the land division continues to be consistent with the Jurupa Valley 2017 General Plan in that the Project's density and use is consistent with the land use designation and the Jurupa Valley General Plan.

(d) The site of the land division continues to be physically suitable for the type of development in that the Project meets all design, zoning and subdivision standards.

(e) The site of the land division continues to be physically suitable for the proposed density of the development in that the Project meets all design, zoning and subdivision standards.

(f) The design of the land division or proposed improvements is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage nor substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat in that no riparian linkages or native resident or migratory wildlife corridors in the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) have been identified within the proposed Project area. No native resident or migratory fish or proposed native wildlife nursery sites have been identified within the proposed Project area.

(g) The design of the land division or the type of improvements is not likely to cause serious public health problems in that it is a project for residential subdivision.

(h) The design of the land division or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the land division in that the Project extends the existing Jurupa Valley General Plan roads and provides for access to the park, trails and other public facilities.

(i) A finding has been made in Section B of “Facts, Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations” of the Final EIR prepared for the Project, pursuant to CEQA, that specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.
Section 6. **Approval of Master Application No. 19003.** Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby approves a one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812 for a Schedule “F” subdivision, for financing purposes, of approximately 168.3 gross acres into 4 parcels on real property located north of Canal Street and Union Pacific Railroad Line, east of Sierra Avenue, south of Karen Lane, and west of the Rio Vista Specific Plan (APNs: 175-080-11; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007 and 008) in the Planned Residential (R-4) Zone and designated Community Development Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR). Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812 shall expire on March 17, 2020, unless within that period of time the expiration date of March 17, 2020, shall have been extended or a final map shall have been approved and filed with the County Recorder.

Section 7. **Certification.** The Planning Director shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

**PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED** by the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 13th day of February, 2019.

\[Signature\]
Corey Moore  
Chair of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission

**ATTEST:**

\[Signature\]
Thomas G. Merrell, AICP  
Planning Director/Secretary to the Planning Commission
I, Thomas G. Merrell, Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-02-13-01 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 13th day of February, 2018, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Moore, Pruitt, Lopez, Newman, Silva

NOES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

THOMAS G. MERRELL
PLANNING DIRECTOR
Previous Environmental Document Review Determination

City of Jurupa Valley Master Application 19003
(Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812)

Lead Agency
City of Jurupa Valley
8930 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
Contact: Annette Tam, Senior Planner
(951) 332-6464
atam@jurupavalley.org

Applicant:
Parkview Rubidoux, LLC
3161 Michelson Drive, Suite 425
Irvine, CA 92612

January 28, 2019
Revised: February 12, 2019
1.0 INTRODUCTION

A. Document Purpose.

This document is a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination 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.).

This document has been prepared to determine if the Proposed Project is within the scope of the analysis contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report, Highland Park Project, SCH #2014081029, ("EIR") certified by the City of Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2016-06 on March 17, 2016, and to ensure the Proposed Project does not create new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously analyzed impacts as compared to those identified previously.

B. Project Location.

Sierra Avenue between 20th Street and Canal Street, west of Rio Vista Specific Plan (See Exhibit 1).

C. Project Description.

Approved Project

Richland Communities, Inc. (the “Applicant”) received approval for General Plan Amendment No. 1207, Change of Zone No. 1205, Tentative Tract Map No. 31894, Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812, Variance No. 1505 and an exception to Subsection C of Section 3.8 of Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code (collectively, Master Application (MA) No. 1212) to permit the subdivision of approximately 168 gross acres into 398 single-family residential lots, 3 pocket parks and one 5-acre community park on real property located north of Canal Street and the Union Pacific Railroad Line, east of Sierra Avenue, south of Karen Lane, and west of the Rio Vista Specific Plan (APNs: 175-080-011; 177-020-004, 015, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007). These entitlements are further described below:

A. General Plan Amendment No. 1207:

Change the General Plan land use designation of the subject site (APNs: 175- 080-011; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007) from Open Space Mineral Resources (CS: MIN) and Community Development Medium High Density Residential (CD:MHDR) to Community Development Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR); and change the street classification of Sierra Avenue, between 20th Street and Canal Street, from an Arterial Highway (right-of-way width: 128’; four thru-lanes) to a modified Secondary Highway (right-of-way width: 100’; raised median; four thru-lanes).
B. Change of Zone No. 1205:

Change the Project site’s zoning classifications from Manufacturing-Heavy (M-H), Rural Residential (R-R), Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC) and One-Family Dwelling (R-1) to (Planned Residential) R 4.

C. Tentative Tract Map No. 31894:

A Schedule ‘A’ subdivision, to subdivide approximately 168.3 gross acres into 398 numbered lots for single-family residential purposes, lots for open space purposes and lettered lots for streets and public utility purposes.

D. Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812:

A Schedule ‘F’ subdivision, to subdivide approximately 168.3 gross acres into 4 parcels for financing purposes.

E. Variance No. 1505:

Variance for Lot Nos. 44, 282, 293 and 294 on the subject property from the minimum lot depth requirement of 80 feet set forth in Section 8.93.b. of Riverside County Zoning Ordinance No. 348, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

F. Exception to Subsection C of Section 3.8 of Ordinance No. 460:

Exception to Subsection C of Section 3.8 of Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, for the depth of Lots 46, 123, 154-155, 276-277 and 390 in the proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 to exceed 2½ times the width.

Proposed Project

A request for a one (1) year extension of time for Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) No. 36812 to extend the time for the expiration of the TPM from March 17, 2019 to March 19, 2020.

2.0 USE OF PREVIOUS EIR

The EIR was certified by the City of Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2016-06 on March 17, 2016. The EIR evaluated the above described entitlements.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) allows a previously certified EIR to be used as the environmental assessment for a project if it is determined that the project currently under review is “within the scope” of the earlier EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 (a) which states:
"When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative."

The EIR is on file with the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department (8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509) and is hereby incorporated by reference pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15150.
3.0 DETERMINATION:

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

______________________________
Signature

______________________________
City of Jurupa Valley
Agency

______________________________
Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director
Printed Name/Title

______________________________
January 25, 2019
Date
4.0 ANALYSIS

As required by CEQA, an Extension of Time request is based on any physical changes to the project site or its immediate environs that would result in any potentially new significant impacts that were not identified in the previously certified EIR.

Table 1.0-3: Environmental Impact Summary of the EIR identified the following environmental issues would be impacted by the Approved Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant air quality impacts as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.1-2:</strong> Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.1-3:</strong> 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. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.1-4:</strong> Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Impacts:</strong> Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.
Biological Resources

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to biological resources as follows:

**Impact 4.2-1:** May 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. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.2-2:** 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. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-2 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts.** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes that would impact biological resources than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Cultural Resources

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to cultural resources as follows:

**Impact 4.3-1:** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 through MM CR-4 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.3-2:** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 through MM CR-4 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.
Impact 4.3-3: *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.* Mitigation Measures MM CR-5 through MM CR-9 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts. *Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project.* Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 through MM CR-9 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes that would impact cultural resources than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 and MM CR-9 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Geology and Soils

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to geology and soils as follows:

Impact 4.4-1: *Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rockfall.* Mitigation Measures MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts. *Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project.* Mitigation Measures MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes that would impact geology and soils than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-2 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions as follows:

**Impact 4.5-1**: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. Although impacts were less than significant, Mitigation Measures MM GHG-1 through MM GHG-5 were required to reduce impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

**Cumulative Impacts**: Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Although impacts were less than significant. Mitigation Measures GHG-1 through MM GHG-5 were required to reduce impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

Conclusion

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM GHG-1 through MM GHG-5 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials as follows:

**Impact 4.6-1**: Implementation of the proposed Project may create a hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 and MM HAZ-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.6-2**: Implementation of the proposed Project may emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 and MM HAZ-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts**: Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 and MM HAZ-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.
Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 and MM HAZ-2 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality as follows

Impact 4.7-1: 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. Mitigation Measure MM HYD-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts: Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measure MM HYD-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM HYD-1 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Noise

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to noise as follows:
Impact 4.8-1: 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. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-15 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact 4.8-2: Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-15 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact 4.8-4: A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-13 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts: Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-15 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM NOI-1 through NOI-15 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Transportation/Traffic

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to transportation/traffic as follows:

Impact 4.9-1: 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. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through MM TRA-5 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts: Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through MM TRA-5 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion
The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through TRA-5 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project. Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Utilities and Service Systems

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to utilities and service systems as follows:

Impact 4.10-4: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed. Mitigation Measures MM UTL-1 and MM UTL-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact 4.10-5: 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. Mitigation Measures MM UTL-1 and MM UTL-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts: Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM UTL-1 and MM UTL-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM UTL-1 and UTL-2

Conclusion

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM UTL-1 and UTL-2 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project. Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project. will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.
RRESOLUTION NO. 2019-02-13-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY APPROVING A ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31894 FOR A SCHEDULE "A" SUBDIVISION OF APPROXIMATELY 168.3 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED NORTH OF CANAL STREET AND UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD LINE, EAST OF SIERRA AVENUE, SOUTH OF KAREN LANE, AND WEST OF RIO VISTA SPECIFIC PLAN (APNs: 175-080-011; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; AND 177-110-006, 007, AND 008) INTO 398 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS, 3 POCKET PARKS AND ONE 5-ACRE COMMUNITY PARK, AND DETERMINING NO FURTHER CEQA REVIEW REQUIRED

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

Section 1. Project. Richland Communities, Inc. (the "Applicant") has applied for a one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 (TTM No. 31894) (Master Application No. 19004 or MA No. 19004) for a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 168.3 gross acres into 398 numbered lots for single-family residential purposes, lots for open space purposes, and lettered lots for streets and public utility purposes on real property located north of Canal Street and Union Pacific Railroad Line, east of Sierra Avenue, south of Karen Lane, and west of the Rio Vista Specific Plan (APNs: 175-080-11; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007 and 008) in the Planned Residential (R-4) Zone and designated Community Development Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR) (the "Project").

Section 2. Extension of Time.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of a one-year Extension of Time for TTM No. 31894, a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 168.3 gross acres into 398 numbered lots for single-family residential purposes, lots for open space purposes, and lettered lots for streets and public utility purposes on real property located north of Canal Street and Union Pacific Railroad Line, east of Sierra Avenue, south of Karen Lane, and west of the Rio Vista Specific Plan (APNs: 175-080-11; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007 and 008).

(b) The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley originally approved TTM No. 31894 on March 17, 2016, with an expiration date of March 17, 2019.

(c) The Applicant filed an application for a one-year extension of time for TTM No. 31894 on December 28, 2018, prior to the March 17, 2019 expiration date.
(d) Section 7.15.230.A. of Chapter 7.15 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that prior to the expiration date, the land divider may apply in writing for an extension of time. Each application shall be made to the Planning Director thirty (30) days prior to the expiration date of the tentative map and shall be accompanied by the applicable fee. The Planning Director shall forward to the Advisory Agency a recommendation for approval or denial of the application. The Advisory Agency may extend the date on which the map expires for one (1) year and, on further application before expiration thereof, may further extend it for a second year and on further application before expiration thereof, may further extend it for a third year, and on further application before expiration thereof, may further extend it for a fourth year, and on further application before expiration thereof, may further extend it for a fifth year. The decision of the Advisory Agency shall be forwarded to the City Clerk. The decision of the Advisory Agency shall be final unless the decision is appealed to the City Council. Any appeal must be filed with the City Clerk accompanied by the applicable fee within ten (10) days of the date the notice of decision appears on the City Council’s agenda.

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

(f) Government Code Section 66452.6(e) provides that upon application of the subdivider filed prior to the expiration of an approved or conditionally approved tentative map, the time at which the map expires pursuant to Section 66452.6(a) may be extended by the legislative body or by an advisory agency authorized to approve or conditionally approve tentative maps for a period or periods not exceeding a total of six years. The period of extension specified in this subdivision shall be in addition to the period of time provided by Section 66452.6(a). Prior to the expiration of an approved or conditionally approved tentative map, upon an application by the subdivider to extend that map, the map shall automatically be extended for 60 days or until the application for the extension is approved, conditionally approved, or denied, whichever occurs first. If the advisory agency denies a subdivider’s application for an extension, the subdivider may appeal to the legislative body within 15 days after the advisory agency has denied the extension.

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

(a) The application for MA No. 19004 was processed including, but not limited to a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

(b) On February 13, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 19004, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing.
All legal preconditions to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

Section 4. California Environmental Quality Act Findings. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby makes the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Project:

(a) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the City's local CEQA Guidelines, City staff has considered the potential environmental impacts of the one-year Extension of Time for TTM No. 31894. City staff has also reviewed the Initial Study and the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) prepared for TTM No. 31894 and approved by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on March 17, 2016, including the impacts and mitigation measures identified therein, and prepared a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, attached hereto as Exhibit "A," in accordance with CEQA for the Project. Based on that review, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department has determined that the Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR prepared for TTM No. 31894. All potential environmental impacts associated with TTM No. 31894 and the one-year Extension of Time for TTM No. 31894 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for TTM No. 31894, and the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR will reduce certain impacts to a level that is less than significant.

(b) The Planning Commission has independently reviewed the Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, and based upon the whole record before it, the Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, and its independent review and judgment, finds that that the Project, as modified, is not subject to further environmental review pursuant to the Guidelines because:

1) The Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR prepared for TTM No. 31894; and

2) All potential environmental impacts associated with TTM No. 31894 and the one-year Extension of Time for TTM No. 31894 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for TTM No. 31894, and the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR will reduce certain impacts to a level that is less than significant.

(c) The custodian of records for the Final EIR prepared for TTM No. 31894, and all other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Planning Commission's action is based, is the Planning Department of the City of Jurupa Valley. Those documents are available for public review in the Planning Department located at 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509.
Section 5. **Findings for Approval of Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 31894.** The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that the proposed one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 should be granted because:

(a) The proposed Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 continues to meet all requirements of Title 7 (Subdivisions) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(b) The proposed Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan in that it allows for residential subdivision.

(c) The design or improvement of the land division continues to be consistent with the Jurupa Valley 2017 General Plan in that the Project’s density and use is consistent with the land use designation and the Jurupa Valley General Plan.

(d) The site of the land division continues to be physically suitable for the type of development in that the Project meets all design, zoning and subdivision standards.

(e) The site of the land division continues to be physically suitable for the proposed density of the development in that the Project meets all design, zoning and subdivision standards.

(f) The design of the land division or proposed improvements is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage nor substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat in that no riparian linkages or native resident or migratory wildlife corridors in the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) have been identified within the proposed Project area. No native resident or migratory fish or proposed native wildlife nursery sites have been identified within the proposed Project area.

(g) The design of the land division or the type of improvements is not likely to cause serious public health problems in that it is a project for residential subdivision.

(h) The design of the land division or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the land division in that the Project extends the existing Jurupa Valley General Plan roads and provides for access to the park, trails and other public facilities.

(i) A finding has been made in Section B of “Facts, Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations” of the Final EIR prepared for the Project, pursuant to CEQA, that specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

Section 6. **Approval of Master Application No. 19004.** Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby approves a one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 for a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 168.3 gross acres into 398 numbered lots for single-family residential purposes, lots for open space purposes, and lettered lots for streets and public utility purposes on real property located north of
Canal Street and Union Pacific Railroad Line, east of Sierra Avenue, south of Karen Lane, and west of the Rio Vista Specific Plan (APNs: 175-080-11; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007 and 008) in the Planned Residential (R-4) Zone and designated Community Development Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR). Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 shall expire on March 17, 2020, unless within that period of time the expiration date of March 17, 2020, shall have been extended or a final map shall have been approved and filed with the County Recorder.

Section 7. Certification. The Planning Director shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 13th day of February, 2019.

[Signature]
Corey Moore
Chair of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission

ATTEST:

[Signature]
Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director/Secretary to the Planning Commission
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

I, Thomas G. Merrell, Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-02-13-02 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 13th day of February, 2018, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Moore, Pruitt, Lopez, Newman, Silva

NOES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

THOMAS G. MERRELL
PLANNING DIRECTOR
Previous Environmental Document Review Determination

City of Jurupa Valley Master Application 19004
(Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 31894)

Lead Agency
City of Jurupa Valley
8930 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
Contact: Annette Tam, Senior Planner
(951) 332-6464
atam@jurupavalley.org

Applicant:
Parkview Rubidoux, LLC
3161 Michelson Drive, Suite 425
Irvine, CA 92612

January 28, 2019
Revised: February 12, 2019
1.0 INTRODUCTION

A. Document Purpose.

This document is a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination 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.).

This document has been prepared to determine if the Proposed Project is within the scope of the analysis contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report, Highland Park Project, SCH #2014081029, ("EIR") certified by the City of Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2016-06 on March 17, 2016, and to ensure the Proposed Project does not create new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously analyzed impacts as compared to those identified previously.

B. Project Location.

Sierra Avenue between 20th Street and Canal Street, west of Rio Vista Specific Plan (See Exhibit 1).

C. Project Description.

Approved Project

Richland Communities, Inc. (the “Applicant”) received approval for General Plan Amendment No. 1207, Change of Zone No. 1205, Tentative Tract Map No. 31894, Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812, Variance No. 1505 and an exception to Subsection C of Section 3.8 of Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code (collectively, Master Application (MA) No. 1212) to permit the subdivision of approximately 168 gross acres into 398 single-family residential lots, 3 pocket parks and one 5-acre community park on real property located north of Canal Street and the Union Pacific Railroad Line, east of Sierra Avenue, south of Karen Lane, and west of the Rio Vista Specific Plan (APNs: 175-080-011; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007). These entitlements are further described below:

A. General Plan Amendment No. 1207:

Change the General Plan land use designation of the subject site (APNs: 175-080-011; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007) from Open Space Mineral Resources (CS: MIN) and Community Development Medium High Density Residential (CD: MHDR) to Community Development Medium Density Residential (CD: MDR); and change the street classification of Sierra Avenue, between 20th Street and Canal Street, from an Arterial Highway (right-of-way width: 128’; four thru-lanes) to a modified Secondary Highway (right-of-way width: 100’; raised median; four thru-lanes).
B. Change of Zone No. 1205:

Change the Project site’s zoning classifications from Manufacturing-Heavy (M-H), Rural Residential (R-R), Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC) and One-Family Dwelling (R-1) to (Planned Residential) R-4.

C. Tentative Tract Map No. 31894:

A Schedule ‘A’ subdivision, to subdivide approximately 168.3 gross acres into 398 numbered lots for single-family residential purposes, lots for open space purposes and lettered lots for streets and public utility purposes.

D. Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812:

A Schedule ‘I’ subdivision, to subdivide approximately 168.3 gross acres into 4 parcels for financing purposes.

E. Variance No. 1505:

Variance for Lot Nos. 44, 282, 293 and 294 on the subject property from the minimum lot depth requirement of 80 feet set forth in Section 8.93.b. of Riverside County Zoning Ordinance No. 348, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

F. Exception to Subsection C of Section 3.8 of Ordinance No. 460:

Exception to Subsection C of Section 3.8 of Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, for the depth of Lots 46, 123, 154-155, 276-277 and 390 in the proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 to exceed 2½ times the width.

Proposed Project

A request for a one (1) year extension of time for Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 38914 to extend the time for the expiration of the TPM from March 17, 2019 to March 19, 2020.

2.0 USE OF PREVIOUS EIR

The EIR was certified by the City of Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2016-06 on March 17, 2016. The EIR evaluated the above described entitlements.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) allows a previously certified EIR to be used as the environmental assessment for a project if it is determined that the project currently under review is “within the scope” of the earlier EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 (a) which states:
"When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative."

The EIR is on file with the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department (8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509) and is hereby incorporated by reference pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15150.
3.0 DETERMINATION:

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

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director
Printed Name/Title

City of Jurupa Valley
Agency

January 25, 2019
Date
4.0 ANALYSIS

As required by CEQA, an Extension of Time request is based on any physical changes to the project site or its immediate environs that would result in any potentially new significant impacts that were not identified in the previously certified EIR.

Table 1.0-3: Environmental Impact Summary of the EIR identified the following environmental issues would be impacted by the Approved Project:

**Air Quality**

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant air quality impacts as follows:

**Impact 4.1-2:** Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.1-3:** 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. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.1-4:** Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts:** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Conclusion**

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.
Biological Resources

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to biological resources as follows

**Impact 4.2-1:** May 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. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.2-2:** 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. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-2 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts.** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Conclusion**

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes that would impact biological resources than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Cultural Resources

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to cultural resources as follows:

**Impact 4.3-1:** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 through MM CR-4 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.3-2:** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 through MM CR-4 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.
Impact 4.3-3: *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.* Mitigation Measures MM CR-5 through MM CR-9 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts.** *Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project.* Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 and MM CR-9 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Conclusion**

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes that would impact cultural resources than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 through MM CR-9 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

**Geology and Soils**

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to geology and soils as follows:

**Impact 4.4-1:** *Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rockfall.* Mitigation Measures MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts.** *Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project.* Mitigation Measures MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Conclusion**

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes that would impact geology and soils than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-2 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions as follows:

**Impact 4.5-1:** *Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.* Although impacts were less than significant, Mitigation Measures MM GHG-1 through MM GHG-5 were required to reduce impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

**Cumulative Impacts.** *Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project.* Although impacts were less than significant, Mitigation Measures GHG-1 through MM GHG-5 were required to reduce impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

**Conclusion**

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM GHG-1 through MM GHG-5 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials as follows:

**Impact 4.6-1:** *Implementation of the proposed Project may create a hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.* Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 and MM HAZ-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.6-2:** *Implementation of the proposed Project may emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.* Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 and MM HAZ-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts:** *Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project.* Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 and MM HAZ-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.
Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 and MM HAZ-2 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality as follows:

**Impact 4.7-1:** 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). Mitigation Measure MM HYD-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts:** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measure MM HYD-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM HYD-1 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Noise

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to noise as follows:
Impact 4.8-1: 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. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-15 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact 4.8-2: Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-15 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact 4.8-4: A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-13 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts: Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-15 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM NOI-1 through NOI-15 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Transportation/Traffic

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to transportation/traffic as follows:

Impact 4.9-1: 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. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through MM TRA-5 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts: Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through MM TRA-5 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.
Conclusion

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through TRA-5 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.
Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Utilities and Service Systems

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to utilities and service systems as follows:

**Impact 4.10-4:** Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed. Mitigation Measures MM UTL-1 and MM UTL-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.10-5:** 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. Mitigation Measures MM UTL-1 and MM UTL-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts:** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM UTL-1 and MM UTL-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM UTL-1 and UTL-2 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.
will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.
DATE: FEBRUARY 13, 2019
TO: CHAIR MOORE AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR
BY: ANNETTE TAM, SENIOR PLANNER
SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 6.1
MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 19003: TPM36812EOT
MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 19004: TTM31894EOT
MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 19011: TTM31894M2
PROPOSAL: “HIGHLAND PARK 1” – ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TPM36812 AND TTM31894; MODIFICATION TO CONDITION OF APPROVAL NOS. 11 AND 13 REGARDING FENCE MATERIAL
LOCATION: SIERRA AVENUE BETWEEN 20TH STREET AND CANAL STREET; WEST OF RIO VISTA SPECIFIC PLAN
APPLICANT: PARKVIEW RUBIDOUX, LLC

RECOMMENDATION

By motion:

1. Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-02-13-01, (1) adopting Previous Environmental Determination Document, and (2) approving an Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812; and

2. Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-02-13-02, (1) adopting Previous Environmental Determination Document, and (2) approving an Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 31894; and

3. Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-02-13-03, approving Minor Change No. 2 for Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 in order to modify Condition of Approval No. 11 and 22 to allow the use of vinyl instead of HDPE for fences.

BACKGROUND

Project Description: Highland Park 1. Highland Park 1 is a 398-single-family lot subdivision of 168 acres located generally along Sierra Avenue between 20th Street and Canal Street. See Exhibit A “Project Site” map.

Table 1 presents the applicant’s requests for a one-year extension of both the tentative tract and parcel maps’ approval period to allow one more year to record the subdivision. Once the final maps are recorded, the applicant can proceed with permits to construction the homes and
community park. In addition to the one-year extension of time applications, the only proposed change is the construction material for interior lot line and trail fences.

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

![Map of the project site](image)

**TABLE 1. REQUESTED ENTITLEMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENTITLEMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP</td>
<td>One-year extension from March 17, 2019 to March 17, 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TENTATIVE TRACT MAP</td>
<td>One-year extension from March 17, 2019 to March 17, 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR CHANGE</td>
<td>Change the required construction material for interior lot and trail fences from high density polyethylene (HDPE) to vinyl (required by Condition Nos. 11 &amp; 22 under case number MA1212)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2: GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMATION</th>
<th>INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER</td>
<td>175-080-011; 177-020-004; 177-020-016; 177-020-017; 177-030-001; 177-030-002; 177-030-004; 177-030-006; 177-030-010; 177-030-016; 177-110-006; 177-110-007; 177-110-008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACREAGE OF PROJECT SITE</td>
<td>168.3 gross acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION(S)</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING ZONING CLASSIFICATION(S)</td>
<td>R-4 Planned Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL PLAN OVERLAY(S)</td>
<td>Community Development Overlay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background of Highland Park 1. In March 2016, the City Council approved a residential subdivision for 398 single-family homes with a community park on 168 acres of land in the Sunnyslope community. See Exhibit B. The residential subdivision is named Highland Park and it is surrounded by residential communities. Highland Park 1 has an average lot size of 6,550 square-feet for a total of 398 single-family homes. Highland Park 2 has an average lot size of 6,400 square-feet.

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

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

ANALYSIS

I. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA).

A. Extension of Time Applications. The City of Jurupa Valley has previously adopted an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Project. The City has prepared a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination 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.).

The document has been prepared to determine if the Proposed Project is within the scope of the analysis contained in the EIR adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2016-06 on March 17, 2016, and to ensure the Proposed Project does not create new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously analyzed impacts as compared to those identified previously.
On the basis of the evaluation in the Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR, pursuant to all applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures are imposed upon the Proposed Project. Nothing further is required.

B. **Minor Change Application.** This project is exempt per CEQA Section 15061 (a) (3): The activity is covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment.

There is with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment. Thus, the activity is not subject to CEQA.

II. **GENERAL PLAN.** The project has a land use designation of Medium Density Residential which allows up to 5 units per acre and the project's density is 2.36 dwelling units per acre. The project meets the intent, characteristics and policies of the land use designation.

III. **ZONING ORDINANCE.** The project is consistent with R-4 zone and related standards in the zoning ordinance. Since the project has not changed, all findings previously made are still valid.

IV. **SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE.**

A. **Extension of Time Applications.** There is no change to the tentative maps or R-4 Development Plan. The approvals for the maps are for three years from the date of approval.

The expiration date for both maps is March 17, 2019. If the Extension of Time applications are not approved, the project will expire and the applicant will have to start over with the entitlement process if they wish to proceed.

The applicant's request for a one-year extension from March 17, 2019 to March 17, 2020 for both maps.

Pursuant to the subdivision ordinance, an extension of time shall not be granted unless the land division conforms to the Comprehensive General Plan, is consistent with existing zoning, and does not adversely affect the general health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Both subdivision maps are consistent with the General Plan and are consistent with the existing zoning code. The maps do not adversely affect the general health, safety, and welfare of the public. It will add to the existing residential community and provide a community park to the residents and larger community. Approving the extension of time applications will allow the applicant one more year to process and record the subdivision maps.

B. **Minor Change Application.** A Minor Change application is a request for a minor modification of an approved tentative map. The applicant is requesting to modify Condition Nos. 11 and 22 to change the construction material for fencing from HDPE to vinyl:

11. **Fencing for Interior (Rear and Side) Lot Lines.** High density polyethylene (HDPE) fencing shall be used for interior side and rear lot
lines instead of vinyl fencing as shown on the approved “Wall & Fence” exhibit if HDPE is available. The HDPE fencing shall be constructed according to the following specification: The HDPE fencing shall have an "outside" cap. The spacing of the fencing posts shall not exceed 10 feet on center. In the event that the HDPE is not available, the applicant shall use vinyl fencing or decorative block wall for the interior lot lines.

In the event HDPE is not available for privacy fencing, vinyl fencing shall be constructed according to the following specifications:

a. The vinyl fencing shall have an "outside" cap. The spacing of the fencing posts shall not exceed 10 feet on center.

b. The vinyl fencing shall meet the highest ASTM International standard for durability.

22. Split-Rail Fencing for Trails. The split-rail fencing for trails shall be constructed with high density polyethylene (HDPE). Prior to the issuance of any Building permit, the applicant shall submit exhibits that meet this condition for the review and approval of the City Engineer and Planning Director.

The Planning Commission added both conditions because HDPE is more durable than vinyl. Although HDPE is available for purchase, the availability is very limited. Future residents will have difficulty finding repair material, panels, or fence replacement. As oppose to vinyl fence, residents can readily find them at their local home supply store. Limited availability of HDPE will become an obstacle to the general maintenance and upkeep of the residential community.

Staff supports a modification of the conditions to allow vinyl fence that meets the highest ASTM International standard for durability. This is part of the original condition and it meets the intent of the Planning Commission’s original conditions.

Jurupa Area Recreation and Parks District (JARPD) will maintain the trail fence and JARPD’s fence standard is vinyl. Thus, the applicant has requested to modify the required of HDEP to vinyl as well. Staff supports the request to use vinyl consistent with JARPD’s standard.

CONCLUSION

By approving the Extension of Time applications and the Minor Change application, the project will create a quality residential development designed to create neighborhoods consistent with the values of the community. It will connect existing neighborhoods with future neighborhoods such as Highland Park 2 and Rio Vista Specific Plan.

A Community Park will be constructed for the residents and the larger community to enjoy. Additional benefits of Highland Park 1 include a connection between Sierra Avenue and Pacific Avenue, a quiet zone crossing for an existing rail spur, and increases connectivity to other neighborhoods.
ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution No. 2019-02-13-01 (MA19003)
   a. Exhibit A. Previous Environmental Determination Document

2. Resolution No. 2019-02-13-02 (MA19004)
   a. Exhibit A. Previous Environmental Determination Document

3. Resolution No. 2019-02-13-03 (MA19011)
   a. Exhibit A. Conditions of Approval

4. Applicant’s Request (Use of Vinyl instead of HDPE for fences)

5. Approved Tentative Tract Map

6. Approved Tentative Parcel Map
ATTACHMENT NO. 1

Resolution No. 2019-02-13-01 (EOT for TPM)
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-02-13-01

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY APPROVING A ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 36812 FOR A SCHEDULE “F” SUBDIVISION FOR FINANCING PURPOSES OF APPROXIMATELY 168.3 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED NORTH OF CANAL STREET AND UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD LINE, EAST OF SIERRA AVENUE, SOUTH OF KAREN LANE, AND WEST OF RIO VISTA SPECIFIC PLAN (APNS: 175-080-011; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; AND 177-110-006, 007, AND 008) INTO 4 PARCELS, AND DETERMINING NO FURTHER CEQA REVIEW REQUIRED

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

Section 1. Project. Richland Communities, Inc. (the “Applicant”) has applied for a one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812 (TPM No. 36812) (Master Application No. 19003 or MA No. 19003) for a Schedule “F” subdivision, for financing purposes, of approximately 168.3 gross acres into 4 parcels on real property located north of Canal Street and Union Pacific Railroad Line, east of Sierra Avenue, south of Karen Lane, and west of the Rio Vista Specific Plan (APNs: 175-080-11; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007 and 008) in the Planned Residential (R-4) Zone and designated Community Development Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR) (the “Project”).

Section 2. Extension of Time.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of a one-year Extension of Time for TPM No. 36812, a Schedule “F” subdivision, for financing purposes, of approximately 168.3 gross acres into 4 parcels on real property located north of Canal Street and Union Pacific Railroad Line, east of Sierra Avenue, south of Karen Lane, and west of the Rio Vista Specific Plan (APNs: 175-080-11; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007 and 008).

(b) The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley originally approved TPM No. 36812 on March 17, 2016, with an expiration date of March 17, 2019.

(c) The Applicant filed an application for a one-year extension of time for TPM No. 36812 on December 28, 2018, prior to the March 17, 2019 expiration date.

(d) Section 7.15.230.B. of Chapter 7.15 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that prior to the expiration date, the land divider may apply in writing for an extension
of time. Each application shall be made to the Planning Director thirty (30) days prior to the expiration date of the tentative map and shall be accompanied by the applicable fee.

(e) Section 7.15.230.B.(1) of Chapter 7.15 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that for a Schedule “F” map, the Planning Director is the Advisory Agency and may extend the date on which the map expires for one (1) year and, on further application thereof, may further extend it for a second year, and on further application thereof may extend it for a third year, and on further application before expiration thereof, may further extend it for a fourth year, and on further application before expiration thereof, may further extend it for a fifth year. The Planning Director shall report its action directly to the land divider and the City Council. If the Planning Director denies the request for an extension, the applicant may appeal that decision to the Advisory Agency which has jurisdiction on the land division within ten (10) days following the date the notice of decision appears on the City Council’s agenda by filing an appeal with the Planning Department accompanied by the applicable fee.

(f) Section 7.05.020.B. of Chapter 7.05 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that if any such tentative map land division includes a policy implication or the proposed use is the subject of concern for the public interest, as expressed by the City Council, the Planning Director may refer review of the tentative map land division subject to the Planning Director’s review to the Planning Commission and the division shall be heard by the Planning Commission, as the Advisory Agency, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 6.05.

(g) Section 7.05.020.A. of Chapter 7.05 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the Commission is authorized to approve, conditionally approve or disapprove all such tentative map land divisions and report the action directly to the City Council and the land divider.

(h) Government Code Section 66452.6(e) provides that upon application of the subdivider filed prior to the expiration of an approved or conditionally approved tentative map, the time at which the map expires pursuant to Section 66452.6(a) may be extended by the legislative body or by an advisory agency authorized to approve or conditionally approve tentative maps for a period or periods not exceeding a total of six years. The period of extension specified in this subdivision shall be in addition to the period of time provided by Section 66452.6(a). Prior to the expiration of an approved or conditionally approved tentative map, upon an application by the subdivider to extend that map, the map shall automatically be extended for 60 days or until the application for the extension is approved, conditionally approved, or denied, whichever occurs first. If the advisory agency denies a subdivider’s application for an extension, the subdivider may appeal to the legislative body within 15 days after the advisory agency has denied the extension.

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

(a) The application for MA No. 19003 was processed including, but not limited to a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.
(b) On February 13, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 19003, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing.

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

Section 4. California Environmental Quality Act Findings. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby makes the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Project:

(a) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and the City’s local CEQA Guidelines, City staff has considered the potential environmental impacts of the one-year Extension of Time for TPM No. 36812. City staff has also reviewed the Initial Study and the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) prepared for TPM No. 36812 and approved by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on March 17, 2016, including the impacts and mitigation measures identified therein, and prepared a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, attached hereto as Exhibit “A,” in accordance with CEQA for the Project. Based on that review, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department has determined that the Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR prepared for TPM No. 36812. All potential environmental impacts associated with TPM No. 36812 and the one-year Extension of Time for TPM No. 36812 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for TPM No. 36812, and the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR will reduce certain impacts to a level that is less than significant.

(b) The Planning Commission has independently reviewed the Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, and based upon the whole record before it, the Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, and its independent review and judgment, finds that that the Project, as modified, is not subject to further environmental review pursuant to the Guidelines because:

1) The Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR prepared for TPM No. 36812; and

2) All potential environmental impacts associated with TPM No. 36812 and the one-year Extension of Time for TPM No. 36812 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for TPM No. 36812, and the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR will reduce certain impacts to a level that is less than significant.

(c) The custodian of records for the Final EIR prepared for TPM No. 36812, and all other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Planning
Commission’s action is based, is the Planning Department of the City of Jurupa Valley. Those documents are available for public review in the Planning Department located at 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509.

Section 5. Findings for Approval of Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that the proposed one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812 should be granted because:

(a) The proposed Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812 continues to meet all requirements of Title 7 (Subdivisions) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(b) The proposed Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812 is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan in that it allows for residential subdivision.

(c) The design or improvement of the land division continues to be consistent with the Jurupa Valley 2017 General Plan in that the Project’s density and use is consistent with the land use designation and the Jurupa Valley General Plan.

(d) The site of the land division continues to be physically suitable for the type of development in that the Project meets all design, zoning and subdivision standards.

(e) The site of the land division continues to be physically suitable for the proposed density of the development in that the Project meets all design, zoning and subdivision standards.

(f) The design of the land division or proposed improvements is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage nor substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat in that no riparian linkages or native resident or migratory wildlife corridors in the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) have been identified within the proposed Project area. No native resident or migratory fish or proposed native wildlife nursery sites have been identified within the proposed Project area.

(g) The design of the land division or the type of improvements is not likely to cause serious public health problems in that it is a project for residential subdivision.

(h) The design of the land division or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the land division in that the Project extends the existing Jurupa Valley General Plan roads and provides for access to the park, trails and other public facilities.

(i) A finding has been made in Section B of “Facts, Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations” of the Final EIR prepared for the Project, pursuant to CEQA, that specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.
Section 6. **Approval of Master Application No. 19003.** Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby approves a one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812 for a Schedule “F” subdivision, for financing purposes, of approximately 168.3 gross acres into 4 parcels on real property located north of Canal Street and Union Pacific Railroad Line, east of Sierra Avenue, south of Karen Lane, and west of the Rio Vista Specific Plan (APNs: 175-080-11; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007 and 008) in the Planned Residential (R-4) Zone and designated Community Development Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR). Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812 shall expire on March 17, 2020, unless within that period of time the expiration date of March 17, 2020, shall have been extended or a final map shall have been approved and filed with the County Recorder.

Section 7. **Certification.** The Planning Director shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

**PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED** by the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 13th day of February, 2019.

________________________________________
Corey Moore  
Chair of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission

ATTEST:

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

I, Thomas G. Merrell, Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-02-13-01 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 13th day of February, 2018, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:  COMMISSION MEMBERS:

NOES:  COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSENT:  COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSTAIN:  COMMISSION MEMBERS:

THOMAS G. MERRELL  
PLANNING DIRECTOR
EXHIBIT A FOR ATTACHMENT NO. 1

Previous Environmental Document Review Determination
Previous Environmental Document Review Determination

City of Jurupa Valley Master Application 19003
(Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812)

Lead Agency
City of Jurupa Valley
8930 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
Contact: Annette Tam, Senior Planner
(951) 332-6464
atam@jurupavalley.org

Applicant:
Parkview Rubidoux, LLC
3161 Michelson Drive, Suite 425
Irvine, CA 92612

January 28, 2019
1.0 INTRODUCTION

A. Document Purpose.

This document is a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination 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.).

This document has been prepared to determine if the Proposed Project is within the scope of the analysis contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report, Highland Park Project, SCH #2014081029, (“EIR”) certified by the City of Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2016-06 on March 17, 2016, and to ensure the Proposed Project does not create new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously analyzed impacts as compared to those identified previously.

B. Project Location.

Sierra Avenue between 20th Street and Canal Street, west of Rio Vista Specific Plan (See Exhibit 1).

C. Project Description.

Approved Project

Richland Communities, Inc. (the “Applicant”) received approval for General Plan Amendment No. 1207, Change of Zone No. 1205, Tentative Tract Map No. 31894, Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812, Variance No. 1505 and an exception to Subsection C of Section 3.8 of Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code (collectively, Master Application (MA) No. 1212) to permit the subdivision of approximately 168 gross acres into 398 single-family residential lots, 3 pocket parks and one 5-acre community park on real property located north of Canal Street and the Union Pacific Railroad Line, east of Sierra Avenue, south of Karen Lane, and west of the Rio Vista Specific Plan (APNs: 175-080-011; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007). These entitlements are further described below:

A. General Plan Amendment No. 1207:

Change the General Plan land use designation of the subject site (APNs: 175-080-011; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007) from Open Space Mineral Resources (OS: MIN) and Community Development Medium High Density Residential (CD:MHDR) to Community Development Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR); and change the street classification of Sierra Avenue, between 20th Street and Canal Street, from an Arterial Highway (right-of-way width: 128'; four thru-lanes) to a modified Secondary Highway (right-of-way width: 100'; raised median; four thru-lanes).
B. Change of Zone No. 1205:

Change the Project site’s zoning classifications from Manufacturing-Heavy (M-H), Rural Residential (R-R), Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC) and One-Family Dwelling (R-1) to (Planned Residential) R-4.

C. Tentative Tract Map No. 31894:

A Schedule ‘A’ subdivision, to subdivide approximately 168.3 gross acres into 398 numbered lots for single-family residential purposes, lots for open space purposes and lettered lots for streets and public utility purposes.

D. Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812:

A Schedule ‘F’ subdivision, to subdivide approximately 168.3 gross acres into 4 parcels for financing purposes.

E. Variance No. 1505:

Variance for Lot Nos. 44, 282, 293 and 294 on the subject property from the minimum lot depth requirement of 80 feet set forth in Section 8.93.b. of Riverside County Zoning Ordinance No. 348, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

F. Exception to Subsection C of Section 3.8 of Ordinance No. 460:

Exception to Subsection C of Section 3.8 of Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, for the depth of Lots 46, 123, 154-155, 276-277 and 390 in the proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 to exceed 2½ times the width.

Proposed Project

A request for a one (1) year extension of time for Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) No. 36812 to extend the time for the expiration of the TPM from March 17, 2019 to March 19, 2020.

2.0 USE OF PREVIOUS EIR

The EIR was certified by the City of Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2016-06 on March 17, 2016. The EIR evaluated the above described entitlements.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) allows a previously certified EIR to be used as the environmental assessment for a project if it is determined that the project currently under review is “within the scope” of the earlier EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 (a) which states:

“When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:
(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative."

The EIR is on file with the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department (8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509) and is hereby incorporated by reference pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15150.
3.0 DETERMINATION:

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

______________________________  ______________________________
Signature                            City of Jurupa Valley

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director  January 25, 2019

Printed Name/Title                      Date
4.0 ANALYSIS

As required by CEQA, an Extension of Time request is based on any physical changes to the project site or its immediate environs that would result in any potentially new significant impacts that were not identified in the previously certified EIR.

Table 1.0-3: Environmental Impact Summary of the EIR identified the following environmental issues would be impacted by the Approved Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant air quality impacts as follows:

**Impact 4.1-2:** Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.1-3:** 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). Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.1-4:** Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts:** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Conclusion**

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.
Biological Resources

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to biological resources as follows:

**Impact 4.2-1:** May 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. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.2-2:** 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. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-2 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts.** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Conclusion**

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes that would impact biological resources than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Cultural Resources

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to cultural resources as follows:

**Impact 4.3-1:** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 through MM CR-4 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.3-2:** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 through MM CR-4 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.
**Impact 4.3-3:** Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Mitigation Measures MM CR-5 through MM CR-9 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts.** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 and MM CR-9 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Conclusion**

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes that would impact cultural resources than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 and MM CR-9 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

**Geology and Soils**

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to geology and soils as follows:

**Impact 4.4-1:** Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rockfall. Mitigation Measures MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts.** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Conclusion**

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes that would impact geology and soils than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-2 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions as follows:

**Impact 4.5-1:** *Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.* Although impacts were less than significant, Mitigation Measures MM GHG-1 through MM GHG-5 were required to reduce impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

**Cumulative Impacts:** *Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project.* Although impacts were less than significant. Mitigation Measures GHG-1 through MM GHG-5 were required to reduce impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

**Conclusion**

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM GHG-1 through MM GHG-5 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials as follows:

**Impact 4.6-1:** *Implementation of the proposed Project may create a hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.* Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 and MM HAZ-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.6-2:** *Implementation of the proposed Project may emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.* Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 and MM HAZ-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts:** *Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project.* Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 and MM HAZ-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.
Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 through MM HAZ-4 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality as follows:

**Impact 4.7-1:** 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. Mitigation Measure MM HYD-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts:** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measure MM HYD-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM HYD-1 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Noise

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to noise as follows:
Impact 4.8-1: 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. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-15 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact 4.8-2: Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-15 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact 4.8-4: A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-13 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts: Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-15 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM NOI-1 through NOI-15 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Transportation/Traffic

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to transportation/traffic as follows:

Impact 4.9-1: 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. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through MM TRA-5 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts: Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through MM TRA-5 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through TRA-5 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.
Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Utilities and Service Systems

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to utilities and service systems as follows:

Impact 4.10-4: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed. Mitigation Measures MM UTL-1 and MM UTL-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact 4.10-5: 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. Mitigation Measures MM UTL-1 and MM UTL-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts: Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM UTL-1 and MM UTL-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM UTL-1 and UTL-2

Conclusion

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through TRA-5 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project. will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.
ATTACHMENT NO. 2

Resolution No. 2019-02-13-02 (EOT for TTM)
RRESOLUTION NO. 2019-02-13-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY APPROVING A ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31894 FOR A SCHEDULE “A” SUBDIVISION OF APPROXIMATELY 168.3 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED NORTH OF CANAL STREET AND UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD LINE, EAST OF SIERRA AVENUE, SOUTH OF KAREN LANE, AND WEST OF RIO VISTA SPECIFIC PLAN (APNs: 175-080-011; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; AND 177-110-006, 007, AND 008) INTO 398 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS, 3 POCKET PARKS AND ONE 5-ACRE COMMUNITY PARK, AND DETERMINING NO FURTHER CEQA REVIEW REQUIRED

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

Section 1. Project. Richland Communities, Inc. (the “Applicant”) has applied for a one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 (TTM No. 31894) (Master Application No. 19004 or MA No. 19004) for a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 168.3 gross acres into 398 numbered lots for single-family residential purposes, lots for open space purposes, and lettered lots for streets and public utility purposes on real property located north of Canal Street and Union Pacific Railroad Line, east of Sierra Avenue, south of Karen Lane, and west of the Rio Vista Specific Plan (APNs: 175-080-11; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007 and 008) in the Planned Residential (R-4) Zone and designated Community Development Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR) (the “Project”).

Section 2. Extension of Time.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of a one-year Extension of Time for TTM No. 31894, a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 168.3 gross acres into 398 numbered lots for single-family residential purposes, lots for open space purposes, and lettered lots for streets and public utility purposes on real property located north of Canal Street and Union Pacific Railroad Line, east of Sierra Avenue, south of Karen Lane, and west of the Rio Vista Specific Plan (APNs: 175-080-11; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007 and 008).

(b) The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley originally approved TTM No. 31894 on March 17, 2016, with an expiration date of March 17, 2019.

(c) The Applicant filed an application for a one-year extension of time for TTM No. 31894 on December 28, 2018, prior to the March 17, 2019 expiration date.
(d) Section 7.15.230.A. of Chapter 7.15 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that prior to the expiration date, the land divider may apply in writing for an extension of time. Each application shall be made to the Planning Director thirty (30) days prior to the expiration date of the tentative map and shall be accompanied by the applicable fee. The Planning Director shall forward to the Advisory Agency a recommendation for approval or denial of the application. The Advisory Agency may extend the date on which the map expires for one (1) year and, on further application before expiration thereof, may further extend it for a second year and on further application before expiration thereof, may further extend it for a third year, and on further application before expiration thereof, may further extend it for a fourth year, and on further application before expiration thereof, may further extend it for a fifth year. The decision of the Advisory Agency shall be final unless the decision is appealed to the City Council. Any appeal must be filed with the City Clerk accompanied by the applicable fee within ten (10) days of the date the notice of decision appears on the City Council’s agenda.

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

(f) Government Code Section 66452.6(e) provides that upon application of the subdivider filed prior to the expiration of an approved or conditionally approved tentative map, the time at which the map expires pursuant to Section 66452.6(a) may be extended by the legislative body or by an advisory agency authorized to approve or conditionally approve tentative maps for a period or periods not exceeding a total of six years. The period of extension specified in this subdivision shall be in addition to the period of time provided by Section 66452.6(a). Prior to the expiration of an approved or conditionally approved tentative map, upon an application by the subdivider to extend that map, the map shall automatically be extended for 60 days or until the application for the extension is approved, conditionally approved, or denied, whichever occurs first. If the advisory agency denies a subdivider’s application for an extension, the subdivider may appeal to the legislative body within 15 days after the advisory agency has denied the extension.

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

(a) The application for MA No. 19004 was processed including, but not limited to a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

(b) On February 13, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 19004, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing.
(c) All legal preconditions to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

Section 4. **California Environmental Quality Act Findings.** The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby makes the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Project:

(a) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and the City’s local CEQA Guidelines, City staff has considered the potential environmental impacts of the one-year Extension of Time for TTM No. 31894. City staff has also reviewed the Initial Study and the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) prepared for TTM No. 31894 and approved by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on March 17, 2016, including the impacts and mitigation measures identified therein, and prepared a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, attached hereto as Exhibit “A,” in accordance with CEQA for the Project. Based on that review, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department has determined that the Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR prepared for TTM No. 31894. All potential environmental impacts associated with TTM No. 31894 and the one-year Extension of Time for TTM No. 31894 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for TTM No. 31894, and the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR will reduce certain impacts to a level that is less than significant.

(b) The Planning Commission has independently reviewed the Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, and based upon the whole record before it, the Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, and its independent review and judgment, finds that that the Project, as modified, is not subject to further environmental review pursuant to the Guidelines because:

1) The Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR prepared for TTM No. 31894; and

2) All potential environmental impacts associated with TTM No. 31894 and the one-year Extension of Time for TTM No. 31894 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for TTM No. 31894, and the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR will reduce certain impacts to a level that is less than significant.

(c) The custodian of records for the Final EIR prepared for TTM No. 31894, and all other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Planning Commission’s action is based, is the Planning Department of the City of Jurupa Valley. Those documents are available for public review in the Planning Department located at 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509.
Section 5. **Findings for Approval of Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 31894.** The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that the proposed one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 should be granted because:

(a) The proposed Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 continues to meet all requirements of Title 7 (Subdivisions) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(b) The proposed Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan in that it allows for residential subdivision.

(c) The design or improvement of the land division continues to be consistent with the Jurupa Valley 2017 General Plan in that the Project’s density and use is consistent with the land use designation and the Jurupa Valley General Plan.

(d) The site of the land division continues to be physically suitable for the type of development in that the Project meets all design, zoning and subdivision standards.

(e) The site of the land division continues to be physically suitable for the proposed density of the development in that the Project meets all design, zoning and subdivision standards.

(f) The design of the land division or proposed improvements is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage nor substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat in that no riparian linkages or native resident or migratory wildlife corridors in the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) have been identified within the proposed Project area. No native resident or migratory fish or proposed native wildlife nursery sites have been identified within the proposed Project area.

(g) The design of the land division or the type of improvements is not likely to cause serious public health problems in that it is a project for residential subdivision.

(h) The design of the land division or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the land division in that the Project extends the existing Jurupa Valley General Plan roads and provides for access to the park, trails and other public facilities.

(i) A finding has been made in Section B of “Facts, Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations” of the Final EIR prepared for the Project, pursuant to CEQA, that specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

Section 6. **Approval of Master Application No. 19004.** Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby approves a one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 for a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 168.3 gross acres into 398 numbered lots for single-family residential purposes, lots for open space purposes, and lettered lots for streets and public utility purposes on real property located north of
Canal Street and Union Pacific Railroad Line, east of Sierra Avenue, south of Karen Lane, and west of the Rio Vista Specific Plan (APNs: 175-080-11; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007 and 008) in the Planned Residential (R-4) Zone and designated Community Development Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR). Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 shall expire on March 17, 2020, unless within that period of time the expiration date of March 17, 2020, shall have been extended or a final map shall have been approved and filed with the County Recorder.

Section 7. Certification. The Planning Director shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 13th day of February, 2019.

______________________________
Corey Moore
Chair of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission

ATTEST:

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

I, Thomas G. Merrell, Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-02-13-02 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 13th day of February, 2018, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

NOES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

_________________________________
THOMAS G. MERRELL
PLANNING DIRECTOR
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8930 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
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Applicant:
Parkview Rubidoux, LLC
3161 Michelson Drive, Suite 425
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

A. Document Purpose.

This document is a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination 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.).

This document has been prepared to determine if the Proposed Project is within the scope of the analysis contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report, Highland Park Project, SCH #2014081029, (“EIR”) certified by the City of Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2016-06 on March 17, 2016, and to ensure the Proposed Project does not create new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously analyzed impacts as compared to those identified previously.

B. Project Location.

Sierra Avenue between 20th Street and Canal Street, west of Rio Vista Specific Plan (See Exhibit 1).

C. Project Description.

Approved Project

Richland Communities, Inc. (the “Applicant”) received approval for General Plan Amendment No. 1207, Change of Zone No. 1205, Tentative Tract Map No. 31894, Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812, Variance No. 1505 and an exception to Subsection C of Section 3.8 of Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code (collectively, Master Application (MA) No. 1212) to permit the subdivision of approximately 168 gross acres into 398 single-family residential lots, 3 pocket parks and one 5-acre community park on real property located north of Canal Street and the Union Pacific Railroad Line, east of Sierra Avenue, south of Karen Lane, and west of the Rio Vista Specific Plan (APNs: 175-080-011; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007). These entitlements are further described below:

A. General Plan Amendment No. 1207:

Change the General Plan land use designation of the subject site (APNs: 175-080-011; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007) from Open Space Mineral Resources (OS: MIN) and Community Development Medium High Density Residential (CD:MHDR) to Community Development Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR); and change the street classification of Sierra Avenue, between 20th Street and Canal Street, from an Arterial Highway (right-of-way width: 128'; four thru-lanes) to a modified Secondary Highway (right-of-way width: 100'; raised median; four thru-lanes).
B. Change of Zone No. 1205:

Change the Project site’s zoning classifications from Manufacturing-Heavy (M-H), Rural Residential (R-R), Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC) and One-Family Dwelling (R-1) to (Planned Residential) R-4.

C. Tentative Tract Map No. 31894:

A Schedule ‘A’ subdivision, to subdivide approximately 168.3 gross acres into 398 numbered lots for single-family residential purposes, lots for open space purposes and lettered lots for streets and public utility purposes.

D. Tentative Parcel Map No. 36812:

A Schedule ‘F’ subdivision, to subdivide approximately 168.3 gross acres into 4 parcels for financing purposes.

E. Variance No. 1505:

Variance for Lot Nos. 44, 282, 293 and 294 on the subject property from the minimum lot depth requirement of 80 feet set forth in Section 8.93.b. of Riverside County Zoning Ordinance No. 348, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

F. Exception to Subsection C of Section 3.8 of Ordinance No. 460:

Exception to Subsection C of Section 3.8 of Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, for the depth of Lots 46, 123, 154-155, 276-277 and 390 in the proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 to exceed 2½ times the width.

**Proposed Project**

A request for a one (1) year extension of time for Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 38914 to extend the time for the expiration of the TPM from March 17, 2019 to March 19, 2020.

**2.0 USE OF PREVIOUS EIR**

The EIR was certified by the City of Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2016-06 on March 17, 2016. The EIR evaluated the above described entitlements.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) allows a previously certified EIR to be used as the environmental assessment for a project if it is determined that the project currently under review is “within the scope” of the earlier EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 (a) which states:

“When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:
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(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative."

The EIR is on file with the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department (8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509) and is hereby incorporated by reference pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15150.
3.0 DETERMINATION:

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

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director

Printed Name/Title

January 25, 2019

Date
4.0 ANALYSIS

As required by CEQA, an Extension of Time request is based on any physical changes to the project site or its immediate environs that would result in any potentially new significant impacts that were not identified in the previously certified EIR.

Table 1.0-3: Environmental Impact Summary of the EIR identified the following environmental issues would be impacted by the Approved Project:

**Air Quality**

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant air quality impacts as follows:

**Impact 4.1-2:** Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.1-3:** 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. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.1-4:** Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts:** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Conclusion**

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-8 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.
Biological Resources

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to biological resources as follows:

Impact 4.2-1: *May 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.* Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact 4.2-2: *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.* Mitigation Measures MM BIO-2 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts. *Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project.* Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes that would impact biological resources than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Cultural Resources

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to cultural resources as follows:

Impact 4.3-1: *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5.* Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 through MM CR-4 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact 4.3-2: *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5.* Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 through MM CR-4 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.
Impact 4.3-3: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Mitigation Measures MM CR-5 through MM CR-9 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts. Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 and MM CR-9 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes that would impact cultural resources than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM CR-1 and MM CR-9 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Geology and Soils

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to geology and soils as follows:

Impact 4.4-1: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rockfall. Mitigation Measures MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts. Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes that would impact geology and soils than what was originally evaluated under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-2 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions as follows:

**Impact 4.5-1:** Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. Although impacts were less than significant, Mitigation Measures MM GHG-1 through MM GHG-5 were required to reduce impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

**Cumulative Impacts.** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Although impacts were less than significant. Mitigation Measures GHG-1 through MM GHG-5 were required to reduce impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

**Conclusion**

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM GHG-1 through MM GHG-5 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Hazardous and Hazardous Materials

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials as follows:

**Impact 4.6-1:** Implementation of the proposed Project may create a hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 and MM HAZ-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.6-2:** Implementation of the proposed Project may emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 and MM HAZ-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts:** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 and MM HAZ-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.
Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 through MM HAZ-4 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality as follows:

**Impact 4.7-1:** 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.

Mitigation Measure MM HYD-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts:** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measure MM HYD-1 was required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

Conclusion

The Project site remains in the same physical condition as it did as the time of Project approval (primarily vacant land). The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM HYD-1 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Noise

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to noise as follows:
**Impact 4.8-1:** 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. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-15 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.8-2:** Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-15 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.8-4:** A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-13 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts:** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Measures MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-15 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Conclusion**

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM NOI-1 through NOI-15 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

**Transportation/Traffic**

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to transportation/traffic as follows:

**Impact 4.9-1:** 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. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through MM TRA-5 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts:** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through MM TRA-5 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Conclusion**

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through TRA-5 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.
Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

**Utilities and Service Systems**

The EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in potentially significant impacts related to utilities and service systems as follows:

**Impact 4.10-4:** Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed. Mitigation Measures MM UTL-1 and MM UTL-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Impact 4.10-5:** 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. Mitigation Measures MM UTL-1 and MM UTL-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts:** Result in cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the Highland Park Project. Mitigation Measures MM UTL-1 and MM UTL-2 were required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level.

**Conclusion**

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM UTL-1 and UTL-2

**Conclusion**

The Extension of Time does not propose any changes to the intensity or type of development than what was originally allowed under the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures MM TRA-1 through TRA-5 will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.

Based on a review of the EIR and the analysis above, there are no substantial changes, no new information of substantial importance, or a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken that would change the analysis and conclusions made in the EIR. No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project. will still be imposed on the Proposed Project.
ATTACHMENT NO. 3

Resolution No. 2019-02-13-03 (Minor Change)
A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY APPROVING MINOR CHANGE NO. 2 TO TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31894 (TTM31894M2) TO MODIFY CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL REGARDING FENCING MATERIALS, AND MAKING A FINDING OF EXEMPTION FROM CEQA

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

Section 1. Project. Richland Communities, Inc. (the “Applicant”) has applied for Minor Change No. 2 to Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 (TTM31894M2) (Master Application No. 19011 or MA No. 19011) to modify Conditions of Approval Nos. 11 and 22 to allow the use of vinyl instead of HDPE for fencing materials (the “Project”).

Section 2. Minor Changes to Tentative Tract Map Authority.

(a) On March 17, 2016, the City Council approved Tentative Tract Map No. 31894, a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 168.3 gross acres into 398 numbered lots for single-family residential purposes, lots for open space purposes, and lettered lots for streets and public utility purposes on real property located north of Canal Street and Union Pacific Railroad Line, east of Sierra Avenue, south of Karen Lane, and west of the Rio Vista Specific Plan (APNs: 175-080-11; 177-020-004, 016, 017; 177-030-001, 002, 004, 006, 010, 016; and 177-110-006, 007 and 008) in the Planned Residential (R-4) Zone and designated Community Development Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR). Further, the City Council certified a Final Environmental Impact Report for Tentative Tract Map No. 31894.

(b) The Applicant is seeking Minor Change No. 2 to Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 (TTM31894M2) to modify Condition of Approval No. 11 to read as follows:

11. Fencing for Interior (Rear and Side) Lot Lines. High density polyethylene (HDPE) Vinyl fencing that meets the highest ASTM International standard for durability shall be used for interior side and rear lot lines instead of vinyl fencing as shown on the approved “Wall & Fence” exhibit if HDPE is available. The HDPE vinyl fencing shall be constructed according to the following specification: The HDPE vinyl fencing shall have an “outside” cap. The spacing of the fencing posts shall not exceed 10 feet on center. In the event that the HDPE is not available, the applicant shall use vinyl fencing or decorative block wall for the interior lot lines.

(c) Further, the Applicant is seeking Minor Change No. 2 to Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 (TTM31894M2) to modify Condition of Approval No. 22 to read as follows:

22. Split-Rail Fencing for Trails. The split-rail fencing for trails shall be constructed with high density polyethylene (HDPE) vinyl that meets the highest...
ASTM International standard for durability. Prior to the issuance of any Building permit, the applicant shall submit exhibits that meet this condition for the review and approval of the City Engineer and Planning Director.

(d) Section 7.15.210 of Chapter 7.15 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides the procedure for a minor change to a previously approved tentative map.

(e) Pursuant to Section 7.15.210, any request for approval of a minor change to a previously approved tentative map must be filed with the Planning Department. The Planning Director must make a recommendation to the body having jurisdiction over the underlying map and notice a public hearing in accordance with Section 7.15.130 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, unless the underlying map did not previously require a hearing. The Planning Commission may decide the matter when it appears on the agenda, or it may continue the matter with or without the consent of the land divider. The decision of the Planning Commission shall be final, unless the decision is appealed to the City Council. The approval by the Planning Commission of a minor change shall not affect the time period within which the land divider must prepare and file the final map.

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

(a) The application for MA No. 19011 was processed including, but not limited to a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

(b) On February 13, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 19011, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing.

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

Section 4. California Environmental Quality Act Findings. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby makes the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Project:

(a) The proposed Minor Change No. 2 to Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 (TTM31894M2) is exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and the City’s CEQA Guidelines pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3) because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the proposed Minor Change No. 2, modifying Conditions of Approval related to the use of vinyl fencing materials rather than High density polyethylene (HDPE) fencing materials, will have a significant effect on the environment. The Planning Commission has reviewed the administrative record concerning the proposed Minor Change No. 2 and the proposed CEQA exemption, and based on its own independent judgment, finds that the Minor Change No. 2 is exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and the City’s CEQA Guidelines pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3).
Section 5.  **Findings for Approval of Minor Change No. 2.** No findings are required under the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code to approve a minor change to a previously approved tentative tract map.

Section 6.  **Approval of Master Application No. 19011.** Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby approves Minor Change No. 2 to Tentative Tract Map No. 31894 (TTM31894M2) to modify Conditions of Approval Nos. 11 and 22 as set forth in Sections 2(b) and 2(c) of this Resolution, subject to the Conditions of Approval attached hereto as Exhibit A.

Section 7.  **Certification.** The Planning Director shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

**PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED** by the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 13th day of February, 2019.

______________________________
Corey Moore  
Chair of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission

ATTEST:

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

I, Thomas G. Merrell, Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-02-13-03 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 13th day of February, 2018, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

NOES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

__________________________________________
THOMAS G. MERRELL
PLANNING DIRECTOR
EXHIBIT A FOR ATTACHMENT NO. 3

Conditions of Approval
EXHIBIT A

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. **PROJECT PERMITTED.** MA19011 (TTM31894M2) – Approval of a minor change application to modify the construction material for fences in Condition of Approval No. 11 and 22 of original approval under MA1212. The use of vinyl is approved high-density polyethylene (HDPE) for interior and trail fences.

   **Condition of Approval of No. 11 shall be revised as follows:**

   **11. Fencing for Interior (Rear and Side) Lot Lines.** Vinyl fencing shall be used for interior side and rear lot lines as shown on the approved “Wall & Fence” exhibit.

   Vinyl fencing shall be constructed according to the following specifications:

   a. The vinyl fencing shall have an "outside" cap. The spacing of the fencing posts shall not exceed 10 feet on center.

   b. The vinyl fencing shall meet the highest ASTM International standard for durability.

   **Condition of Approval of No. 22 shall be revised as follows:**

   **22. Split-Rail Fencing for Trails.** The split-rail fencing for trails shall be constructed with vinyl fence. Prior to the issuance of any Building permit, the applicant shall submit exhibits that meet this condition for the review and approval of the City Engineer and Planning Director.

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

3. **CONSENT TO CONDITIONS.** Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the property owner or designee shall submit written consent to the required conditions of approval to the Planning Director or designee.

4. **FEES.** The approval of MA19011 (TTM31894M2) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

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: ________________
ATTACHMENT NO. 4

Applicant’s Request
January 14, 2019

Annette Tam  
City of Jurupa Valley  
8930 Limonite Avenue  
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509

Re: MA 1212 - Tentative Tract Map 31894

Annette:

Please consider this letter our request to modify the following conditions of approval:

**11. FENCING FOR INTERIOR (REAR AND SIDE) LOT LINES**

Request: Change the fencing condition from HDPE to Vinyl

HDPE fencing is not readily available and does not add any benefit to lot fencing. This material is primarily used in equestrian applications, and supply is extremely limited for yard fencing. Our fence supplier’s response to the request for HDPE: “The HDPE is a NON Stock Item, it’s all special ordered and I really don’t recommend using it. It’s a Recycled Material and does not hold up.” If the HDPE fence is damaged, homeowners will have difficulty locating repair material, and the community will eventually end up with cobbled-together fences. With vinyl fencing, the homeowner can buy direct replacements at the local home supply store or local fence company.

**22. SPLIT-RAIL FENCING FOR TRAILS**

Request: Change the fencing condition from HDPE to Vinyl

The trails in the Community will be operated and maintained by the Jurupa Area Recreation and Parks District (JARPD). The trail fence standard for JARPD is vinyl, and HDPE is not acceptable to the District. The JARPD trail fencing specification is attached.
Thank you for your consideration of our request and please let me know if you require any additional information.

Sincerely,

John H. Schafer  
Senior Vice President  
Richland Ventures, Inc.

cc: Richard Valdez  
Samantha Kuhns
TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 31894
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SCHEDULE "A" SUBDIVISION
HIGHLAND PARK

City of Jurupa Valley
Approved by City Council
Date: 4-25-77

OWNER / DEVELOPER
Parsons & Wisglen
4200 Newport Place, Suite 300
Newport Beach, CA 92660
(949) 631-7010

UTILITIES
Owner:
JULIPE COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT
Owner:
JULIPE COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT
Owner:
SOUTHWEST CALIF. GAS COMPANY
Owner:
SOUTHWEST CALIF. GAS COMPANY

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
PORTION OF SECTION 8 AND 9, TOWNSHIP 2 SOUTH RANGE 5 WEST OF THE 1ST. M.N. & W.R.

ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBERS

TOPO SOURCE
PROJECT DESIGN CONSULTANTS
4435 Wojo Circle
Riverside, CA 92506
(714) 997-3666

EARTHWORK
APPROXIMATE CUT = 1,200,000 Y.D.
APPROXIMATE SWEEP = 200,000 Y.D.

GENERAL NOTES
THOMAS BIRD COURTS,
9545 HOLLAND AVE., RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730
(909) 874-3600

INDEX MAP
R-4 OPEN SPACE CALCULATION
63.65 ACRES OF OPEN SPACE (0.07 A.F., A-F, B, L, S, U, V, W, Y, Z)
39 acres Residential Lots
63.65 AC (366 LOTS) + 0.07 AC (0.07 A.F.) = 63.65 SQ. FT. 17,077

NOTES:
1. ALL APPURTENANCES SHALL BE IN CONFORMITY WITH SCHEDULES. EASEMENTS, EDRS, AND URBAN GUIDELINES.
2. ALL APPURTENANCES SHALL BE IN CONFORMITY WITH SCHEDULES. EASEMENTS, EDRS, AND URBAN GUIDELINES.
3. ALL APPURTENANCES SHALL BE IN CONFORMITY WITH SCHEDULES. EASEMENTS, EDRS, AND URBAN GUIDELINES.
4. ALL APPURTENANCES SHALL BE IN CONFORMITY WITH SCHEDULES. EASEMENTS, EDRS, AND URBAN GUIDELINES.
5. ALL APPURTENANCES SHALL BE IN CONFORMITY WITH SCHEDULES. EASEMENTS, EDRS, AND URBAN GUIDELINES.
6. ALL APPURTENANCES SHALL BE IN CONFORMITY WITH SCHEDULES. EASEMENTS, EDRS, AND URBAN GUIDELINES.
7. ALL APPURTENANCES SHALL BE IN CONFORMITY WITH SCHEDULES. EASEMENTS, EDRS, AND URBAN GUIDELINES.
8. ALL APPURTENANCES SHALL BE IN CONFORMITY WITH SCHEDULES. EASEMENTS, EDRS, AND URBAN GUIDELINES.
9. ALL APPURTENANCES SHALL BE IN CONFORMITY WITH SCHEDULES. EASEMENTS, EDRS, AND URBAN GUIDELINES.
10. ALL APPURTENANCES SHALL BE IN CONFORMITY WITH SCHEDULES. EASEMENTS, EDRS, AND URBAN GUIDELINES.
11. ALL APPURTENANCES SHALL BE IN CONFORMITY WITH SCHEDULES. EASEMENTS, EDRS, AND URBAN GUIDELINES.
12. ALL APPURTENANCES SHALL BE IN CONFORMITY WITH SCHEDULES. EASEMENTS, EDRS, AND URBAN GUIDELINES.
13. ALL APPURTENANCES SHALL BE IN CONFORMITY WITH SCHEDULES. EASEMENTS, EDRS, AND URBAN GUIDELINES.
14. ALL APPURTENANCES SHALL BE IN CONFORMITY WITH SCHEDULES. EASEMENTS, EDRS, AND URBAN GUIDELINES.

VSL ENGINEERING
30170 DURANGO PARKWAY, PO BOX 1099, CLARINDA, NV 89017
TOLL FREE: 1-888-719-4364
FAX: 1-775-726-3664

PREPARED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF:
RICHARD VALZ
P.O. BOX 1099, CLARINDA, NV 89017
TOLL FREE: 1-888-719-4364
FAX: 1-775-726-3664

CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
SCHEDULE "A"
TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 31894
ATTACHMENT NO. 6

Approved TPM
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR MA1212 (TTM31894, TPM36812, & VAR1505)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. **PROJECT PERMITTED.** MA1212 (GPA1207, CZ1205, TTM31894, TPM36812, VAR1505 & exception to Section 3.8c of Ordinance No. 460) is for the approval of a residential subdivision of 398 single-family lots, a community park, and pocket parks.

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

3. **CONSENT TO CONDITIONS.** Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to the required conditions of approval to the Planning Director or designee.

4. **MITIGATION MEASURES.** This project shall be subject to the mitigation measures adopted with the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the project and included with these conditions of approval.

5. **FEES.** The approval of MA1212 (GPA1207, CZ1205, TTM31894, TPM36812, VAR1505 & exception to Section 3.8c of Ordinance No. 460) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

6. **APPROVAL PERIOD.** An approved or conditionally approved tentative tract or parcel map shall expire 36 months after such approval unless within that period of time a final map shall have been approved and filed with the County Recorder. Prior to the
expiration date, the land divider may apply in writing for an extension of time pursuant to Ordinance No. 460.

7. **CONFORMANCE TO APPROVED EXHIBITS.** The project shall be in conformance to the approved plans as follows:

   
   
   
   
   e. Sierra Avenue cross-section (stand-alone)
   
   f. 20th Street cross-section (stand-alone)

8. **REVISION TO APPROVED DEVELOPMENT PLAN.** Prior to the recordation of the final map, the applicant shall submit a final Development Plan with the following changes to the approved Development Plan: All text and exhibits (including Maintenance Plan, street cross-sections, and trails plan) shall be revised to be consistent with the approved street trees and cross-sections for Sierra Avenue and 20th Street (as shown in Condition Nos. 18 and 19).

9. **PROJECT DESIGN APPROvals.** Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit an application for “Professional Services” that includes the following plans to the City for review and approval consistent with the approved final Development Plan:

   a. Final Site (Plotting) Plan for Dwellings. All dwelling units shall be plotted in compliance with the approved setbacks.
   
   b. Wall & Fence Plan. The Wall & Fence Plan shall comply with Condition of Approval Nos. 10, 11, and 17.
   
   c. Neighborhood Entry Statements (monument signs)
   
   d. Architectural Styles
   
   e. Residential Home Models

10. **MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF SOLID FENCING AND WALLS WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK.** No solid fencing or wall shall exceed 42 inches in height within the front setback.

11. **FENCING FOR INTERIOR (REAR AND SIDE) LOT LINES.** High density polyethylene (HDPE) fencing shall be used for interior side and rear lot lines instead of vinyl fencing as shown on the approved “Wall & Fence” exhibit if HDPE is available. The HDPE fencing shall be constructed according to the following specification: The HDPE fencing shall have an "outside" cap. The spacing of the fencing posts shall not exceed 10 feet
on center. In the event that the HDPE is not available, the applicant shall use vinyl fencing or decorative block wall for the interior lot lines.

In the event HDPE is not available for privacy fencing, vinyl fencing shall be constructed according to the following specifications:

a. The vinyl fencing shall have an "outside" cap. The spacing of the fencing posts shall not exceed 10 feet on center.

b. The vinyl fencing shall meet the highest ASTM International standard for durability.

12. ON-SITE LANDSCAPING. Prior to the issuance of any Building permit, the applicant shall a submit a “Professional Services (PROS)” application (with current fees) and the following items for City review and approval:

a. The total cost estimate of landscaping, irrigation, and one-year of maintenance.

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

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

d. Final landscape, maintenance, planting, and irrigation plans and digital copies (CD format) that are consistent with the approved conceptual landscape plans and demonstrate compliance with the landscape provisions of Ordinance No. 348, Ordinance No. 859, and the Riverside County Guide to California Friendly Landscaping. Additionally, the plans shall include the following items:

- Maintenance Plan shall indicate HOA as the responsible agency for fuel modification zones, non-water quality basins, landscaped slopes, and pocket parks.
- Pedestrian-level lighting within the parks including the vehicle parking lot.
- The street trees within the parkways of Sierra Avenue shall be Chinese Flame tree [Koelreuteria bipinnata] or Australian Willow [Geijera parviflora].
- In order to be in compliance with the latest Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELO) requirements, revise the tree and shrub palette to include more plants with a low / very low WUCOLS rating. Water use calculations must demonstrate that the estimated landscape water use will not exceed a factor of 0.55.
- Use a warm season sports field turf mix for park grass areas.
- Illustrate the meandering sidewalks on 20th Street and Sierra Avenue.
- Provide a continuous 8’ wide D.G. trail along Sierra Avenue to connect the trails on La Cañada Drive/Canal Street and 20th Street.
- Specify block wall house returns with vinyl gates.
• Add street medians to the Maintenance Responsibility Plan.
• Landscape Plan shall be revised to show Lot 118 is a buildable lot instead of an open space lot.
• Provide typical front yard landscape plan and include 2 front yard trees in addition to the street tree.
• Wet signed by a licensed landscape architect
• Applicant’s wet signature and date with statement, “I agree to comply with the criteria of the City of Jurupa Valley Water Use Efficiency Ordinance”.
• Water budget calculations; Maximum Applied Water Allowance (MAWA) and Estimated Annual Applied Water Use (EAWU)
• Hydrozone information table
• Irrigation run time schedules; six month establishment period and for established landscape
• Provide root barriers to prevent tree root damage to sidewalks and sewer lines.
• Notation: The project landscape architect shall conduct a field inspection at substantial completion of each phase of the project to verify that the landscape and irrigation installation is in Compliance with the approved design plans; this prior to beginning the contractors 1 year maintenance period. The project Landscape Architect shall then submit a Certificate of Compliance letter to the City of Jurupa Valley and request a final City Inspection of the landscape and irrigation installation. The Certificate shall include a list of any deficiencies or necessary changes for approval by the Department of Development Services. At the time of the City final landscape inspection an irrigation system coverage review will be conducted; the landscape contractor may be required to be in attendance to operate the irrigation system to facilitate the review.

• Notation: The project landscape architect shall conduct a field inspection at completion of the project 1 year maintenance period to verify that the landscape and irrigation installation is in Compliance with the approved design plans and is healthy and flourishing. The project Landscape Architect shall then submit a Certificate of Compliance letter to the City of Jurupa Valley and request a final City Inspection of the maintained landscape and irrigation installation.

Prior to the final inspection of any Building permit, the Landscape Architect of Record shall conduct an inspection and submit a letter to the City of Jurupa Valley once s/he has deemed the installation is in conformance to the approved plans. Following the inspection of the Landscape Architect of Record, the applicant shall schedule a City inspection with the City’s landscape architect.
13. COVENANTS, CONDITIONS, & RESTRICTIONS (CC & RS). Prior to recordation of the final map, the applicant shall submit Covenants, Conditions, & Restrictions (CC & Rs) for City review and approval. The CC&Rs shall include, but not limited to, the provisions relating to the following items:

   a. Formation of home owner's association to own, operate, and maintain common areas;
   b. Identify common areas (including perimeter community wall, pocket parks, landscaped slopes, fuel modification zones);
   c. Include approved Landscape exhibit;
   d. Include approved Maintenance exhibit;
   e. Allowed users of the common areas;
   f. Maintenance Plan shall indicate HOA as the responsible maintenance agency for fuel modification zones, non-water quality basins, landscaped slopes, and pocket parks. Include a provision to require Planning Director approval if there are any changes to the approved Maintenance exhibit;
   g. Maintenance of perimeter wall surrounding the tract, unless a CFD was formed to maintain the perimeter wall. All graffiti and vandalism shall be removed on a regular basis;
   h. Maintenance of any on-site community signage in a clean, legible condition at all times. All graffiti and vandalism shall be removed on a regular basis;

14. LIGHTING FOR PARKS. All parks, including the parking area, shall be well-lit for crime prevention and safety. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit a photometric plan, lighting fixture specifications, and a site plan for review and approval. The light fixtures shall be shielded to direct light only onto the project site.

15. SETBACKS. All structures shall comply with the approved setbacks in the approved Development Plan. In addition to the required front yard setback of 20 feet for a garage, no garage shall protrude from any part of a habitable area.

16. TWO-CAR GARAGE.
   a. All residential units shall not have less than two parking spaces in a garage with roll-up doors.
   b. A two-car garage with roll-up doors, in the original form, shall be replaced if the owner converts the garage into habitable or accessory space.

17. GRAFFITI PROTECTION FOR WALLS & SIGNS. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit plans that include graffiti coating or protection for the exterior side of the perimeter walls for City review and approval.

18. STREET TREES.
   a. The applicant shall plant Chinese Flame tree [Koelreuteria bipinnata] or Australian Willow [Geijera parviflora] within the parkway of Sierra Avenue. Any change to the street trees requires Planning Director approval. Afghan Pine is prohibited on Sierra Avenue and 20th Street.
b. Street trees and related security and agreements are required pursuant to Section 14 of Ordinance No. 460.

19. CIRCULATION.

a. SIERRA AVENUE. Sierra Avenue shall be constructed consistent with the cross-section below. There shall be a two (2) foot wide clearance (no obstructions) on both sides of the sidewalk.

b. 20TH STREET.

i. 20th Street shall be constructed consistent with the cross-section below but shall include a raised landscaped median.

ii. Prior to final inspection or occupancy of any residential units greater than 80% of the units in that phase or subdivision unit or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer, the applicant shall provide a temporary turn-around at the end of 20th Street to accommodate emergency vehicles. The turn-around shall be within the Highland Park tract. The approved street improvements plans shall include the turn-around at the end of 20th Street.

c. VACATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY. Prior to the recordation of final map, the subdivider shall submit an application to vacate a portion of existing Sierra Avenue (west of Lot No. 118 of TTM31894 and westerly of the intersection of Sierra Avenue and 20th Street) to the City Engineer for the land to be owned, maintained, and used by the homeowner's association.
20. JURUPA AREA RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit proof of satisfying any fees, dedications, or requirements by the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District to the Building Official.

21. MULTIPLE SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN MITIGATION FEE (ORD. NO. 810). The applicant shall pay any owed fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 810. In order for the agency to determine that the project qualifies for any exemptions for any of the subject fees, the applicant needs to submit sufficient evidence to the City to demonstrate that it qualifies for the exemption.

22. SPLIT-RAIL FENCING FOR TRAILS. The split-rail fencing for trails shall be constructed with high density polyethylene (HDPE). Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit exhibits that meet this condition for the review and approval of the City Engineer and Planning Director.

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

1. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (ENGINEERING)

1.1. This land division shall comply with the State of California Subdivision Map Act and with all requirements of Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley, for a Schedule “A” subdivision for single family residential purposes, unless otherwise modified by the conditions listed herein.

1.2. Grading, including clearing and grubbing, shall conform to the California Building Code, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley and Riverside County Ordinance 457, and all other relevant laws, rules, and regulations governing grading in the city of Jurupa Valley and state of California.

1.3. Lots which propose retaining walls will require separate permit(s). Permits for retaining walls shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any other grading or building permit(s) for dwelling units unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer and Building Official. The walls shall be designed by a Registered Civil Engineer unless they conform in all respects to the Riverside County Standard Retaining Wall designs shown on Riverside County Building and Safety Department Standard Plans.

1.4. All drainage and storm drain improvements shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District’s (RCFC&WCD) standards. Drainage facilities shall be designed to accommodate 100-year storm flows. Facilities outletting sump conditions shall be designed to convey the tributary 100 year storm flows and additional emergency overflow escape shall also be provided.

The 10-year storm flow shall be contained within the top of the curbs and the 100-year storm flow shall be contained within the street right of way. When either of these criteria is exceeded additional drainage facilities shall be installed.

1.5. Construction activities including but not limited to clearing, stockpiling, grading or excavation of land which disturb 1 acre or more, or which disturb less than 1 acre, but are part of a larger common plan of development, are required to obtain coverage under the construction general permit with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). Developer is required to provide proof of WDID# and keep a current copy of the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) on the construction site.
1.6. It is assumed that the tentative map exhibit is all inclusive of a parcel or parcels of land legally subdivided in compliance with the Subdivision Map Act, and local ordinance. The later determination that this assumption is incorrect may require that the Developer amend or revise the tentative map as necessary to allow a finding that the final Map is in substantial conformance with the tentative map.

1.7. All off-site rights-of-way and easements necessary to construct the project as shown the tentative subdivision map shall be obtained at no cost to the City and without eminent domain proceedings by the City.

1.8. It is assumed that easements shown on the tentative map exhibit are shown correctly and include all the easements that encumber the subject property. The Developer shall secure approval from all easement holders for all grading and improvements which are proposed over the respective easement or provide evidence that the easement has been relocated, quitclaimed, vacated, abandoned, easement holder cannot be found, or is otherwise of no affect. The later determination that this assumption is incorrect may require that the Developer amend or revise the tentative map as may be necessary to allow a finding that the Final Map is substantial conformance with the tentative map.

1.9. A traffic impact analysis was prepared for Tentative Tract 31894 by Albert A. Webb Associates for, Highland Park residential development titled “Revised Traffic Impact Analysis Report – Tentative Tract 31894” (TIA) and dated July 2014 and supplemental analysis. This analysis and report was accepted for preliminary planning purposes only for the referenced project (Highland Park). The TIA and environmental report indicated a planned timeline for development of each project phase. If the project development schedule substantially lags that proposed timeline, the Developer shall submit an amended and/or updated TIA focusing on the phase or unit for review and approval of the City Engineer to verify that the proposed mitigation listed in the monitoring report will effectively address the project’s impacts.

1.10. All landscaping, irrigation and systems maintenance shall comply with the “County of Riverside Guide to California Friendly Landscaping” and Riverside County Ordinance No. 859, as adopted by the City.

1.11. In compliance with Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Orders this project is required to comply with the Water Quality Management Plan for Urban Runoff (WQMP). The WQMP addresses post-development water quality impacts from new development and redevelopment projects. Guidelines and templates to assist the developer in completing the necessary studies are available on-line at www.floodcontrol.co.riverside.ca.us under Programs and Services, Stormwater Quality. To comply with the WQMP the Developer must submit a “Project Specific” WQMP. This report is intended to 1) identify potential post-project pollutants and hydrologic impacts associated with the development; 2) identify proposed mitigation measures (BMPs) for identified impacts including site design, source control and treatment control post-development BMPs; and 3) identify sustainable funding and maintenance mechanisms for the aforementioned BMPs. A template for this report is indicated as ‘Exhibit A’ on the website above. A final Project Specific WQMP must be approved by the City prior to issuance of any building or grading permit.
A Preliminary Project Specific WQMP (P-WQMP) was prepared for this project that minimally meets the criteria for a P-WQMP of addressing points 1), 2), and 3) above. It shall be noted that while the P-WQMP was adequate at that stage, the report will need revisions at the improvement plan check phase of the development in order to meet the requirements of a final project specific Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), including detailed drawings for the BMPs along with all supporting calculations.

If Clean Water Act, Section 401 Water Quality Certification is necessary for the project, the Regional Water Quality Control Board may require additional water quality measures.

1.12. This project proposes water quality management facilities and features. All water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) will require maintenance by a public agency or Home Owner's/Property Owner’s Association (HOA/POA). To ensure that the general public is not unduly burdened with future costs the City will require that an acceptable financial mechanism be implemented to provide for maintenance of water quality treatment BMPs in perpetuity. This may consist of a mechanism to assess individual benefiting property owner(s), or other means approved by the City Engineer.

1.13. The site’s BMPs must be shown on the project’s site improvement plans, street improvement plans, grading plans, or landscaping plans. The type of improvement plans on which the BMPs are to be shown will be determined by the City Engineer and may depend on the maintenance entity.

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

1.15. An Environmental Constraint Sheet (ECS) is required to be prepared for this subdivision based on information provided with the tentative map submittal. The ECS shall be prepared in accordance with all requirements of Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley and include applicable ECS notes as determined by the City Engineer.

2. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

2.1. No grading permit shall be issued until the related cases associated with this subdivision are approved and are in effect.

2.2. The Developer shall protect downstream properties from damages caused by alteration of the drainage patterns, i.e., concentration or diversion of flow. Protection shall be provided by constructing adequate drainage facilities including enlarging existing facilities, if necessary, and/or by securing drainage easements. All drainage easements shall be shown on the final map and noted as follows: "Drainage Easement - no building, obstructions, or encroachments by landfills are allowed". The protection shall be as approved by the Engineering Department.

2.3. The Developer shall accept and properly dispose of all off-site drainage flowing onto or through the site. In the event the Engineering Department permits the use of streets for
drainage purposes, the provisions of Article XI of Ordinance No. 460, as adopted by the City, will apply. Should the quantities exceed the street capacity or the use of streets be prohibited for drainage purposes, the developer shall provide adequate drainage facilities and/or appropriate easements as approved by the Engineering Department.

2.4. The developer shall prepare drainage and storm drain improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer.

2.5. The Developer shall prepare a Rough Grading plan or a combined Rough and Precise Grading Plan for the entire site or, if phased, each phase or subdivision unit of the tentative map. All grading shall conform to the California Building Code and Riverside County Ordinance 457, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley, and all other relevant laws, rules, and regulations governing grading in the City of Jurupa Valley and the State of California. The grading plan shall be approved by the City Engineer. Securities and agreements must be in place to assure completion of the grading, or as sufficient to perform remedial or corrective grading to the extent necessary, as determined by the City Engineer.

2.6. Minimum drainage grades shall be 1% except on Portland Cement Concrete where 0.5% shall be the minimum.

2.7. All lots shall be graded to drain to the adjacent street or an adequate outlet as approved by the City Engineer.

2.8. To the maximum extent practicable all top soil from the area of grading shall be carefully removed and stockpiled for later use in final or precise grading of landscaped or planted areas. No top soil shall be removed from the area of the tentative subdivision unless it is determined to contain hazardous or other deleterious matter which renders it unusable for planting. Commercial sale of top soil from this site is prohibited.

2.9. Prior to approval of the grading and drainage plans and storm drain improvement plans, the Developer shall prepare a detailed hydrology and hydraulics report, corresponding with the proposed improvements, for approval of the City Engineer.

2.10. Project Proponent shall obtain an encroachment permit from RCFC&WCD for connection to its facilities, if any.

2.11. Should the source for water which is required for construction purposes involve the importing of water by truck or other vehicles using city streets, review and approval, by the City Engineer, of the construction water haul route will be required. Conditions relative to the various impacts that such hauling might have on the City’s infrastructure may be imposed in approving the haul route.

2.12. Where grading involves import or export the Developer shall obtain approval for the import/export location, from the Engineering and Planning departments if located in the City. If an Environmental Assessment did not previously approve the import/export location, a Grading Environmental Assessment shall be submitted to the Engineering Department for comment and to the Planning Director for review and approval. If import/export location is outside the City the Developer shall provide evidence that the jurisdictional agency has provided all necessary approvals for import/export to/from the site.
2.13. If grading involves import/export from the site using city streets, the Developer shall prepare a Grading Traffic Management Plan (GTMP) for approval of the City Engineer. The GTMP shall include, but not be limited to, an approved Haul Route. Such plan may include conditions of approval to mitigate related impacts.

2.14. It shall be the sole responsibility of the Developer to obtain any and all proposed or required easements and/or permissions necessary to perform the grading shown on the tentative map exhibit. If grading is required offsite, the Developer shall obtain written permission from the property owner(s) to grade as necessary and provide a notarized copy to the Engineering Department.

2.15. Temporary erosion control measures shall be implemented immediately following rough 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.

2.16. The proposed development of this site would adversely impact water quality. The City has reviewed the tentative map exhibit and Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (P-WQMP). The submittal reflects the general drainage and water quality plan for the development and meets the minimum requirements for the preliminary planning review process. A final WQMP, including additional details, will be required at the time grading plans are submitted. This may require that BMPs be sized larger than initially proposed or include alternate or additional BMPs to be constructed.

In compliance with the adopted General Construction Permit (Order No. R8-2010-0033), the WQMP shall be designed to include site features in compliance with Low Impact Development (LID) requirements promulgated by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFC&WCD) and the City.

2.17. It is assumed that the conceptual grading and the provisions for water quality management shown on the tentative map exhibit can comply with all requirements for a final Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) without substantial change from that shown. 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 (RCFC&WCD) for approval of the City Engineer. The later determination that this assumption is incorrect may require that the Developer amend or revise the tentative map as necessary to allow a finding that the Final (Tract) Map is in substantial conformance with the tentative map.

2.18. Prior to approval of the grading plan for disturbance of one (1) or more acres, the landowner shall provide evidence that it has prepared and submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWRCB issued WDID number shall be included on the face of the grading plan.

2.19. Project related geological and soils evaluations have previously been prepared and include:

- Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation prepared by LGC Geo-Environmental dated June 2005
• **Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation of Slope Stability** prepared by Lawson & Associates dated July 2013

• **Geotechnical Review** prepared by Ninyo & Moore dated January 2014

Prior to approval of the grading plan, the Developer shall prepare a geotechnical/soils report for the proposed grading and infrastructure and post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs) for review and approval of the City Engineer. All recommendations of the geotechnical/soils report shall be incorporated in the grading plan. The title and date of the geotechnical/soils report and the name and contact information of the Project Geotechnical Engineer shall be included on the face of the grading plan. The geotechnical engineer shall sign the grading plan.

The geotechnical/soils, compaction and inspection reports will be reviewed in accordance with the Riverside County “Geotechnical Guidelines for Review of Geotechnical and Geologic Reports”. All processing is through the City of Jurupa Valley.

2.20. **Prior to grading permit issuance**, all required environmental mitigation measures for any applicable paleontological issues shall be satisfied in accordance with the Environmental Impact Report dated October 2015 prepared for the project.

2.21. **Prior to grading permit issuance**, all required environmental mitigation measures for any applicable archeological or cultural resources issues shall be satisfied in accordance with the Environmental Impact Report dated October 2015 prepared for the project.

2.22. **Prior to grading permit issuance**, all applicable required environmental mitigation measures shall be satisfied in accordance with the Environmental Impact Report dated October 2015 prepared for the project.

3. **PRIOR TO MAP RECORDATION (ENGINEERING)**

Final (Tract) Map

3.1. No Final (Tract) Map shall be recorded until the related cases associated with this subdivision are approved and are in effect.

3.2. **After approval of the tentative map and prior to the expiration of said map**, the Developer shall cause the real property included within the tentative map exhibit, or any part thereof, to be surveyed and a Final (Tract) Map thereof prepared in accordance with the City Engineer’s current requirements, conditions of tentative map approval, and in accordance with Article IX of Riverside County Ordinance 460 as adopted by the city. All processing is through the City of Jurupa Valley.

3.3. Three (3) phases or subdivision units of this land division have been proposed. Any approval of recording phases or subdivision units as proposed or otherwise revised is at the discretion of the City and, if approved, may include additional conditions of approval specifically directed to circumstances and conditions caused by the phasing of the project. Necessary improvements and plans associated with each phase shall be as determined by the City Engineer. Sierra Avenue shall be required to be constructed with the first phase or subdivision unit to be constructed.
3.4. Lot access shall be restricted along the following streets as shown on the tentative map.

- Sierra Avenue both sides for the full length of the subdivision
- 20th Street both sides for the full length of the subdivision
- Laramore Lane both sides between "B" Street and westerly subdivision boundary
- "A" Street and "B" Street both sides between "C" Street and 20th Street
- "I" Street both sides between "F" Street and Sierra Avenue
- "N" Street both sides between "M" Street and Sierra Avenue
- Rodeo Drive both sides between "L" Street and easterly subdivision boundary

The Owner shall dedicate on the Final (Tract) Map abutter’s right of access. Any change of right-of-way from that of prior dedications which included restricted access shall require rededication of abutter’s right of access on the Final (Tract) Map or, as may be necessary, by separate instrument to be recorded.

3.5. The Developer shall provide improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer for all public improvements including, but not limited to streets, including AC pavement, curb, gutter and sidewalk; curbed center medians; traffic signals; signing and striping; street lighting; drainage and storm drain system improvements; landscape and irrigation system improvements; water quality BMPs; and sewer system improvements, and water system improvements, including a non-potable water supply. Rights-of-way for streets and public utilities shall be dedicated and shown on the Final (Tract) Map (or by separate instrument as may be necessary) in accordance with these conditions of approval, Riverside County Ordinance No. 460 (Subdivision Ordinance) and Riverside County Ordinance No. 461 (“Riverside County Road improvement Standards and Specifications”) as adopted by the City. All plans shall be prepared in accordance with the Riverside County Transportation Department “Improvement Plan Check Policies and Guidelines” as adapted by the City Engineer. All improvement plans shall be processed through the city of Jurupa Valley Engineering Department and where applicable the water supply/distribution and sewage collection/disposal provider and Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCD).

It is understood that the tentative map exhibit correctly shows acceptable centerline elevations, all existing easements, traveled ways, and drainage courses with appropriate Q’s, and that the omission or unacceptability may require that the Developer amend or revise the tentative map as may be necessary to allow a finding that the Final Map is substantial conformance with the tentative map.


3.6.1. FIRST DEVELOPMENT PHASE

3.6.1.1. Sierra Avenue for the extent shown on the tentative subdivision map (between 20th Street and Canal Street/Pacific Avenue intersection), including portions shown offsite, shall be improved to its full-street width, including AC pavement (top course shall be rubberized asphalt concrete), curb and gutter,
landscaped and irrigated median and parkways, sidewalk, trail, street lights, and all utilities unless otherwise approved in writing by the City Engineer.

Street improvements shall be per Standard No. 94, Secondary Highway modified as approved by the City Engineer. The roadway cross section shall include a 10-foot wide curbed median per Standard No. 113 and 2 travel lanes in each direction. A “no stopping” restriction will be imposed on both sides. Additional traffic lanes and right-of-way width may be required at intersections as determined by the City Engineer. The Developer shall at the time of construction improve all legs of all intersections with Sierra Avenue to the limits of the curb returns.

The travel lanes on 20th Street and Sierra Avenue shall not exceed 11 feet. The design and configurations of the travel lanes shall meet standard practice for safety and engineering design to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

The Developer shall design traffic signal, signal interconnection, signing and striping improvements and modifications per Table A attached, City standards and plans approved by the City Engineer at the intersection of Sierra Avenue and:

- Armstrong Road
- 20th Street
- “I” Street
- Rodeo Drive

All signals in Sierra Avenue, including at Armstrong Road, shall be interconnected utilizing fiber optic technology.

The Developer shall design improvements, at no cost to the City, at the crossing of the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) right-of-way as required by UPPR and the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). These improvements and the Canal Street/Pacific Avenue intersection improvements shall be designed per Table A attached and constructed prior to final building inspection or granting of occupancy of the 100th structure in this subdivision.

All necessary equipment, improvements and applicable processes required by UPRR, CPUC and the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) to qualify this as a “quiet zone” crossing shall be provided prior to final building inspection or granting of occupancy of the 300th structure in this subdivision.

The Developer shall, at no expense to the City, obtain dedications for all off-site right-of-way to construct improvements as shown. The dedication documents shall be approved by the City Engineer and shall be recorded concurrent with recordation of the Final (Tract) Map and where applicable recording data shall be shown on the Final (Tract) Map.

The Owner shall dedicate to the City on the Final (Tract) Map a 1-foot wide barrier strip at the southerly terminus of Sierra Avenue at the southerly tract boundary.
3.6.1.2. Sewer and water system improvements, including non-potable water supply, in Sierra Avenue, and as necessary offsite, per Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) requirements for approval of JCSD and City Engineer.

3.6.1.3. All utilities as required by the respective utility providers in Sierra Avenue, and as necessary offsite, per respective utility company provider requirements for approval of utility company provider and City Engineer.

3.7. In-tract Improvements (including improvements shown on the Tentative Map immediately adjacent offsite of the project)

3.7.1. 20th Street for the extent shown on the tentative subdivision (between Sierra Avenue and the northerly terminus), including portions shown offsite, shall be improved to its full-street width, including AC pavement (top course shall be rubberized asphalt concrete), curb and gutter, landscaped and irrigated curbed median and parkways, sidewalk, street lights, and all utilities, unless otherwise approved in writing by the City Engineer.

Street improvements shall be per Standard No. 94, Secondary Highway modified as approved by the City Engineer. The roadway cross section shall include a 10-foot wide curbed median per Standard No. 113 modified and 2 travel lanes in each direction. A “no stopping” restriction with be imposed on both sides. Additional traffic lanes and right-of-way width may be required at intersections. The Developer shall at the time of construction improve all legs of all intersections with 20th Street.

The travel lanes on 20th Street and Sierra Avenue shall not exceed 11 feet. The design and configurations of the travel lanes shall meet standard practice for safety and engineering design to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

The Owner shall dedicate to the City on the Final (Tract) Map a 1-foot wide barrier strip at the northerly terminus of 20th Street.

The Developer shall, at no expense to the City, obtain dedications for all off-site right-of-way to construct improvements as shown. The dedication documents shall be approved by the City Engineer and shall be recorded concurrent with recordation of the Final (Tract) Map and where applicable recording data shall be shown on the Final (Tract) Map.

3.7.2. Streets internal to the subdivision shall be dedicated as shown on the tentative subdivision map. Roadway cross-section and included improvements shall be as approved by the City Engineer. All street dedications shall be designated on the Final (Tract) Map as a lettered lot.

3.7.3. Roadway cross-section and improvements for streets immediately adjacent to the project shall be designed as shown on the tentative map, or as otherwise directed by the City Engineer, and approved by the City Engineer.

3.7.4. Developer shall, at no expense to the City, obtain dedications for all off-site right-of-way to construct improvements as shown. The dedication documents shall be approved by the City Engineer and shall be recorded concurrent with recordation of the Final (Tract) Map and, where applicable, recording data shall be shown on the final map.
3.7.5. Sewer and water system improvements in-tract, and as necessary offsite, per Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) requirements for approval of JCSD and City Engineer.

3.7.6. All utilities as required by the respective utility provider in-tract, and as necessary offsite, per respective utility company provider requirements for approval of utility company provider and City Engineer.

3.8. Off-site Improvements

3.8.1. Developer shall design landscaped and irrigated curbed median and other improvements in Valley Way/Armstrong Road from 29th Street to Sierra Avenue per Table A. Curbed median improvements shall be per Standard No. 113 or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer. The northerly end of the median shall include a left turn pocket for the existing driveway on the northwesterly side of Armstrong Road.

3.8.2. Developer shall design traffic signal, signal interconnection, signing and striping improvements and modifications per Table A attached, City standards and plans approved by the City Engineer at the intersection of Armstrong Road and 30th Street.

3.8.3. Developer shall design traffic signal modification, signing and striping improvements and modifications per Table A attached, City standards and plans approved by the City Engineer at the intersection of Pacific Avenue and Mission Boulevard.

3.8.4. Developer shall design traffic signal modification, signing and striping improvements and modifications per Table A attached, City standards and plans approved by the City Engineer at the intersection of Sierra Avenue and Armstrong Road.

3.8.5. Developer shall design other various and miscellaneous improvements as shown per Table A attached, City standards and plans approved by the City Engineer at various locations shown.

3.8.6. Sewer and water system improvements in-tract, and as necessary offsite, per Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) requirements for approval of JCSD and City Engineer.

3.8.7. All utilities as required by the respective utility provider in-tract, and as necessary offsite, per respective utility company provider requirements for approval of utility company provider and City Engineer.

3.9. Street improvement plans for the required improvements must be prepared based on a design plan and profile extending a minimum of 300 feet beyond the limits of the improvement at a grade and alignment as approved by the City Engineer. The Developer shall be responsible for any match up asphalt concrete (AC) paving, and reconstruction or resurfacing of existing paving as determined by the City Engineer.

3.10. The improvements in the street right-of-way shall meet the requirements for public streets per Riverside County Ordinance No. 461, as adopted by the City, and all corner cutbacks shall be designed per Standard 805, or as otherwise approved by the
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City Engineer. Underground facilities within the street right-of-way shall be located as shown per Standard No. 817.

3.11. Traffic signing, striping and marking for the required improvements may be shown on the street improvement plans and must be prepared based on extending a minimum of 300 feet beyond the project limits, or the limits of striping removal necessary to join existing, as approved by the City Engineer. The Developer shall be responsible for any additional paving and/or removal of existing striping that might be required by the approved signing, striping and marking plan.

3.12. Separate streetlight plans must be prepared for required improvements for approval of the City Engineer. Street lighting shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance 460, Standard No. 1000 (modified) and Street Light Specification Chart (modified) found in Section 22 of Riverside County Ordinance 461. Modified street lighting shall include pedestrian level lighting in the curbed median and bollards or other pedestrian level lighting in the parkway. Approval of streetlight plans shall be at the discretion of the City Engineer with the following exception: approval of the street lighting in the parkway shall be at the discretion of the City Engineer and Planning Director.

3.13. Separate plans must be prepared for the water quality features and facilities improvements for the approval of the City Engineer. The water quality BMPs shall be designed in accordance with the applicable requirements of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFC & WCD) and the City Engineer. Water quality basins shall be designed for public passive use. A short fence or shrub barrier is required between any sidewalk or pathway and any basin. If the basin slope is greater than 4:1 a 6’ tubular steel or alternate fence approved by the City Engineer will be required around the entire basin with a DG path to the bottom to accommodate the passive use. A 10-foot (minimum) wide all-weather vehicular access road shall be provided to the bottom of the basin for maintenance purposes.

3.14. For landscaping within public road rights-of-way and the water quality BMPs the Developer shall prepare separate landscape and irrigation plans for each for approval of the City Engineer. Landscaping and irrigation shall be designed within a water quality basin that is compatible with the primary function of this BMP. The improvements shall comply with Riverside County Ordinance No. 461, as adopted by the City, “Comprehensive Landscaping Guidelines & Standards”, and Riverside County Ordinance No. 859, as adopted by the City. Landscaping and irrigation plans shall be submitted with the street improvement plans. If landscaping maintenance is to be included in a Community Facilities District (CFD), or Landscaping and Lighting Maintenance District (LLMD), landscaping plans shall depict ONLY such landscaping, irrigation and related facilities as are to be placed within the public rights-of-way.

3.15. Separate sewer and water system improvement plans shall be prepared for required improvements per Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) requirements for approval of JCSD and City Engineer. Water system improvement plans showing the locations of fire hydrants (see Standard No. 400 and JCSD standards) must be approved by the Fire Department.

3.16. Separate storm drain plans must be prepared for required improvements for approval of the City Engineer. The City Engineer may determine that storm drain plans
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additionally require the approval of Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCD).

Traffic Impacts

3.17. A traffic impact analysis was prepared for Tentative Tract 31894 by Albert A. Webb Associates for, Highland Park residential development titled "Revised Traffic Impact Analysis Report – Tentative Tract 31894" (TIA) and dated July 2014 and supplemental analysis. This analysis and report was accepted for preliminary planning purposes only for the referenced project (Highland Park). The TIA and environmental report indicated a planned timeline for development of each project phase. If the project development schedule substantially lags that proposed timeline, the Developer shall submit an amended and/or updated TIA focusing on the phase or unit for review and approval of the City Engineer to verify that the proposed mitigation listed in the monitoring report will effectively address the project’s impacts.

L&LMD and Special Districts

3.18. Developer shall initiate formation of, or annexation to if one already exists, a Community Facilities District (CFD) for Public Safety Services in order to provide funding for City Public Safety Services. The agreement to form or annex to a CFD shall be in a manner to be approved by the City Attorney. Participation in a CFD for Public Safety Services is intended to fully mitigate the incremental impact of new development on City Public Safety Services and maintain such services at the standards established in the General Plan.

If for any reason applicant does not take the necessary steps to have the development included within a CFD for Public Safety Services, applicant shall, in a manner approved by the City Council and City Attorney, provide for alternative means of fiscal mitigation at a level equal to the special taxes established in the Rate and Method of Apportionment applicable to the CFD, as they may be adjusted from time to time.

The Developer shall pay for all costs associated with CFD formation or annexation.

3.19. Developer shall initiate formation of, or annexation to if one already exists, a Community Facilities District (CFD) for operation and maintenance of traffic signals, street lighting, landscaping and irrigation in the public right-of-way, publicly owned post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs) whether in the public right-of-way or not, and for graffiti abatement of walls and other permanent structures along all public rights-of-way.

The Developer shall pay for all costs associated with CFD formation or annexation.

3.20. Developer shall complete annexation to Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) of those areas of the project which lie outside the JCSD district boundaries.

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

Utilities

3.22. Electrical power, telephone, communication, traffic signal interconnections, street lighting, and cable television lines shall be designed to be placed underground in
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accordance with Riverside County Ordinances Nos. 460 and 461, as adopted by the City and Standard No. 817. The Developer 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. 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 and/or application or the relocation, issued by the utility company, shall be submitted to the Engineering Department for verification purposes.

4. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF PERMIT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS (ENGINEERING)

4.1. The Developer shall obtain approval of the City Engineer to start construction of infrastructure improvements.

4.2. Prior to approval to start infrastructure construction, all applicable required environmental mitigation measures shall be satisfied in accordance with the Environmental Impact Report dated October 2015 prepared for the project.

4.3. Prior to approval to start infrastructure construction, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) shall be submitted the City Engineer for approval. The CTMP shall include, but not be limited to, approved routes for construction traffic to access the construction area and appropriate points of ingress/egress to that area. Approval of such plan may include restrictions, requirements and conditions to mitigate related impacts as determined by the City Engineer.

5. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

5. Rough grading must be completed as shown on the approved grading plans.

5.1.1. The Project Geotechnical Engineer shall certify to the completion of grading in conformance with the approved grading plans and the recommendations of the geotechnical report approved for this project.

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

5.1.3. The grading civil engineer shall provide “as-built” grading plan.

5.2. The Developer shall prepare a precise grading plan for each of the lot for which a building permit is required. The precise grading plan shall be approved by the City Engineer and securities shall be in place.

5.3. The required water system, including fire hydrants, shall be installed and accepted by the JCSD prior to any combustible building materials being placed on an individual lot.

5.4. Access to the construction site shall be approved by the Fire Department and the City Engineer.

5.5. All utility extensions within the subdivision shall be placed underground, or as otherwise approved in writing by the City Engineer.
5.6. **Prior to issuance of the first building permit**, a Site Development Traffic Management Plan (SDTMP) shall be submitted to the City Engineer for approval. The SDTMP shall include, but not be limited to, approved routes for site development construction traffic to access the construction site and appropriate points of ingress/egress to the site. Approval of such plan may include restrictions, requirements and conditions to mitigate related impacts as determined by the City Engineer.

6. **PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION (ENGINEERING)**

6.1. The Developer is responsible for the completing all grading and construction of all “backbone”, “in-tract” and, as necessary, “offsite” infrastructure improvements for that phase or subdivision unit to the extent determined by the City Engineer per approved plans and to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, except the top course of AC pavement within Sierra Avenue and 20th Street may be deferred as approved by the City Engineer, in compliance with all other applicable requirements, and in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance No. 461, as adopted by the city. The top course of AC pavement shall be constructed no later than the time of final building inspection of the last lot on which building improvements are proposed or sooner as may be directed by the City Engineer. Construction of the top course of paving in Sierra Avenue and 20th Street shall utilize rubberized AC (ARHM).

6.1.1. For the first phase of development (any one of the designated phases or subdivision units) the extent of infrastructure improvements to be completed includes all “in-tract” improvements, necessary “offsite” improvements to serve the phase, and:

- Sierra Avenue, including all underground improvements in Sierra Avenue even if such improvements are installed “dry”, from northwesterly of 20th Street (to join existing Sierra Avenue improvements) to southerly tract boundary prior to final inspection or occupancy of the 99th residential unit in the subdivision or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer or as may be determined by the Fire Department as necessary to provide emergency access.

- Sierra Avenue from the southerly tract boundary to Canal Street/Pacific Avenue intersection including rail road crossing and intersection improvements prior to final inspection or occupancy of the 100th residential unit in the subdivision or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

6.1.2. For the phase of development designated as subdivision Unit 1 (TM 36894-1, west of Sierra Avenue) the extent of infrastructure improvements includes all “in-tract” improvements, necessary “offsite” improvements to serve the phase, and:

- “J” Street from Donner Way to 30th including the offsite connection to the existing Donner Way and 30th Street improvements prior to final inspection or occupancy of any residential units greater than 80% of the units in that phase or subdivision unit or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer or if determined by the Fire Department as necessary to provide emergency access. No construction traffic will be permitted to travel westerly of the intersections with Donner Way or 30th Street, except as necessary to
construct storm drain improvements, through the existing residential neighborhood.

- Those improvements designated respectively in Table A prior to final inspection or occupancy of any residential units greater than 80% of the units in that phase or subdivision unit or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

6.1.3. For the phase of development designated as subdivision Unit 2 (TM 36894-2, east of Sierra Avenue) the extent of infrastructure improvements includes all “in-tract” improvements, necessary “offsite” improvements to serve the phase, and:

- Rodeo Drive from Sierra Avenue to the easterly tract boundary, including connection to existing Rodeo Drive improvements, prior to final inspection or occupancy of any residential units greater than 80% of the units in that phase or subdivision unit or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer or as may be determined by the Fire Department as necessary to provide emergency access. No construction traffic will be permitted to travel east of the easterly tract boundary through the existing residential neighborhood.

- Knuckle improvements from La Canada Drive to Joel Drive per Standard No. 801 (or such design as otherwise approved by the City Engineer), prior to final inspection or occupancy of any residential units greater than 80% of the units in that phase or subdivision unit or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

- Those improvements designated in Table A prior to final inspection or occupancy of any residential units greater than 80% of the units in that phase or subdivision unit or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

6.1.4. For the phase of development designated as subdivision Final Unit (TM 36894, northwest of 20th Street) the extent of infrastructure improvements includes all “in-tract” improvements, necessary “offsite” improvements to serve the phase, and:

- 20th Street from Sierra Avenue to the northeasterly tract boundary including the portion shown offsite prior to final inspection or occupancy of any residential units greater than 80% of the units in that phase or subdivision unit or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

- Laramore Lane from “B” Street to the westerly tract boundary including the offsite connection to the existing Laramore Lane improvements prior to final inspection or occupancy of any residential units greater than 80% of the units in that phase or subdivision unit or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer or as may be determined by the Fire Department as necessary to provide emergency access. No construction traffic will be permitted to travel west of the westerly tract boundary through the existing residential neighborhood.

- Leafwood Drive cul-de-sac per Standard No. 800 or 800A (or such design as otherwise approved by the City Engineer) including the offsite connection to the existing Leafwood Drive improvements, prior to final inspection or occupancy of any residential units greater than 80% of the units in that...
Conditions of Approval for MA1212

**phase or subdivision unit or as otherwise approved by the City.** No construction traffic will be permitted to travel west of the westerly tract boundary through the existing residential neighborhood.

- Those improvements designated in Table A **prior to final inspection or occupancy of any residential units greater than 80% of the units in that phase or subdivision unit or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer.**

6.2. Precise grading must be completed as shown on the approved grading plans.

6.2.1. The Project Geotechnical Engineer shall certify to the completion of grading in conformance with the approved grading plans and the recommendations of the geotechnical report approved for this project.

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

6.2.3. The grading civil engineer of record shall provide “as-built” grading plans to the Engineering Department.

6.3. **Prior to completion and acceptance of infrastructure improvements,** the project civil engineer shall provide “as-built” drawings of all infrastructure improvements to the Engineering Department.

6.4. **Prior to completion and acceptance of infrastructure improvements or prior to the final building inspection, whichever occurs first,** assurance of maintenance of public improvements is required by completion of annexation into a Community Facilities District (CFD) for operation and maintenance of required improvements in the public right-of-way and post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs) and graffiti abatement of walls and other permanent structures along all public rights-of-way.

6.5. The Developer shall ensure that all sewer and water system improvements are installed in accordance with approved plans and have been accepted by JCSD. Correspondence from JCSD accepting improvements shall be provided to the Engineering Department.

6.6. Electrical power, telephone, communication, street lighting, and cable television lines shall be placed underground, or as otherwise approved in writing by the City Engineer. This also applies to existing overhead lines that are 33.6 kilovolts or below along the project frontage. Written correspondence accepting improvements shall be provided from each respective utility company.

6.7. Developer shall ensure that the traffic signals and street lights along all streets are permanently energized and operational.

6.8. Developer shall ensure that all applicable required environmental mitigation measures are satisfied in accordance with the Environmental Impact Report dated October 2015 prepared for the project.

6.9. Developer shall comply with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 (Development Impact Fees, DIF), as adopted by the City, or later ordinance adopted by the City, which requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in the Ordinance.
in accordance with the fee schedule in effect at the time of the final inspection. The fee shall be paid for each residential unit to be constructed within this land division.

6.10. Developer shall pay the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) in accordance with the fee schedule in effect at the time of the final inspection.

6.11. Developer shall pay a fair-share amount of $2,200 per single-family residential (SFR) dwelling unit toward mitigation of various intersection and roadway segment improvements as listed in Table A attached.
### TABLE A

**TR 31894 (MA1212) - 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><strong>Project-Specific Intersection Mitigation- Phase/Subdivision Unit 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Intersection of Armstrong Road (NS) and 30th Street (EW) | Modify geometries to provide:  
  - **NB**: one TH lane, one shared TH/RT lane.  
  - **SB**: one LT lane, two TH lanes.  
  - **EB**: N/A.  
  - **WB**: one LT lane, one RT lane.  
  Note: Install new traffic signal. |
| Intersection of Sierra Avenue (NS) and 20th Street (EW) | Install geometries to provide:  
  - **NB**: one TH lane, one shared TH/RT lane.  
  - **SB**: one LT lane, two TH lanes.  
  - **EB**: N/A.  
  - **WB**: N/A.  
  Note: Install new traffic signal conduits. SB LT lane and NB RT lane to be provided, but striped out until 20th Street is constructed. |
| Intersection of Sierra Avenue (NS) and "I" Street (EW) | Install geometries to provide:  
  - **NB**: one LT lane, two TH lanes.  
  - **SB**: one TH lane, one shared TH/RT lane.  
  - **EB**: one LT lane, one RT lane.  
  - **WB**: N/A.  |
| Intersection of Sierra Avenue Rodeo Drive (NS) and (EW) | Install geometries to provide:  
  - **NB**: N/A  
  - **SB**: one RT lane.  
  - **EB**: one LT lane.  
  - **WB**: N/A.  
  Note: Install new traffic signal conduits. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection of Armstrong Road (NS) and Sierra Avenue (EW)</th>
<th>Modify geometries to provide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NB: two LT lanes, one TH lane, and one RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SB: two LT lanes, one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EB: one LT lane, two TH lanes, one free-flow RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WB: one LT lane, two TH lanes, one RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Will require signal modification with NB and WB RT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overlap phasing and widening of the accepting side of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east approach to accommodate new dual SB LT lanes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will require N/S lead/lag LT phasing due to a conflict of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the dual left-turn paths.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade traffic signal to provide video detection,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dedicated LT phasing for EB and WB LTs, BBU, LED signal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faces, LED IISNS, Ped countdown timers, ADA-spec ped push</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buttons, and current specification control cards as needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection of Sierra Avenue (NS) and Rodeo Drive (EW)</th>
<th>Install geometries to provide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NB: one LT lane, one TH lane, one shared TH/RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SB: one LT lane, one TH lane, one shared TH/RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EB: one LT lane, one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WB: one LT lane, one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Install new traffic signal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection of Sierra Avenue/Pacific Avenue (NS) and La Canada Drive (EW)</th>
<th>To be removed as part of Phase 2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note: Raised median may be required per UPRR up to 100' north of the RR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tracks to avoid bypassing the gates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection of Sierra Avenue/Pacific Avenue (NS) and Canal Street (EW)</th>
<th>Modify geometries to provide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NB: one LT lane, one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SB: one LT lane, one TH lane, one RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EB: one shared LT/TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WB: one shared LT/TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Raised median may be required per UPRR btwn Canal Street and the RR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tracks to avoid bypassing the gates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Avenue and UPRR Crossing</td>
<td>Install at-grade crossing control including warning system and crossing gates. Crossing shall be widened to accommodate four traffic lanes and pedestrian/trail facilities. Crossing design to be approved by the City and UPRR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Intersection of Pacific Avenue (NS) and Mission Boulevard (EW) | Modify geometries to provide:  
  - **NB**: one LT lane, one shared TH/RT lane.  
  - **SB**: one LT lane, one TH lane, one RT lane.  
  - **EB**: one LT lane, two TH lanes, one RT lane.  
  - **WB**: one LT lane, two TH lanes, one RT lane.  
  Note: Signal to be modified to include RT overlap phasing for the SB, EB & WB approaches. |

**Project-Specific Intersection Mitigation - Phase/Subdivision Unit 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Intersection of Sierra Avenue (NS) and 20th Street (EW) | Install geometries to provide:  
  - **NB**: two TH lanes, one RT lane.  
  - **SB**: one LT lane, two TH lanes.  
  - **EB**: N/A.  
  - **WB**: one LT lane, one RT lane.  
  Note: Install new traffic signal. |
| Intersection of "A" Street (NS) and 20th Street (EW) | Install geometries to provide:  
  - **NB**: N/A.  
  - **SB**: one shared LT/RT lane.  
  - **EB**: one LT lane, two TH lanes.  
  - **WB**: one TH lane, one shared TH/RT lane. |
| Intersection of "B" Street (NS) and 20th Street (EW) | Install geometries to provide:  
  - **NB**: N/A.  
  - **SB**: one shared LT/RT lane.  
  - **EB**: one LT lane, two TH lanes.  
  - **WB**: one TH lane, one shared TH/RT lane. |

**Fair-Share Intersection Improvements**
| Intersection of Valley Way (NS) and WB SR-60 On-Ramp (EW) | Modify geometries to provide:  
|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                            | • **NB**: one LT lane.  
|                                                            | • **SB**: two TH lanes, one RT lane.  
|                                                            | • **EB**: N/A.  
|                                                            | • **WB**: N/A.  
|                                                            | Note: Drop added SB lane as the RT lane (see segment list). Caltrans approval needed to modify the ramp.  |
| Intersection of Valley Way (NS) and /Granite Hill/WB SR-60 Off-Ramp (EW) | Modify geometries to provide:  
|                                                            | • **NB**: one LT lane, two TH lanes.  
|                                                            | • **SB**: two TH lanes, one shared TH/RT lane.  
|                                                            | • **EB**: one 100' LT lane, one RT lane.  
|                                                            | • **WB**: one LT lane, one shared LT/TH/RT lane, one 300' RT lane.  
|                                                            | Note: This will require widening on the north side of both the EB and WB approaches, ROW acquisition on the EB approach to the west of the Farmer Boys site, including C/G & S, and Caltrans approval to modify the ramp.  
|                                                            | Upgrade traffic signal to provide video detection, dedicated LT phasing for EB and WB LTs, BBU, LED signal faces, LED IISNS, Ped countdown timers, ADA-spec ped push buttons, and current specification control cards as needed.  |
| Intersection of Valley Way (NS) and 37th Street (EW) | Modify geometries to provide:  
|                                                            | • **NB**: one LT lane, two TH lanes.  
|                                                            | • **SB**: two TH lanes, one shared TH/RT lane.  
|                                                            | • **EB**: one LT lane, one RT lane.  
|                                                            | • **WB**: N/A.  
<p>|                                                            | Note: This modification will require widening Valley Way along the west side to add a third SB TH lane.  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection of Valley Way (NS) and 36th Street (EW)</th>
<th>Modify geometries to provide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>NB</strong>: one LT lane, one TH lane, one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>SB</strong>: one LT lane, one TH lane, one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>EB</strong>: one shared LT/TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>WB</strong>: one shared LT/TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: The added third SB TH lane will begin south of the intersection and will require modification of the SW quadrant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection of Valley Way/Armstrong Road (NS) and 34th Street (EW)</th>
<th>Modify geometries to provide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>NB</strong>: one LT lane, one TH lane, one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>SB</strong>: one LT lane, one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>EB</strong>: one LT lane, one shared TH/RT lane text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>WB</strong>: one LT lane, one TH lane, one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Upgrade traffic signal to provide video detection, dedicated LT phasing for EB and WB LTs, BBU, LED signal faces, LED IISNS, Ped countdown timers, ADA-spec ped push buttons, and current specification control cards as needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard (NS) and Mission Boulevard (EW)</th>
<th>Modify geometries to provide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>NB</strong>: one shared LT/TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>SB</strong>: one LT lane, one shared TH/RT lane, one RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>EB</strong>: two LT lanes, one TH lane, one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>WB</strong>: one LT lane, two TH lanes, one RT lane.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection of EB SR-60 Ramps/Byrne Road (NS) and Mission Boulevard (EW)</th>
<th>Modify geometries to provide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>NB</strong>: one shared LT/TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>SB</strong>: one LT lane, one shared LT/TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>EB</strong>: one LT lane, one TH lane, one shared TH/LT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>WB</strong>: one LT lane, two TH lanes, one RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Modifications to ramp striping and signal detection will require Caltrans approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROADWAY SEGMENTS**
### Project-Specific Roadway Segment Mitigation - Phase 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Segment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Way btwn 29th Street and Sierra Avenue</td>
<td>Install 650’ raised landscaped median beginning at 29th Street and terminating at the start of the #1NB LT lane. Provide NB acceleration lane from 29th Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sierra Avenue btwn Armstrong Road and Rodeo Drive | Provide four TH lanes plus landscaped and irrigated curbed median.  
Note: Provide a trail on the east side of Sierra Avenue btwn 20th Street and Rodeo Drive |

### Project-Specific Roadway Segment Mitigation - Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Segment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sierra Avenue btwn Rodeo Drive and Canal Street | Provide four TH lanes plus median.  
Note: Provide a trail on the east side of Sierra Avenue btwn 20th Street and Rodeo Drive |
| Pacific Avenue btwn Canal Street and SR-60 | Infill curb, gutter and sidewalk on the east and west sides of the street. Approximately 1,000’ of C/G and sidewalk. Roadway will have two TH lanes plus median turn lane (3 lanes total). |
| Pacific Avenue/SR-60 viaduct | Provide curb, gutter and sidewalk. Roadway will be narrowed to maintain two TH lanes, but no on-street parking will be allowed. |

### Project-Specific Roadway Segment Mitigation - Phase 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Segment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20th Street btwn Sierra Avenue and Project boundary</td>
<td>Provide four TH lanes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fair-Share Roadway Segment Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Segment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley Way btwn Granite Hill Drive and 37th Street</td>
<td>Add third SB TH lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Way btwn 37th Street and 36th Street</td>
<td>Replace existing painted median with raised median. Add third SB TH lane. Flare the NE curb return at 3ihStreet and the SW curb return at 36th Street to accommodate U-turns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Way btwn 36th Street and 34th Street</td>
<td>Replace existing painted median with raised landscaped median. Flare the NE curb return at 36th Street and the SW curb return at 34th Street to accommodate U-turns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Avenue btwn SR-60 and Mission Boulevard</td>
<td>Infill curb, gutter and sidewalk on the east and west sides of the street. Approximately 1,000’ of C/G and 1,300’ of sidewalk. Roadway will have two TH lanes plus median turn lane (3 lanes total).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Applicant hereby agrees that these Conditions of Approval are valid and lawful and binding on the Applicant, and its successors and assigns, and agrees to the Conditions of Approval.

Applicant’s name (Print Form): ____________________________

Applicant’s name (Signature): ____________________________

Date: ______________
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 7, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

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

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 13.G

STATUS REPORT ON EMERGENCY REPAIRS TO LIMONITE AVENUE ROAD DAMAGE AND CONTINUED AUTHORIZATION OF EMERGENCY WORK

RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council adopt by a 4/5ths vote, Resolution No. 2019-14, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, DETERMINING THAT THERE IS A NEED TO CONTINUE THE ACTIONS AUTHORIZED BY RESOLUTION NO. 2019-13 FOR THE EMERGENCY REPAIR OF LIMONITE AVENUE, BETWEEN BAIN STREET AND BEACH STREET (PYRITE CREEK) PURSUANT TO PUBLIC CONTRACT CODE SECTION 22050

STATUS REPORT ON LIMONITE AVENUE ROAD DAMAGE REPAIRS

On February 21, 2019, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2019-13 finding that severe problems exist with portions of the roadway, underlying soils and surrounding land on Limonite Avenue, between Bain Street and Beach Street (at Pyrite Creek) consisting of the following: sinkholes; road failures; underlying soil failures; flooding; excessive ground water; and other related problems resulting from these conditions (“Limonite Avenue Road Damage”).

Resolution 2019-13 also authorized the City Manager to proceed at once to replace or repair the Limonite Avenue Road Damage without adopting plans, specifications, plan sheets, or working details, or giving notice for bids to let contracts and authorized the City Manager to enter into one or more contracts not exceeding a combined amount of $500,000 to do such work pursuant to Public Contract Code Sections 22035 and 22050.

Public Contract Code Section 22050(c) requires the City Council review the emergency action at its next regularly scheduled meeting following the adoption of Resolution No. 2019-14.
2019-13 to determine, by a four-fifths vote, that there is a need to continue the action and to take a similar action at each regularly scheduled meeting thereafter until the emergency is terminated.

As of March 7, 2019, the following work for the repair and replacement of the Limonite Avenue Road Damage has been completed:

- Placement of erosion control measures (i.e., boulders, concrete slurry on slopes) and repair of existing drainage pipe crossing Limonite Avenue.
- Re-establishment of shoulder under and adjacent to the pavement reconstruction to minimize further erosion.
- Observation by City Engineer and staff.

As of March 7, 2019 the following work needs to be undertaken to complete the repair and replacement of the Limonite Avenue Road Damage:

- Closeout of emergency repairs.

As of February 26, 2019, the City has received the following estimates for the cost of the external contract work to the repair and replacement of the Limonite Avenue Road Damage:

- $75,000 from Gentry Brothers, Inc. for reconstruction of Limonite Avenue.
- $10,000 from HR Green for construction management and inspection services.

OTHER INFORMATION

Previous Actions:


FINANCIAL IMPACT

The cost to repair and replace Limonite Avenue Road Damage by external contract services as well as City staff is not expected to exceed $100,000. The City Manager will seek reimbursement from State and Federal emergency funds and any parties responsible for the damage, as appropriate.
Prepared by:
Steve R. Loriso, PE
City Engineer/Director of Public Works

Submitted by:
Gary S. Thompson
City Manager

Reviewed by:
George A. Wentz
Deputy City Manager

Reviewed by:
Alan Kreimeier
Director of Administrative Services

Reviewed by:
Peter M. Thorson
City Attorney

Attachments:

1. Resolution No. 2019-14
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, DETERMINING THAT THERE IS A NEED TO CONTINUE THE ACTIONS AUTHORIZED BY RESOLUTION NO. 2019-13 FOR THE EMERGENCY REPAIR OF LIMONITE AVENUE, BETWEEN BAIN STREET AND BEACH STREET (PYRITE CREEK) PURSUANT TO PUBLIC CONTRACT CODE SECTION 22050

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

Section 1. Recitals. The City Council does hereby find, determine and declare that:

(a) On February 21, 2019, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2019-13 finding that severe problems exist with Limonite Avenue between Bain Street and Beach Street (Pyrite Creek) consisting of the following: sinkholes; road failures; underlying soil failures; flooding; excessive ground water; and other related problems resulting from these conditions (“Damaged Road”).

(b) Resolution 2019-13 also authorized the City Manager to proceed at once to replace or repair the Damaged Road without adopting plans, specifications, strain sheets, or working details, or giving notice for bids to let contracts and authorized the City Manager to enter into one or more contracts not exceeding a combined amount of $500,000 to do such work pursuant to Public Contract Code Sections 22035 and 22050.

(c) The repair work for the Damaged Road is proceeding under the authority of Resolution No. 2019-13. The City Manager has submitted a written report to the City Council of this date detailing the status of the repair work and reasons justifying why the emergency will not permit a delay resulting from a competitive solicitation for bids and why the action continues to be necessary to respond to the emergency.

Section 2. Continued Finding of Emergency. Based on the evidence submitted in the City Manager's Staff Report to the City Council, the City Council hereby finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the Damaged Road constitutes a continuing emergency that will not permit a delay resulting from a competitive solicitation for bids, and that the actions described in Resolution No. 2019-13 are necessary and continue to be necessary to respond to the emergency, complete the repairs to the Damaged Road and protect the public using Limonite Avenue between Bain Street and Beach Street (Pyrite Creek).

Section 3. Ratification of Staff Actions to Repair Damaged Road. The City Council hereby ratifies and affirms the actions of the City Manager and City employees and contractors taken so far to repair or replace portions of Limonite Avenue between Bain Street and Beach Street (Pyrite Creek) and associated rights of way as a result of the Damaged Road, any directly related and immediate action required to mitigate the Damaged Road, and procurement of the necessary equipment, services, and supplies for those purposes.
Section 4. Certification. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 7th day of March, 2019.

______________________________  
Brian Berkson  
Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________  
Victoria Wasko, CMC  
City Clerk
CERTIFICATION

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

I, Victoria Wasko, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-14 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 7th day of March, 2019 by the following votes, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, this 7th day of March, 2019.

________________________________
Victoria Wasko, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council approve the purchase of two used pick-up trucks from Enterprise Auto Sales and appropriate the necessary funds.

ANALYSIS

When the City initiated its “Park Ranger” program two new positions were approved. Each position required a vehicle. Historically, the City has acquired its vehicles through the use of AB 2766 subvention funds distributed by the Air Quality Management District (AQMD). To utilize such funding the vehicle must meet certain emission standards. There were no small trucks (the vehicles required by the new staff) that could meet these standards at the time. Consequently staff leased regular gas trucks with the understanding that electric or hybrid trucks were coming to market in the near future.

While many manufacturers have indicated a desire to bring such vehicles to market, none have become available. Rather than continue to pay costly lease rates, staff is proposing to purchase used trucks from our leasing vendor (Enterprise) to reduce annual costs until such time as reliable qualifying low emission vehicles can be bought with AQMD money.

The proposal to purchase the used trucks includes a contribution of funds in the amount of approximately $22,147 (50% of purchase price based on formula) from Riverside County Abandoned Vehicle Abatement Service Authority (funded by the State), as well as $5,290 in lease savings for the current budget year. The remainder will come from the General Fund.
FINANCIAL IMPACT

A General Fund appropriation of $44,294.28 is required for the purchase of the vehicles. $22,147.14 will be reimbursed by the County after the purchase and the City will save $5,290 in lease costs through the remainder of the fiscal year. This result is a net cost of $16,857.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Provide other direction to staff.

Prepared by: 

[Signature]

Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Submitted by:

[Signature]

Gary S. Thompson
City Manager

Attachments:

Enterprise Car Sales bid sheets for the Vehicles.
**BUYER**  
Name:  
Address: Riverside, CA 92504  
City of Riverside, CA  
County:  
Home Phone:  
Cell Phone:  
Work Phone:  
Email:  

**FINANCE CHARGE**  
**% RATE**  
0.00 %  
$0.00  

**AMOUNT FINANCED**  
$21,350.60  

**TOTAL OF PAYMENTS**  
$21,350.60  

**TOTAL SALE PRICE**  
Down: $0.00  
$21,350.60  

**LICENSE FEES**  
Add On Amount: $0.00  
License Title Transfer Fee: $15.00  
Electronic Filing Fee: $30.00  
Total: $45.00*  

**SERVICE CONTRACTS**  
Limited Warranty  
Total: $0.00  

**ITEMIZATION OF AMOUNT FINANCED**  
Vehicle Cash Price: $19,499.00  
Document Processing Charge: $85.00  
Sales Tax @ 8.7500%: $1,713.60  
Service Contracts: $0.00  
Subtotal: $21,297.60  
License Fees: $45.00*  
Smog Waiver Fee: $8.00  
Total Sale Price: $21,350.60  
Total Cash: $0.00  
Total Down: $0.00  
Amount Financed: $21,350.60  

**VEHICLE INFORMATION**  
Stock Number: 7PB14X  
VIN: 1N6AD0ER1HN763818  
Year: 2017  
Make: NISSAN  
Model: FRONTIER  
Body Style: SV2W  
Odometer: 29,094  

**TRADE-IN(S)**  

---  

Provider of this form makes no warranty, express or implied, as to content or fitness for purpose of this form. Consult your own legal counsel.

This is a non-binding proposal. All sales subject to credit approval.
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**ENTERPRISE CAR SALES - 32RN**
7745 Indiana Ave Riverside, CA 92504

**Phone:** (951) 509-5800  
**Fax:** ()  
**Salesperson:**  
**F&I Manager:**  
**Today's Date:** 02/19/2019  
**Deal Date:** 02/19/2019

**BUYER**  
Name: CITY OF J  
Address: Riverside, CA 92504  
County: Riverside  
Home Phone:  
Cell Phone:  
Work Phone:  
Email:  

**CO-BUYER**  
Address:  
County:  

**INSURANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANNUAL % RATE</th>
<th>FINANCE CHARGE</th>
<th>AMOUNT FINANCED</th>
<th>TOTAL OF PAYMENTS</th>
<th>TOTAL SALE PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$22,943.68</td>
<td>$22,943.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMIZATION OF AMOUNT FINANCED</th>
<th>BREAK DOWNS</th>
<th>PAYMENT SCHEDULE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Cash Price: $20,597.00</td>
<td>LICENSE FEES</td>
<td>Cash Payment @: $22,943.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Processing Charge: $85.00</td>
<td>Base DMV Fee: $83.00</td>
<td>Due On: 02/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax @ 8.7500%: $1,809.68</td>
<td>Add On Amount: $11.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Contracts: $0.00</td>
<td>License Title Transfer Fee: $15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong> $22,491.68</td>
<td>Vehicle License Fee: $133.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License Fees: $444.00*</td>
<td>Trans. Improvement Fee: $50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smog Waiver Fee: $8.00</td>
<td>Smog Abatement Fee: $20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sale Price:</strong> $22,943.68</td>
<td>Electronic Filing Fee: $30.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash:</strong> $0.00</td>
<td>Weight Fee: $80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Down:</strong> $0.00</td>
<td>Additional Fees: $22.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Financed: $22,943.68</td>
<td><strong>Total:</strong> $444.00*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SERVICE CONTRACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limited Warranty: $0.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong> $0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VEHICLE INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STOCK NUMBER: 7QH8W9</th>
<th>VIN: 1N6AD0ER8JN747153</th>
<th>YEAR: 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAKE: NISSAN</td>
<td>MODEL: FRONTIER</td>
<td>BODY STYLE: SV2W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOMETER: 16063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PURCHASE - USED**

**TRADE-IN(S)**

| Seller Signature:  
Title:  
Date: |
|-------------------|

*Items marked with * are estimated

Provider of this form makes no warranty, express or implied, as to content or fitness for purpose of this form. Consult your own legal counsel.

This is a non-binding proposal. All sales subject to credit approval.
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STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 7, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER

BY: STEVE R. LORISO, P.E., CITY ENGINEER/DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 13.I

AWARD CONSTRUCTION AGREEMENT TO STURGEON ELECTRIC CALIFORNIA, LLC FOR THE TRAFFIC SIGNAL MODIFICATIONS PROJECT (17-C.2)

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the City Council approve and award a construction agreement to Sturgeon Electric California, LLC in the amount of $108,874.22 for Traffic Signal Modifications (Agreement), for the work included in its proposal, and authorize the City Manager to execute the Agreement in substantially the form attached and in such final form as approved by the City Attorney; and

2. Authorize the City Manager to execute contract change orders not to exceed 5% of the total agreement, pursuant to requirements set forth in the agreement; and

3. That the City Council appropriate $35,275 of Development Impact Fee (DIF) funds from the Traffic Signal Installation/Interconnect, Limonite Avenue Project (Account No. 62311/62312) to the Project Account to fund the total Project Costs; and

4. Authorize the City Manager to record the Notice of Completion upon acceptance of the work by the City Engineer.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting of April 19, 2018, the City Council approved the FY 2018-2019 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The CIP included the Traffic Signal Modifications Project. This project will add protected–permissive left turn (PPLT) phasing to 10 existing signalized intersections throughout the city. The intersection of Pats Ranch Road and 65th Street was removed due to sight distance concerns. PPLT phasing will add a flashing yellow left turn arrow to the signal head from which vehicles making left turn movements are notified to proceed with caution and that oncoming traffic does not stop.
The benefits to adding this type of phasing are the average delay per left turn is reduced, protected green arrow time is reduced and arterial progression is improved.

Kimley-Horn and Associates prepared the bid package for the Project and the City Engineer approved this bid package on January 17, 2019. On January 23, 2019 the Notice Inviting Bids was published in The Press Enterprise. The City Clerk also advertised in various online bid posting services and additional notice was placed on the City’s website. The bid package was uploaded to PlanetBids, the City’s bid solicitation service provider, where interested bidders could obtain the complete bid document package.

ANALYSIS

Formal bidding procedures were followed in conformance with the Public Contract Code. Eight (8) bids were received on February 21, 2019 as summarized below.

All bids were reviewed for accuracy and completeness. Sturgeon Electric California, LLC submitted the lowest cumulative bid totaling $108,874.22 and was verified as the lowest, responsive and responsible bidder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bidder</th>
<th>Total Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sturgeon Electric California, LLC</td>
<td>$108,874.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Siemens Mobility, Inc.</td>
<td>$124,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elecnor Belco Electric, Inc.</td>
<td>$131,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. KDC Inc., dba Dynaelectric</td>
<td>$132,530.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. DBX, Inc.</td>
<td>$135,994.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PTM General Engineering Services, Inc.</td>
<td>$165,959.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cen-Pac Engineering, Inc.</td>
<td>$185,239.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. California Professional Engineering, Inc.</td>
<td>$210,913.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer’s Estimate</td>
<td>$123,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City Public Works/City Engineering Department staff will provide Construction Management (CM) and Inspection. This effort will require daily observation of contractor’s operations, materials inspection and testing, monitoring compliance with the contract documents including temporary construction traffic control, preparation of monthly progress payment reports, and performance of various administrative activities related to the project. This construction support is estimated to cost $25,000.

OTHER INFORMATION

Previous Actions:

- March 15, 2018 – Awarded Professional Services Agreement to Kimley-Horn and Associates
FINANCIAL IMPACT

The FY 2018-2019 CIP Project Budget for the Traffic Signal Modifications project is $200,000 and is funded by the City’s Development Impact Fee (DIF) funds. The available funds are not sufficient for award of this agreement as recommended and related support services. Award of a construction contract as recommended requires that City Council appropriate $35,275 of the City’s DIF funds from the Traffic Signal Installation/Interconnect, Limonite Avenue Project, Account No. 62311/62312 bringing the Project Budget to $235,275.

The total estimated project costs for an award of a contract to Sturgeon Electric California, LLC as recommended are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Admin</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Contract</td>
<td>$75,955.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contract</td>
<td>$108,874.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (5%)</td>
<td>$5,443.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Support Services</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$235,273.22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No General Fund monies are required for approval of this agreement.

ALTERNATIVES

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

****************************SIGNATURES ON FOLLOWING PAGE***********************
Prepared by:

Chase Keys
CIP Manager

Reviewed by:

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

Reviewed by:

Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Reviewed by:

George A. Wentz
Deputy City Manager

Approved as to form:

Peter Thorson
City Attorney

Submitted by:

Gary S. Thompson
City Manager

Attachments:

1) Agreement, Project No. 17-C.2
2) Vicinity Map
ATTACHMENT 1

Agreement, Project No. 17-C.2
THIS Agreement, made and entered into the 7th day of March, 2019, by and between the City of Jurupa Valley, a municipal corporation, hereinafter called the "City" and Sturgeon Electric California, LLC, hereinafter called the "Contractor."

That the City and the Contractor for the consideration hereinafter named, agree as follows:

1. **Scope of Services.** Contractor shall perform the work and provide all labor, materials, equipment and services, except as otherwise provided in the Plans or Special Provisions, in a good and workmanlike manner for the project identified as Traffic Signal Modifications ("Project"), in accordance with this Agreement. The complete Agreement includes all of the Documents as if set forth in full herein, to wit, including the Agreement, any and all Contract Change Orders issued after the execution of the Agreement, Addenda No(s). N/A issued prior to the opening of the Bids, the Special Provisions (which includes the General Provisions and Technical Provisions), the Project Plans, the Standard Plans, the Standard Specification, reference Specifications, the Bidder's Proposal, the Notice Inviting Bids, the Non-Collusion Affidavit, the Faithful Performance Bond, the Labor and Materials Payment Bond and insurance (the "Documents"), all of which are essential parts of the Agreement between City and Contractor and are hereby made a part of this Agreement.

In the event of any conflict in the provisions thereof, the terms of said Documents as set forth above shall control, each over the other, in the order provided.

2. **Compensation.** The City will pay the Contractor and the Contractor agrees to receive and accept the prices set forth in the Bid Schedule as full compensation for the work required under the bid items awarded by the City, to wit, the Base Bid Item(s) and Additive Bid Item(s) in the sum total amount of one hundred eighty thousand eight hundred seventy four dollars and twenty two cents, ($108,874.22), subject to additions or reductions of the quantities of the various bid items at the unit prices bid, for furnishing all materials and for doing all the work contemplated and embraced under the Documents.

3. **Payments.** City shall make payments within thirty (30) days after receipt of an undisputed and properly submitted payment request from Contractor. City shall return to Contractor any payment request determined not to be a proper payment request as soon as practicable, but not later than seven (7) days after receipt, and shall explain in writing the reasons why the payment request is not proper.

A payment shall be made as the City Council of the City prescribes upon estimates approved by the City Council. However, progress payments shall not be made in excess of ninety-five percent (95%) of the percentage of actual work completed plus a like percentage of the value of material delivered on the ground or stored subject to, or under the control of, the City, and unused. The City shall withhold not less than five percent (5%) of the Agreement price until final completion and acceptance of the Project. However, at any time after fifty percent (50%) of the work has been completed, if the City Council of the City finds that satisfactory progress is being made, it may, at its discretion, make any of the remaining progress payments in full for actual work completed.
4. **Time.** The Contractor hereby agrees to commence work pursuant to this Agreement within fourteen (14) calendar days after the date of authorization specified in the Notice to Proceed. The Contractor agrees to diligently prosecute the work, including corrective items of work, day to day thereafter, to completion, within **Forty (40) working days** after said date in the “Notice to Proceed with Construction,” except as adjusted by subsequent Contract Change Order(s).

5. **Liquidated Damages.** The City and Contractor hereby agree that in case all construction called for under the Agreement is not completed within the time hereinabove specified, including City caused delays or extensions, damages will be sustained by the City and that, it is and will be impracticable or extremely difficult to ascertain and determine the actual amount of damages the City will sustain in the event of, and by reason of, such delay.

It is, therefore, agreed that such damages shall be presumed to be in the amount of $1000.00 per calendar day, and that the Contractor will pay to the City, or City may retain from amounts otherwise payable to Contractor, said amount for each calendar day by which the Contractor fails to complete the work, including corrective items of work, under this Agreement within the time hereinabove specified and as adjusted by Contract Change Order(s). The Contractor will not be assessed liquidated damages for delay(s) occasioned by the failure of the City or of the owner of a utility to provide for the removal or relocation of utility facilities.

6. **Insurance.** The Contractor shall at all times during the term of this Agreement carry, maintain, and keep in full force and effect: (1) a policy or policies of broad-form comprehensive general liability insurance with minimum limits of $2,000,000.00 combined single limit coverage against any injury, death, loss, or damage as a result of wrongful or negligent acts by the Contractor, its officers, representatives, volunteers, employees, agents, and independent contractors in performance of services under this Agreement; (2) property damage insurance with a minimum limit of $1,000,000.00; (3) automotive liability insurance with a minimum combined single limits coverage of $1,000,000.00; and (4) workers’ compensation insurance with a minimum limit of $1,000,000.00 or the amount required by law, whichever is greater.

Acceptable insurance coverage shall be from an admitted corporate surety insurer licensed in the State of California, approved by the City, and with a rating of, or equivalent to, A:VII by A.M. Best & Company.

Any deviation from this rule shall require specific approval, in writing, from the City.

All insurance policies shall provide that the insurance coverage shall not be non-renewed, canceled, reduced, or otherwise modified (except through addition of additional insured to the policy) by the insurance carrier without the insurance carrier giving the City thirty (30) days prior written notice thereof by certified mail, return receipt requested. The Contractor agrees that it will not cancel, reduce or otherwise modify said insurance coverage.

The Contractor agrees that if it does not keep the aforesaid insurance in full force and effect, and such insurance is available at a reasonable cost, the City may take out the necessary insurance and pay the premium thereon, and the repayment thereof shall be deemed an obligation of the Contractor and the cost of such insurance may be deducted, at the option of the City, from payments due the Contractor.

The Contractor shall submit to the City (1) insurance certificates indicating compliance with the minimum workers’ compensation insurance requirements above, and (2) insurance policy endorsements not less than one (1) day prior to beginning of performance under this Agreement.
Any deductibles must be declared to and approved by the City.

The general liability and automobile liability policies must contain or be endorsed to contain the following provisions: “The City of Jurupa Valley and their officers, agents, employees, and volunteers are to be covered as insureds with respect to liability arising out of automobiles owned, leased, hired or borrowed by or on behalf of the contractor; and with respect to liability arising out of work or operations performed on behalf of the City of Jurupa Valley, including materials, parts or equipment furnished in connection with the work or operations.”

The insurance provided by Contractor shall be primary to any coverage available to the City.

The Contractor shall furnish the City with original certificates and amendatory endorsements effecting coverage required herein. All certificates and endorsements are to be received and approved by the City before work commences. The City may require, at any time, complete, certified copies of all required insurance policies, including endorsements affecting the coverage.

7. **Bonds.** The Contractor hereby agrees to provide and maintain in effect two (2) good and sufficient Surety Bonds for one hundred percent (100%) each of the contract price. The bonds shall be a “Faithful Performance Bond” which shall guarantee the faithful performance of all work and a "Labor and Materials Payment Bond" which shall secure the payment of the claims of labor, mechanics, or materialmen for all work under the Agreement pursuant to Section 9550 of the Civil Code.

8. **Contractor’s Guarantee.** The Contractor, the Contractor’s heirs, executors, administrators, successors, or assigns guarantee that all work performed under this Agreement fully meets the requirements thereof as to quality of workmanship and materials furnished. If any defects in materials or workmanship become evident within a period of one year from the date of the acceptance of the work by the City Council, the Contractor shall, at his or her own expense, make any repair(s) or replacement(s) necessary to restore the work to full compliance with the Plans and Specifications.

9. **Prevailing Wages.** Pursuant to the provisions of Section 1773 of the Labor Code of the State of California, the City Council has obtained the general prevailing rate of per diem wages and the general rate for holiday and overtime work in this locality for each craft, classification, or type of workman needed to execute this Contractor from the Director of the Department of Industrial Relations. Copies may be obtained from the California Department of Industrial Relations Internet website at http://www.dir.ca.gov. Contractor shall provide a copy of prevailing wage rates to any staff or sub-contractor hired, and shall pay the adopted prevailing wage rates as a minimum. Contractor shall comply with the provisions of Sections 1720, 1725.5, 1771.1(a), 1773.8, 1775, 1776, 1777.5, 1777.6, and 1813 of the Labor Code. Pursuant to the provisions of 1775 of the Labor Code, Contractor shall forfeit to the City, as a penalty, the sum of $200.00 for each calendar day, or portion thereof, for each laborer, worker, or mechanic employed, paid less than the stipulated prevailing rates for any work done under this Agreement, by him or by any subcontractor under him, in violation of the provisions of the Agreement. This project, work, or service will be subject to compliance monitoring and enforcement by the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) pursuant to Labor Code Section 1771.4.

Registration with the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) is mandatory as a condition for bidding, providing certain services, and working on a public works project as specified in Labor Code Section 1771.1(a). Contractor and any subcontractors must be registered with the Department of Industrial Relations to be qualified to bid, or provide a proposal and/or time and material quote or be listed in a bid, proposal or quote, subject to the requirements of Public Contract
AGREEMENT
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Code Section 4104; or engage in the performance of any contract that is subject to Labor Code Section 1720 et seq., unless currently registered and qualified to perform public work pursuant to Labor Code Section 1725.5. Contractor and subcontractors will be required to provide proof of registration with the DIR. For more information regarding registration with the Department of Industrial Relations, refer to http://www.dir.ca.gov/Public-Works/PublicWorks.html.

10. **Third Party Claims.** City shall have full authority to compromise or otherwise settle any claim relating to the Agreement at any time. City shall timely notify Contractor of the receipt of any third-party claim relating to the Agreement. City shall be entitled to recover its reasonable costs incurred in providing this notice.

11. **Antitrust Claims.** Contractor offers and agrees to assign to the City all rights, title, and interest in and to all causes of action it may have under Section 4 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. Sec. 15) or under the Cartwright Act (Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 16700) of Part 2 of Division 7 of the California Business and Professions Code) arising from purchases of goods, services, or materials pursuant to the Agreement. This assignment shall be made and become effective at the time the City tenders final payment to Contractor without further acknowledgment by the parties.

12. **Claim Dispute Resolution.** In the event of any dispute or controversy with the City over any matter whatsoever, the Contractor shall not cause any delay or cessation in or of work, but shall proceed with the performance of the work in dispute. The Contractor shall retain any and all rights provided that pertain to the resolution of disputes and protests between the parties. The disputed work will be categorized as an “unresolved dispute” and payment, if any, shall be as later determined by mutual agreement or a court of law. The Contractor shall keep accurate, detailed records of all disputed work, claims and other disputed matters.

All claims arising out of or related to the Agreement or this Project, and the consideration and payment of such claims, are subject to the Government Claims Act (Government Code Section 810 et seq.) with regard to filing claims. All such claims are also subject to Public Contract Code Section 9204 and Public Contract Code Section 20104 et seq. (Article 1.5), where applicable. This Contract hereby incorporates those provisions as though fully set forth herein. Thus, the Contractor or any Subcontractor must file a claim in accordance with the Government Claims Act as a prerequisite to filing a construction claim in compliance with Section 9204 and Article 1.5 (if applicable), and must then adhere to Article 1.5 and Section 9204, as applicable, pursuant to the definition of “claim” as individually defined therein.

13. **Debarred, Suspended or Ineligible Contractors.** Contractor shall not be debarred throughout the duration of this Agreement. Contractor shall not perform work with debarred subcontractor pursuant to California Labor Code Section 1777.1 or 1777.7.

14. **Conflicts of Interest.** Contractor agrees not to accept any employment or representation during the term of this Agreement or within twelve (12) months after completion of the work under this Agreement which is or may likely make Contractor “financially interested,” as provided in Government Code Section 1090 and 87100, in any decisions made by City on any matter in connection with which Contractor has been retained pursuant to this Agreement.

15. **Trenching and Excavations.** If the project involves trenching more than four (4) feet deep, Contractor shall promptly, and before the following conditions are disturbed, notify the City in writing of any: material that Contractor believes may be hazardous waste, as defined in California Health and Safety Code Section 25117, that is required to be removed to a Class I, Class II, or Class III
disposal site in accordance with provisions of existing law; subsurface or latent physical conditions at the site differing from those indicated; or unknown physical conditions at the site of any unusual nature, different materially from those ordinarily encountered and generally recognized as inherent in work of the character provided for in the Agreement. The City shall promptly investigate the conditions, and if the City finds that the conditions do materially differ or do involve hazardous waste and cause a decrease or increase in Contractor’s cost of or the time required for performance of any part of the work, the City shall issue a change order.

16. **Utilities.** The City acknowledges its responsibilities under Government Code section 4215 and incorporates that section herein by this reference.

17. **Location of Existing Elements.** The methods used and costs involved to locate existing elements, points of connection and all construction methods are Contractor’s sole responsibility. Accuracy of information furnished, as to existing conditions, is not guaranteed by the City. Contractor, at its sole expense, must make all investigations necessary to determine locations of existing elements, which may include, without limitation, contacting U.S.A. Alert and other private underground locating firm(s), utilizing specialized locating equipment and/or hand trenching.

18. **Wage and Hour Laws.** The Contractor shall, as a penalty, forfeit twenty-five dollars ($25) for each worker employed in the execution of the Agreement for each calendar day during which the worker is required or permitted to work more than 8 hours in any one calendar day and 40 hours in any one calendar week in violation of the provisions of California Labor Code Section 1813. As provided for in California Labor Code Section 1810, a legal day’s work is 8 hours of labor in any one calendar day.

19. **Audits.** The City or its representative shall have the option of inspecting and/or auditing all records and other written materials used by Contractor in preparing its billings to the City as a condition precedent to any payment to Contractor. Contractor will promptly furnish documents requested by the City. Additionally, Contractor shall be subject to State Auditor examination and audit at the request of the City or as part of any audit of the City, for a period of three (3) years after final payment under this Agreement.

20. **Entire Agreement.** This Agreement, including any other documents incorporated herein by specific reference, represents the entire and integrated agreement between City and Contractor. This Agreement supersedes all prior oral or written negotiations, representations or agreements. This Agreement may not be modified or amended, nor any provision or breach waived, except in a writing signed by both parties which expressly refers to this Agreement.

21. **Termination.** This Agreement may be canceled by the City at any time with or without cause without penalty upon thirty (30) days’ written notice. In the event of termination without fault of Contractor, City shall pay Contractor for all services satisfactorily rendered prior to date of termination, and such payment shall be in full satisfaction of all services rendered hereunder.

22. **Substitution of Securities.** Pursuant to California Public Contract Code Section 22300, the Contractor will be permitted the substitution of securities for any monies withheld by the City of Jurupa Valley to ensure performance under this Agreement. At the request and expense of the Contractor, securities equivalent to the amount withheld shall be deposited with the City of Jurupa Valley, or with a state or federally chartered bank as the escrow agent, who shall pay such monies to the Contractor. Securities eligible for substitution under this section shall include those listed in Section 16430 of the Government Code, bank or savings and loan certificates of deposit, interest-bearing demand deposit accounts, and standby letters of credit. The Contractor shall be the
beneficial owner of any securities substituted for monies withheld and shall receive any dividends or interest thereon. The Contractor shall give the City written notice within thirty (30) days after this Agreement is awarded that it desires to substitute securities for money that would ordinarily be withheld. If the substituted securities are deposited into an escrow, the escrow shall be governed by a written escrow agreement in a form which is substantially similar to the agreement set forth in Section 22300, of the Public Contract Code.

23. **Indemnification.** To the fullest extent permitted by law, Contractor hereby agrees, at its sole cost and expense, to defend, protect, indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Jurupa Valley and their officials, officers, attorneys, agents, employees, volunteers, successors, and assigns (collectively “Indemnites”) from and against any and all damages, costs, expenses, liabilities, claims, demands, causes of action, proceedings, expenses, judgments, penalties, liens, and losses of any nature whatsoever, including fees of accountants, attorneys, or other professionals and all costs associated therewith (collectively “Liabilities”), arising or claimed to arise, directly or indirectly, out of, in connection with, resulting from, incidental to, or related to any act, failure to act, error, or omission of Contractor or any of its officers, agents, servants, employees, subcontractors, materialmen, suppliers or their officers, agents, servants or employees, arising or claimed to arise, directly or indirectly, out of, in connection with, resulting from, or related to this Agreement or the performance or failure to perform any term, provision, covenant, or condition of this Agreement, including this indemnity provision. This indemnity provision is effective regardless of any prior, concurrent, or subsequent active or passive negligence by Indemnites and shall operate to fully indemnify Indemnites against any such negligence. This indemnity provision shall survive the termination of the Agreement and is in addition to any other rights or remedies which Indemnites may have under the law. Payment is not required as a condition precedent to an Indemnity's right to recover under this indemnity provision, and an entry of judgment against an Indemnity shall be conclusive in favor of the Indemnity's right to recover under this indemnity provision. Contractor shall pay Indemnites for any attorney’s fees and costs incurred in enforcing this indemnification provision. Notwithstanding the foregoing, nothing in this instrument shall be construed to encompass (a) Indemnites' sole negligence or willful misconduct to the limited extent that the underlying Agreement is subject to Civil Code 2782(a) or (b) the contracting public agency's active negligence to the limited extent that the underlying Agreement is subject to Civil Code 2782(b). This indemnity is effective without reference to the existence or applicability of any insurance coverages which may have been required under the Agreement or any additional insured endorsements which may extend to Indemnites. The Contractor, on behalf of itself and all parties claiming under or through it, hereby waives all rights of subrogation and contribution against the Indemnites, while acting within the scope of their duties, from all claims, losses and liabilities arising out of or incident to activities or operations performed by or on behalf of the Contractor regardless of any prior, concurrent, or subsequent active or passive negligence by the Indemnites.

24. **Assignment.** The parties do for themselves, their heirs, executors, administrators, successors and assigns agree to the full performance of all of the provisions herein contained. The Contractor may not, either voluntarily or by action of law, assign any obligation assumed by the Contractor hereunder without prior written consent of the City.

25. **Attorney’s Fees.** If any legal action or other proceeding, including action for declaratory relief, is brought for the enforcement of this Agreement or because of an alleged dispute, breach, default or misrepresentation in connection with this Agreement, the prevailing party shall be entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees, experts' fees, and other costs, in addition to any other relief to which the party may be entitled.
26. **Worker’s Compensation Insurance.** By my signature hereunder, as Contractor, I certify that I am aware of the Provisions of Section 3700 of the Labor Code which require every employer to be insured against liability for Workers’ Compensation or to undertake self-insurance in accordance with the Provisions of that code, and I will comply with such Provisions before commencing the performance of the work of this Agreement.

27. **Effective Date.** The effective date of this Agreement shall be the date of the Award of Contract by the City of Jurupa Valley.

28. **Contractor’s License.** Contractors are required by law to be licensed and regulated by the Contractors’ State License Board. Any questions concerning a Contractor may be referred to the Registrar, Contractors’ State License Board, 3132 Bradshaw Road, Sacramento, CA 95826. Mailing address: P.O. Box 26000, Sacramento, CA 95826.

(SIGNATURE PAGE FOLLOWS)
SIGNING INSTRUCTION TO THE CONTRACTOR:

All signatures on the Agreement on behalf of the Contractor must be acknowledged before a notary public.

General Partners must sign on behalf of the partnership.

In the event that the contracting firm is a corporation, two (2) corporate officer’s having authority from the corporation MUST sign (two (2) signatures total). If the corporation has a corporate resolution stating that one person is authorized to sign on behalf of all officers, attach corporate resolution immediately following the notary certificates. Corporate Seal may be affixed hereto.
KNOW ALL MEN AND WOMEN BY THESE PRESENTS:

THAT WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley, State of California, known as "City," has awarded to Sturgeon Electric California, LLC, as Principal hereinafter designated as "Contractor" and have entered into an Agreement whereby the Contractor agrees to construct or install and complete certain designated public improvements, which said Agreement, effective on the date signed by the City Manager, and identified as Project No. 17-C.2, Traffic Signal Modifications, is hereby referred to and made a part hereof; and

WHEREAS, said Contractor under the terms of said Agreement is required to furnish a bond guaranteeing the faithful performance of said Agreement;

NOW THEREFORE, we the undersigned Contractor and , as Surety, are held and firmly bound unto the City of Jurupa Valley, County of Riverside in the penal sum of one hundred eight thousand eight hundred seventy four dollars and twenty two cents, ($108,874.22), lawful money of the United States, to be paid to the said City or its certain attorney, its successors and assigns; for which payment, well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our heirs, executors and administrators, successors and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

THE CONDITION OF THIS OBLIGATION IS SUCH, that if the above bound Contractor, his or her or its heirs, executors, administrators, successors or assigns, shall in all things stand to and abide by, and well and truly keep and perform the covenants, conditions and provisions in said Agreement and any alterations thereof made as therein provided, on his or her or their part, to be kept and performed at the time and in the manner therein specified, and in all respects according to their true intent and meaning, and shall indemnify and save harmless the City of Jurupa Valley, its officers, agents and employees, as therein stipulated, then this obligation shall become null and void; otherwise it shall be and remain in full force and effect. In the event suit is brought upon this bond by the City and judgment is recovered, the Surety shall pay all costs incurred by the City in such suit, including a reasonable attorney fee to be fixed by the court.

The Surety hereby stipulates and agrees that no change, extension of time, alteration, or addition to the terms of the Agreement or to the work to be performed thereunder, or the Provisions accompanying the same shall in any way affect its obligations on this bond, and it does hereby waive notice of any such change, extension of time, alteration or addition to the terms of the Agreement or to the work or the Provisions.

(SIGNATURE PAGE FOLLOWS)
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, we have hereunto set our hands, and seals on this _____ day of ___________ 2019.

STURGEON ELECTRIC CALIFORNIA, LLC

Contractor Name: ___________________________ Name: ___________________________
Address: ___________________________ Address: ___________________________
Telephone No.: ___________________________ Telephone No.: ___________________________
Print Name: ___________________________ Print Name: ___________________________
Signature: ___________________________ Signature: ___________________________

Approved as to Form this _____ day of ___________ 2019

City Attorney
City of Jurupa Valley

NOTE: This bond must be executed by both parties. Corporate seal may be affixed hereto. All signatures must be acknowledged before a notary public (attach acknowledgments). The attorney-in-fact for the corporate surety must be registered, as such, in at least one county in the State of California. (Attach one original Power of Attorney sheet for each bond).
KNOW ALL MEN AND WOMEN BY THESE PRESENTS

THAT WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley, State of California, known as "City", has awarded to Sturgeon Electric California, LLC, as Principal hereinafter designated as "Contractor" and have entered into an Agreement whereby the Contractor agrees to construct or install and complete certain designated public improvements, which said Agreement, effective on the date signed by the City Manager, and identified as Project No. 17-C.2, Traffic Signal Modifications, is hereby referred to and made a part hereof; and

WHEREAS, said Contractor under the terms of said Agreement is required to furnish a bond to secure the payment of claims of laborers, mechanics, materialmen, and other persons, as provided by law;

NOW, THEREFORE, we the undersigned Contractor and ________, as Surety are held and firmly bound unto the City of Jurupa Valley, County of Riverside, in the penal sum of one hundred eight thousand eight hundred seventy four dollars and twenty two cents, ($108,874.22), lawful money of the United States, for which payment, well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our heirs, executors and administrators, successors and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

THE CONDITION OF THIS OBLIGATION IS SUCH, that if said Contractor, his or her or its heirs, executors, administrator, successors or assigns, or subcontractors, shall fail to pay any of the persons described in the State of California Civil Code, Section 9100, or amounts due under the Unemployment Insurance Code with respect to work or labor performed by any such claimant, or any amounts required to be deducted, withheld, and paid over to the Franchise Tax Board from the wages of employees of the Contractor and his or her subcontractors, pursuant to Section 13020, of the Unemployment Insurance Code, with respect to such work and labor, that the Surety or Sureties herein will pay for the same in an amount not exceeding the sum specified in this bond, otherwise the above obligation shall be void. In the event suit is brought upon this bond by the City or other person entitled to bring such an action and judgment is recovered, the Surety shall pay all costs incurred by the City in such suit, including a reasonable attorney fee to be fixed by the court.

This bond shall inure to the benefit of any of the persons described in the State of California Civil Code Section 9100, to give a right of action to such persons or their assigns in any suit brought upon this bond.

(SIGNATURE PAGE FOLLOWS)
LABOR AND MATERIALS PAYMENT BOND
PROJECT NO. 17-C.2

BOND NO.___________

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, we have hereunto set our hands, and seals on this _____ day of _____________ 2019.

STURGEON ELECTRIC CALIFORNIA, LLC

Contractor Name: ___________________________ Name: ___________________________

Address: ___________________________ Address: ___________________________

______________________________

Telephone No.: ________________ Telephone No.: ________________

Print Name: ___________________________ Print Name: ___________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Signature: ___________________________

Approved as to Form this

_____ day of _____________ 2019

______________________________

City Attorney
City of Jurupa Valley

NOTE: This bond must be executed by both parties. Corporate seal may be affixed hereto. All signatures must be acknowledged before a notary public (attach acknowledgments). The attorney-in-fact for the corporate surety must be registered, as such, in at least one county in the State of California. (Attach one original Power of Attorney sheet for each bond).
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 7, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER

BY: STEVE R. LORISO, P.E., CITY ENGINEER/DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 13.J

SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES BETWEEN THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY AND KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC. FOR THE TRAFFIC SIGNAL INSTALLATION, PEDLEY AND JURUPA PROJECT, CIP PROJECT NO. 16-C.2

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the City Council approve the “Second Amendment to Professional Consultant Services” between the City of Jurupa Valley and Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. and authorize the City Manager to execute the Amendment in substantially the form attached and in such final form as approved by the City Attorney.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting of November 17, 2016, the City Council approved an agreement with Kimley-Horn and Associates to study the traffic operations and prepare a warrant analysis associated with the proposed signalization of the Jurupa Road and Pedley Road intersection. Then, at its meeting of August 16, 2018, City Council approved the first amendment to include final design services for the traffic signal installation at that intersection.

ANALYSIS

Since that First Amendment was authorized, Kimley-Horn has been working and has the plans roughly 50% complete, but the original agreement has expired. Staff has been satisfied with the services of Kimley-Horn and wishes to extend the date of the agreement to June 30, 2020 in order to complete the final design of the traffic signal. This amendment is only to extend the date of the agreement as sufficient funds have already been allocated to complete the design.
OTHER INFORMATION

Previous Actions:

- November 17, 2016 the City Council approved an agreement with Kimley-Horn and Associates for the Traffic Analysis and Warrant Study
- February 1, 2018 City Staff presented the Traffic Analysis Study
- August 16, 2018 the City Council approved Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement with Kimley-Horn and Associates for Final Design Services

FINANCIAL IMPACT

No additional financial impact with the approval of this Amendment No. 2.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Do not approve Amendment No. 2
2. Provide alternate direction to Staff

************************************************************************** SIGNATURES ON FOLLOWING PAGE ******************************
Prepared by:

Chase Keys  
CIP Manager

Reviewed by:

Reviewed by:

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

Reviewed by:

Submitted by:

George A. Wentz  
Deputy City Manager

Peter Thorson  
City Attorney

Approved as to form:

Attachments:

1. Second Amendment to the Agreement for Professional Services between the City of Jurupa Valley and Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
ATTACHMENT 1

“Second Amendment to the Agreement for Professional Services between the City of Jurupa Valley and Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.”
SECOND AMENDMENT TO PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC. AND THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY FOR FINAL DESIGN SERVICES FOR TRAFFIC SIGNAL INSTALLATION, PEDLEY AND JURUPA

This Second Amendment is made and effective as of March 7, 2019 between the City of Jurupa Valley, a municipal corporation (“City”) and Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., a California corporation (“Consultant”). In consideration of the mutual covenants and conditions set forth herein, the parties agree as follows:

1. This Second Amendment is made with the respect to the following facts and purposes:

   1.1 On November 17, 2016, the City and Consultant entered into that certain Agreement entitled “Agreement for Professional Consultant Services between the City of Jurupa Valley and Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. for Limonite Avenue Traffic Signal Coordination Study between Downey Street and Pedley Road and Jurupa Road/Pedley Road/UPRR Intersection Signalization Study in Jurupa Valley” (“Agreement”).

   1.2 On August 16, 2018, the City and Consultant entered into that certain First Amendment to the original November 17, 2019 agreement. The original Agreement as amended by the First Amendment shall collectively be referred to as the “Agreement”.

   1.3 The parties now desire to amend the Agreement as set forth in this Amendment.

2. Section 1, Term, of the Agreement is hereby amended to read as follows:

   “1. Term

   This Agreement shall commence on November 17, 2016, and shall remain and continue in effect until tasks described are completed in accordance with the Scope of Services, but in no event later than June 30, 2020, unless sooner terminated pursuant to the provisions of the Agreement.”
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have caused this Agreement to be signed and executed personally or on its behalf by its duly authorized representative.

KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

By: _____________________________
Name: .
Title: 

By: _____________________________
Name: .
Title: 

[SIGNATURES OF TWO CORPORATE OFFICERS OR CORPORATE AUTHORITY RESOLUTION REQUIRED]

CITY
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY,
A California Municipal Corporation

_______________________
Gary Thompson, City Manager
City of Jurupa Valley, California

ATTEST:

__________________________
VICTORIA WASKO
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________
PETER M. THORSON
City Attorney
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 7, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

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

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 13.K

SERVICES OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT FOR INVESTIGATION OF FOUNDATION SCOURING OF MARKET STREET BRIDGE AT THE SANTA ANA RIVER

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the City Council authorize the services of Riverside County Transportation Department for the investigation, analysis and report of river bottom scouring at all pier foundations of the Market Street Bridge; and

2. That the City Council appropriate $62,700 of unencumbered Measure A funds for the analysis; and

3. Authorize the City Manager to execute an agreement with Riverside County Transportation Department in such final form as approved by the City Attorney.

BACKGROUND

The recent storms throughout the Santa Ana River watershed upstream of Jurupa Valley have resulted in measurable scouring at one of the piers of the Market Street Bridge crossing the Santa Ana River. Scouring, the removal of sediment such as sand and gravel from around a bridge foundation, can lead to foundation instability and potentially superstructure failure. The scouring observed January 30, 2019 at Pier #4 is not of a depth or extent to create any damage or immediate concern. However, it is a symptom that warrants further investigation and analysis. Caltrans bi-annual bridge inspection had also noted evidence of scouring around two other foundation piles and pile caps in previous year’s inspection.

This bridge, one of 34 in the City classified by the State as a “bridge”, is one of only 3 major links crossing the Santa Ana River between the City of Riverside and Jurupa Valley serving Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) of nearly 20,000 vehicles. This bridge was built in 1953 and some retrofitting was completed in 2001. Approximately
91% of the 1,195-foot, 12 span, welded steel super structure is in Jurupa Valley and 9% in the City of Riverside. It is supported by reinforced concrete pier walls on driven concrete piles. There is currently no cooperative agreement between the two cities for maintenance of this facility.

The City is currently working with Riverside County and City of Riverside under a 3-party professional services agreement for the design of a 4-lane replacement bridge for the existing 2-lane (one each direction) bridge. The Bridge is currently scheduled for construction in 2021. Riverside County is the Lead Agency for this project. Funding for the replacement structure has been programmed from the Federal Highway Bridge Program (HBP), with a local match proportionally shared between the two cities. However, it has been determined that none of the costs for maintenance or repair activities necessary to address this bridge scouring matter qualify for reimbursement from these bridge replacement funds.

ANALYSIS

Jurupa Valley and the County have in place an On-call Professional Services Agreement, which provides that the County Transportation Department may provide its services on request of the City. The services of a qualified Bridge Engineer are necessary to investigate and evaluate this scouring issue and advise the two cities of any recommended actions. The County’s Sr. Bridge Engineer is qualified and available to assist the City. The County working with the same Consultant, Dokken Engineering, who is the Consultant to the County for the replacement bridge project and has requisite qualifications, has provided its proposal to assist the County. A copy of that proposal is included as Attachment 1.

Due to the urgency of the analysis, staff is requesting funding for the work in advance of maintenance agreement discussions with the City of Riverside. In response to the City’s request the County’s total estimate for scouring investigation, analysis and report including geotechnical investigation (by Dokken), establishment of horizontal and vertical survey control, localized topographic survey, and Project Management by the County is $62,666.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Design Engineering (Dokken Engineering) per proposal dated</td>
<td>$43,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 County Survey Work</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 County of Riverside Administration and Project Management</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$62,666</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This estimate is for the initial scour assessment of the existing condition at all piers of the Market Street Bridge. Upon completion of the report, the cities will be provided a copy for further consideration of potential necessary interim measures for the bridge.

**OTHER INFORMATION**

None.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The necessary funding of $62,700 for this authorization is available in unencumbered Measure A funds.

**ALTERNATIVES**

1. Do not authorize the services.
2. Provide alternate direction to Staff.
Prepared by:

Mike Myers, P.E.
Assistant City Engineer

Reviewed by:

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

Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Reviewed by:

George A. Wentz
Deputy City Manager

Submitted by:

Gary S. Thompson
City Manager

Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Dokken Engineering Scour Analysis Proposal
TASK 1 – SCOUR ANALYSIS

Based on recent observations, several of the existing Market Street bridge piers have experienced scour that has exposed the pier footing and supporting piles. To determine approximate flow at which the bridge becomes scour critical, Dokken Engineering (Dokken) will perform the following tasks:

Task 1.1 Hydraulic Analysis

Using the existing condition HEC RAS model developed for the project, Dokken will make adjustments to the existing topography at the piers based on survey data provided by the County. Based on the updated existing condition model, Dokken will perform a scour analysis based on the methodology specified in FHWA’s HEC-18 and HEC-23 Manuals and in-situ soil information provided by EMI. The scour evaluation will consider pier, abutment, and contraction scour for the 100-year frequency storm. Long term aggradation/degradation will also be evaluated based on the linear historic data developed for the Bridge Design Hydraulic Report, using a 4-year duration. Based on the results of the analysis, Dokken will work with the geotechnical and bridge engineers to evaluate the bridge stability. If determined to be unstable using 100-year flows, Dokken will evaluate successively smaller flows (50-, 25-, and 10-year) until a stable condition is reached.

Task 1.2 Geotechnical Scour Analysis

Earth Mechanics, Inc. (EMI) will perform calculations to assess the existing pile capacity at all piers for various scour conditions. The existing pile type, as-built design load, bottom of footing elevation, bottom of pile elevation, and scour depths will be provided by Dokken. The existing pile capacities will be provided to Dokken in a brief memorandum in a week after receiving the required data. Only Service Limit State will be considered. Extreme Limit State with ARS, liquefaction, and pile capacity after liquefaction will not be evaluated.

Task 1.3 Structural Scour Analysis

Dokken will perform structural analysis for all pier foundations. Analysis will include calculation of existing foundation loading, including dead load, vehicular live load, stream flow pressure, river hydraulic load, and wind loads to determine the service and strength loads on the individual piles at each pier.

The structural capacity of the existing concrete filled steel pipe piles will be investigated for various scour depths with a combination of vertical and lateral loadings and for determination of a critical scour depth. Using soil properties provided by EMI, Dokken will run L-pile analysis to determine the appropriate effective pile length and points of maximum moment and shear in the pile above and below the soil due to lateral loadings. The pile structural capacity will be determined for elastic limits and include pile slenderness effects.

Dokken will summarize the results of the above analyses in a Scour Vulnerability Memorandum. The memo will be submitted to Riverside County and the City of Jurupa Valley for review and comment. The memo will then be updated and finalized.

*Deliverable:* Scour Vulnerability Memorandum
# Market Street Bridge at Santa Ana River Scour Analysis (Br. No. 56C-0024)

**February 22, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANIES</th>
<th>PHASE I</th>
<th>PHASE II</th>
<th>PHASE III</th>
<th>PHASE IV</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dokken Engineering Prime</td>
<td>$33,847.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,847.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Mechanics Inc. Geotechnical Scour Analysis</td>
<td>$9,818.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,818.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$43,665.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$43,665.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase I Scour Analysis**
### FEE PROPOSAL WORKSHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANY: Dokken Engineering</th>
<th>SCOPE OF WORK: Project Summary</th>
<th>PHASE: All Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT: Market Street Bridge at Santa Ana River Scour Analysis (Br. No. 56C-0024)</td>
<td>DATE: February 22, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DIRECT LABOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Liptak</td>
<td>Principal In Charge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juann Ramos</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Maechler</td>
<td>Structures Engineer</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$66.00</td>
<td>$3,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Senior Engineer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>$864.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namat Hosseinion</td>
<td>Senior Environ Planner</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$57.00</td>
<td>$4,560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Associate Engineer</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>$38.00</td>
<td>$2,432.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Assoc. Env. Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td>$44.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Env. Planner/Biologist</td>
<td></td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>SR CAD/Detailer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$59.00</td>
<td>$354.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Engineering Technician</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL HOURS** 218  | **AL DIRECT LABOR** $11,960.00

#### MULTIPLIERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESCALATION @</th>
<th>OVERHEAD @ 80.40%</th>
<th>PAYROLL ADDITIVES @ 76.88%</th>
<th>PROFIT (FIXED FEE) @ 10.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Rates Vary by Phase)</td>
<td>(of Direct Labor + Escalation)</td>
<td>(of Direct Labor + Escalation)</td>
<td>(of Direct Labor + Escalation + Overhead + Payroll Additives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,615.84</td>
<td>$9,194.85</td>
<td>$3,077.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL MULTIPLIERS** $21,887.76

#### OTHER DIRECT COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TOTAL ODC’s**

#### SUB CONSULTANT SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>LABOR</th>
<th>MULTIPLIERS</th>
<th>ODC's</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth Mechanics Inc.</td>
<td>$3,215.00</td>
<td>$6,603.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,818.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fehr &amp; Peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRECO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SUBCONSULTANT SERVICES** $9,818.03

**TOTAL** $43,665.79
### FEE PROPOSAL WORKSHEET

**COMPANY:** Dokken Engineering  
**SCOPE OF WORK:** Scour Analysis  
**PHASE:** Phase I  
**PROJECT:** Market Street Bridge at Santa Ana River Scour Analysis (Br. No. 56C-0024)  
**DATE:** February 22, 2019

#### DIRECT LABOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Liptak</td>
<td>Principal In Charge</td>
<td></td>
<td>$110.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juann Ramos</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Maechler</td>
<td>Structures Engineer</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$66.00</td>
<td>$3,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Senior Engineer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>$864.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namat Hosseinion</td>
<td>Senior Environ Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Associate Engineer</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$57.00</td>
<td>$4,560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Assistant Engineer</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>$38.00</td>
<td>$2,432.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Assoc. Env. Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td>$44.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Env. Planner/Biologist</td>
<td></td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>SR CAD/Detailer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$59.00</td>
<td>$354.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Engineering Technician</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL HOURS:** 218  
**% DIRECT LABOR:** $11,960.00

#### MULTIPLIERS

| ESCALATION @ | (of Direct Labor) | $9,615.84 |
| OVERHEAD @    | 80.40%           | (of Direct Labor + Escalation) |
| PAYROLL ADDITIVES @ | 76.88% | (of Direct Labor + Escalation) |
| PROFIT (FIXED FEE) @ | 10.0% | (of Direct Labor + Escalation + Overhead + Payroll Additives) |

**TOTAL MULTIPLIERS:** $21,887.76

#### OTHER DIRECT COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TOTAL ODC’S**

#### SUB CONSULTANT SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>LABOR</th>
<th>MULTIPLIERS</th>
<th>ODC’s</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth Mechanics Inc.</td>
<td>$3,215.00</td>
<td>$6,603.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,818.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fehr &amp; Peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRECO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SUBCONSULTANT SERVICES:** $9,818.03

**TOTAL:** $43,665.79
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE</th>
<th>PROJECT MANAGER</th>
<th>STRUCTURES ENGINEER</th>
<th>SENIOR ENGINEER</th>
<th>ASSOCIATE ENGINEER</th>
<th>ASSISTANT ENGINEER</th>
<th>SR CADDETAILER</th>
<th>ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$311.31</td>
<td>$212.26</td>
<td>$186.79</td>
<td>$203.77</td>
<td>$161.31</td>
<td>$107.54</td>
<td>$166.97</td>
<td>$70.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| PHASE TOTALS        |       | 6                   | 50              | 12                  | 80              | 64                 | 6                  | 218            | 218                    |
| PHASE I             |       | 6                   | 50              | 12                  | 80              | 64                 | 6                  | 218            | 218                    |
| PHASE II            |       |                     |                 |                     |                 |                    |                    |                |                        |
| PHASE III           |       |                     |                 |                     |                 |                    |                    |                |                        |
| PHASE IV            |       |                     |                 |                     |                 |                    |                    |                |                        |
### MANHOUR WORKSHEET

**COMPANY:** Dokken Engineering  
**SCOPE OF WORK:** Scour Analysis  
**PROJECT:** Market Street Bridge at Santa Ana River Scour Analysis (Br. No. 56C-0024)  
**Phase I**  
**February 22, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE</th>
<th>PROJECT MANAGER</th>
<th>STRUCTURES ENGINEER</th>
<th>SENIOR ENGINEER</th>
<th>ASSOCIATE ENGINEER</th>
<th>ASSISTANT ENGINEER</th>
<th>SR CAD/DETAILER</th>
<th>ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$311.31</td>
<td>$212.26</td>
<td>$186.79</td>
<td>$203.77</td>
<td>$161.31</td>
<td>$107.54</td>
<td>$166.97</td>
<td>$70.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Manhours**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK 1 SCOUR ANALYSIS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Hydraulic Analysis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Geotechnical Scour Analysis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Structural Scour Analysis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total manhours: 218
# Subconsultant Fee Proposal Worksheet

## Company Information

**Company:** Earth Mechanics Inc.  
**Scope of Work:** Geotechnical Scour Analysis  
**Phase:** All Phases  
**Project:** Market Street Bridge at Santa Ana River Scour Analysis (Br. No. 56C-0024)  
**Date:** February 22, 2019

## Direct Labor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lino Cheang</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$86.50</td>
<td>$865.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Brown</td>
<td>Principal Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td>$63.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Gunaranjan</td>
<td>Project Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hoshiyama</td>
<td>Project Geologist</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiat Kaekul</td>
<td>Senior Technician</td>
<td></td>
<td>$34.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alahesh Thurairajah</td>
<td>Senior Project Engineer</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$2,350.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Hours:** 60  
**Total Direct Labor:** $3,215.00

## Multipliers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escalation @</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Rates Vary by Phase)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead @</td>
<td>129.26%</td>
<td>(of Direct Labor + Escalation)</td>
<td>$4,155.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Additives @</td>
<td>48.36%</td>
<td>(of Direct Labor + Escalation)</td>
<td>$1,554.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit (Fixed Fee) @</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>(of Direct Labor + Escalation + Overhead + Payroll Additive)</td>
<td>$892.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Multipliers:** $6,603.03

## Other Direct Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Street Bridge at Santa Ana River Scour Analysis (Br. No. 56C-0024)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical Scour Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 22, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Mechanics Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Phases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total ODC's:**

**Total:** $9,818.03
### SUBCONSULTANT FEE PROPOSAL WORKSHEET

**COMPANY:** Earth Mechanics Inc.  
**SCOPE OF WORK:** Geotechnical Scour Analysis  
**PHASE:** Phase I  
**PROJECT:** Market Street Bridge at Santa Ana River Scour Analysis (Br. No. 56C-0024)  
**DATE:** February 22, 2019

### DIRECT LABOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lino Cheang</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$86.50</td>
<td>$865.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Brown</td>
<td>Principal Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td>$63.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Gunaranjan</td>
<td>Project Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hoshiyama</td>
<td>Project Geologist</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiat Kaekul</td>
<td>Senior Technician</td>
<td></td>
<td>$34.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alahesh Thurairajah</td>
<td>Senior Project Engineer</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$2,350.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL HOURS** 60

\*\*\* DIRECT LABOR \*\*\* $3,215.00

### MULTIPLIERS

- **ESCALATION @** (of Direct Labor)
- **OVERHEAD @** 129.26% (of Direct Labor + Escalation) $4,155.71
- **PAYROLL ADDITIVES @** 48.36% (of Direct Labor + Escalation) $1,554.77
- **PROFIT (FIXED FEE) @** 10.0% (of Direct Labor + Escalation + Overhead + Payroll Additive) $892.55

**TOTAL MULTIPLIERS** $6,603.03

### OTHER DIRECT COSTS

- **ITEM**  
  - Earth Mechanics Inc. Geotechnical Scour Analysis  
  - Market Street Bridge at Santa Ana River Scour Analysis (Br. No. 56C-0024)  

**TOTAL ODC’S** $9,818.03

**TOTAL** $9,818.03
## SUBCONSULTANT MANHOUR WORKSHEET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANY:</th>
<th>SCOPE OF WORK:</th>
<th>PHASE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth Mechanics Inc.</td>
<td>Geotechnical Scour Analysis</td>
<td>All Phases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT:</th>
<th>DATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Street Bridge at Santa Ana River Scour Analysis (Br. No. 56C-0024)</td>
<td>February 22, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PHASE TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT MANAGER</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL ENGINEER</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ENGINEER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT GEOLOGIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR TECHNICIAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR PROJECT ENGINEER</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PHASE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT MANAGER</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL ENGINEER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ENGINEER</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT GEOLOGIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR TECHNICIAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR PROJECT ENGINEER</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PHASE II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT MANAGER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL ENGINEER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ENGINEER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT GEOLOGIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR TECHNICIAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR PROJECT ENGINEER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PHASE III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT MANAGER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL ENGINEER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ENGINEER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT GEOLOGIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR TECHNICIAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR PROJECT ENGINEER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PHASE IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT MANAGER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL ENGINEER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ENGINEER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT GEOLOGIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR TECHNICIAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR PROJECT ENGINEER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUBCONSULTANT MANHOUR WORKSHEET

| COMPANY: | Earth Mechanics Inc. |
| SCOPE OF WORK: | Geotechnical Scour Analysis |
| PHASE: | Phase I |
| PROJECT: | Market Street Bridge at Santa Ana River Scour Analysis (Br. No. 56C-0024) |
| DATE: | February 22, 2019 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>PROJECT MANAGER</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL ENGINEER</th>
<th>PROJECT ENGINEER</th>
<th>PROJECT GEOLOGIST</th>
<th>SENIOR TECHNICIAN</th>
<th>SENIOR PROJECT ENGINEER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$264.16</td>
<td>$192.39</td>
<td>$122.15</td>
<td>$108.56</td>
<td>$105.81</td>
<td>$143.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Manhours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>$9,818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TASK 1.0 - SCOUR ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2 Geotechnical Scour Analysis</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$9,818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 7, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER
BY: STEVE R. LORISO, P.E., CITY ENGINEER

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 15.A

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE VACATION OF PORTION OF KACHINA DRIVE CUL-DE-SAC LOCATED NORTHWESTERLY OF VIRTUE VISTA DRIVE

RECOMMENDATION

1) Requested Action: That the City Council conduct a public hearing on the proposed vacation of city right-of-way being a portion of Kachina Drive located northwesterly of Virtue Vista Drive, with reservation and exemption of easement for public utility purposes and conditions of approval for the vacation.

2) That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-15, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, VACATING PORTIONS OF KACHINA DRIVE NORTHWESTERLY OF THE INTERSECTION WITH VIRTUE VISTA DRIVE WILL, WITH CONDITIONS, PURSUANT TO STREETS AND HIGHWAYS CODE SECTIONS 8320 THROUGH 8325 AND FINDING THE VACATION EXEMPT FROM CEQA PURSUANT TO CEQA GUIDELINES SECTIONS 15061(B)(3) AND 15304

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY

The owner of all the properties adjacent to the area of the proposed street vacation, and all other lots in Tracts 20249 and 20250, has requested that the City vacate a portion of Kachina Drive. See Attachment 2 showing the 5 lots adjacent to the requested vacation. Two of these are mapped as private streets and are under same ownership as all others in the two tracts.

More particularly the right-of-way requested to be vacated is Lot “B” of Tract No. 20249, which was dedicated and accepted for public street and public utility purposes and was formally named Kachina Drive thereon. This subdivision map was recorded in 1990; however, no street improvements have been constructed. When the subdivisions were approved, Tract No. 20249, consisting of 43 single-family residential lots and Tract No.
20250, 14 single-family residential lots, were approved with private streets. The private streets serving the subdivisions take access from two locations - Lot “B”, Kachina Drive cul-de-sac bulb, and at the southerly end of Tract No. 20249 where there is a connection with the public streets Golf Street and Star View Drive. No properties other than the lots of these two unbuilt subdivisions, all of which are owned by the petitioner, require access only from Lot “B” (Kachina Drive).

From the Kachina Drive terminus, Swing Drive, a private street in Tract 20249, goes westerly 900 feet through the subdivision to intersect with Golf Street. Golf Street then extends southerly, as a private street, 1,300 feet to connect with Golf Street, a public street, at the intersection with Star View Drive, a public street. From the Kachina Drive terminus, Putters Circle, a private street in Tract 20250, goes easterly about 500 feet through the subdivision and terminates in a cul-de-sac. (See Attachment 3).

The area of the proposed vacation is the full extent of Lot “B” (Kachina Drive). One condition of the proposed vacation is that the easement for public utility purposes will be reserved from the vacation of the street right-of-way. See Attachment 4 for area of proposed vacation.

One other condition of the proposed vacation is that the owner dedicate, for public street and public utility purposes, an area acceptable to the City Engineer that provides a suitable terminus with full access to accommodate vehicular turn-around before entering the area the private street. The area of the proposed dedication is shown on Attachment 5.

The developer’s stated purpose in requesting the proposed vacation is to facilitate a gated entrance that allows for an improved connection with Kachina Drive, a public street, for the private streets serving the 57 single-family residences to be built in the two tracts. Therefore, another condition of the proposed vacation is that the Owner construct public street improvements acceptable to the City Engineer. The Developer has submitted plans for improvements and the reconfiguration. See Attachment 6 depicting the configuration of the proposed gated private drive access overlaid on the proposed vacation and the newly configured dedication. Attachment 7 shows the Developer's Concept for Landscaping and Traffic Flow in the turn-around.

ANALYSIS

The vacation of public street easements, public utility easements and offers of dedication are authorized pursuant to California Streets and Highways Code Sections 8320 through 8325.

A written request has been made by the adjacent property owner as required. The City Clerk has duly noticed the matter for two successive weeks prior to this hearing in the Press Enterprise and caused Notices to be posted on the site of the vacation as required.

The City Engineer has evaluated this request and in coordination with the Planning Director and is of the opinion that, with the following conditions;
1) reservation from the vacation for the easement for public utility and public services purposes,

2) dedication concurrently to the City, by the Owner of the properties adjacent to Lot “B” and a portion of vacated right-of-way, rights-of-way for street and public utility purposes, the extent of which to be determined by the City Engineer, and

3) construction within the area of the dedicated right-of-way, of certain public improvements, as determined necessary by the City Engineer to facilitate the transition from the existing private streets to the existing public street;

The vacation of Lot “B” (Kachina Drive), Tract No. 20249 as recorded in Book 222 of Maps, Pages 27 through 31 inclusive of the Official Records of the County of Riverside would not be necessary for present or prospective public use.

California Government Code Section 65402 provides that no street shall be vacated or abandoned without a determination and finding by the Planning Agency that the location, purpose, and extent of the proposed vacation or abandonment of the street is in conformity with the General Plan.

At its meeting of February 27, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley considered the matter of this requested vacation. The Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 19-02-27-02 finding “that the location, purpose, and extent of the proposed vacation of the subject property (Lot ‘B”, Tract No. 20249), as conditioned (same as described above) is in conformity with and consistent with the General Plan of the City of Jurupa Valley and each element thereof.”

In the same resolution the Planning Commission also found that, pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), the proposed action to vacate the public right of way with conditions is exempt from the requirements CEQA and the City’s CEQA Guidelines pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15061(b)(3) and 15304 because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the proposed vacation, as conditioned, will have a significant effect on the environment.

OTHER INFORMATION

The City Attorney has reviewed and approved the attached Resolution as to form.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact in taking this action in accordance with staff’s recommendation.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Do not approve the resolution.
2. Provide alternate direction to Staff.
Prepared by:

Mike Myers, P.E.
Assistant City Engineer

Reviewed by:

Steve R. Lorisio, P.E.
City Engineer

Reviewed by:

Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Reviewed by:

George A. Wentz
Deputy City Manager

Approved as to form:

Peter Thorson
City Attorney

Submitted by:

Gary S. Thompson
City Manager

Attachments:

Attachment 1 - Draft City Council Resolution
Attachment 2 - Properties Adjacent to Street Vacation
Attachment 3 - Proposed Vacation Location and Private Street Circulation
Attachment 4 - Area of Proposed Street Vacation
Attachment 5 - Area of Proposed Street Dedication
Attachment 6 - Proposed Configuration of Private Access & Public Turn-around
Attachment 7 - Concept of Proposed Landscaping & Traffic Flow
ATTACHMENT 1

CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION

(INsert resolution after this page)
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-15

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY CALIFORNIA, VACATING PORTIONS OF KACHINA DRIVE NORTHWESTERLY OF THE INTERSECTION WITH VIRTUE VISTA DRIVE WILL, WITH CONDITIONS, PURSUANT TO STREETS AND HIGHWAYS CODE SECTIONS 8320 THROUGH 8325 AND FINDING THE VACATION EXEMPT FROM CEQA PURSUANT TO CEQA GUIDELINES SECTIONS 15061(B)(3) AND 15304

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

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

(a) Pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 8320(a)(2), the owner of Tracts 20249 and 20250 (the “Owner”) has requested the City to vacate Lot B of Tract 20249, a portion of Kachina Drive located northwesterly of the intersection with Virtue Vista Drive in the City of Jurupa Valley, as recorded in Map Book 222, pages 27 through 31, inclusive, of the Official Records of Riverside County (“Subject Parcel”) in 1990. A map showing the location and description of the proposed vacation is attached to this Resolution as Exhibit A and incorporated herein as though set forth in full.

(b) The vacation of the Subject Parcel will be conditioned on the reservation of public utility and public service easements, the Owner concurrently dedicating public rights of way and public services easement to the City, and constructing certain public improvements within the area as determined by the City Engineer in order to facilitate the transition from existing private streets to the public street.

(c) The proposed vacation is being conducted under the general public right of way vacation procedures set forth in Sections 8320 through 8325 of the California Streets and Highways Code.

(d) California Government Code Section 65402 provides that no street shall be vacated or abandoned a determination and finding is made that the proposed vacation or abandonment of the street is in conformity with the General Plan.
(e) The proposed vacation of the Subject Parcel, as conditioned, will be in conformance with and consistent with the General Plan of the City of Jurupa Valley and each element thereof, including without limitation the Mobility Element of the General Plan. On February 27, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley adopted Resolution No. 2019-02-27-02 entitled “A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY FINDING THAT THE PROPOSED VACATION OF PORTIONS OF KACHINA DRIVE NORTHWESTERLY OF THE INTERSECTION WITH VIRTUE VISTA DRIVE WILL BE IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY GENERAL PLAN.”

(f) In accordance with California Streets and Highways Code, Section 8340, the public convenience and necessity require the reservation and exemption of easements for the construction, installation, use and maintenance of public utilities, as defined in Section 216 of the California Public Utilities Code from the proposed vacation.

(g) The public rights of way for street purposes on the Subject Property are unnecessary for present or prospective public use.

(h) The vacation of the Subject Property shall be subject to the reservation of and exemption of easements for the construction, installation, use and maintenance of public utilities, as defined in Section 216 of the California Public Utilities Code.

(i) Pursuant to Section 8320 of the Street and Highways Code, the City Council held a duly noticed Public Hearing on March 7, 2019 to consider vacating the City's rights of way for street purposes in the Subject Property at which time members of the public had the opportunity to comment on the proposed vacation of the Subject Property to the City Council. The Council duly considered all written and oral comments received prior to adopting this Resolution.

(j) The proposed action to vacate the public right of way on the Subject Property with conditions is exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and the City’s CEQA Guidelines pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15061(b)(3) and 15304 because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the proposed vacation, as conditioned, will have a significant effect on the environment. The proposed action will vacate portions of the right of way not needed for public purposes in order to implement the transition from previously approved private streets per recorded map of Tract No. 20249 and Tract No. 20250 to City streets and will not result in direct or indirect physical changes in the environment.

Section 2. Vacation of Lot B of Tract 20249: Conditions of Approval. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby vacates the public right of way for street purposes on the Subject Property, Lot B of Tract 20249, as recorded in Map Book 222, pages 27 through 31, inclusive, of the Official Records of Riverside County, pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Sections 8320 through 8325 subject to the following conditions:

(a) Easements for the construction, installation, use and maintenance of public utilities, as defined in Section 216 of the California Public Utilities Code are hereby reserved and exempted from the vacation of the Subject Property.
(b) **Owner shall dedicate to the City, in a form approved by the City Engineer and City Attorney, such rights of way and public utility easements as determined by the City Engineer to be necessary for the transition of the private portion of Kachina Drive and other private streets in Tracts 20249 and 20250 to the public portion of Kachina Drive, to vest in the City upon completion of the improvements described in Section 2(c) of this Resolution to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.**

(c) **Owner shall prepare improvement plans for the entrance gates, private streets, landscaped island, landscaping, curb, gutter, sidewalks, and other amenities, that would connect the revised public of way to the private streets in Tracts 20149 and 20250, located within two hundred (200) feet of the public portion of Kachina Drive which improvement plans shall be approved by the City Engineer. Upon approval of the plans, Owner and City shall enter into an improvement agreement for the construction of the approved improvements which shall include performance and payment surety bonds to secure the construction of the improvements. The City Manager is authorized to enter into such agreement on behalf of the City.**

(d) **Owner shall obtain a Site Plan Development Permit pursuant to Section 9.240.330 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and such other land use entitlement as may be required, for the revisions to the private streets and related improvements thereto described in Section 1(c) and amend the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions governing Tracts 20249 and 20250 to provide for the maintenance of said revisions to the private streets.**

**Section 3. Certification, Recordation, and Notice.** The City Clerk shall:

(a) **Certify the adoption of this Resolution.**

(b) **Upon receipt of a written certification from the City Engineer that the Conditions of Approval set forth in Section 2 of this Resolution have been fulfilled, cause a certified copy of this Resolution, attested by the clerk under seal, to be recorded without acknowledgment, certificate of acknowledgment, or further proof in the office of the Recorder of the County of Riverside in accordance with the provisions of California Streets and Highways Code, Section 8336. Upon such recordation, the vacation described in Section 2 is complete.**

(c) **Within fifteen (15) days of the adoption of this Resolution give written notice of the vacation to any local agency requesting such notice pursuant to the applicable law.**

**PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED** by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 7th day of March, 2019.

__________________________________
Brian Berkson
Mayor
ATTEST:

_________________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk

CERTIFICATION

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

I, Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-15 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 7th day of March, 2019, by the following votes, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, this 7th day of March, 2019.

___________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
Lot “B” as shown on map of Tract No. 20249, as recorded in Map Book 222, pages 27 through 31, inclusive, of the Official Records of Riverside County, reserving therefrom easement for public utility purposes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>SITE_ADDR</th>
<th>OWNER_NAME_1</th>
<th>OWNER_ADDRESS</th>
<th>OWNER_CITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>166-550-016</td>
<td>8113 SWING DR</td>
<td>HILLS, INDIAN INV</td>
<td>PO BOX 3617</td>
<td>JURUPA VALLEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>166-550-039</td>
<td>8106 SWING DR</td>
<td>HILLS, INDIAN INV</td>
<td>PO BOX 3617</td>
<td>JURUPA VALLEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>166-550-015</td>
<td>7992 PUTTER CIR</td>
<td>HILLS, INDIAN INV</td>
<td>PO BOX 3617</td>
<td>JURUPA VALLEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>166-560-018</td>
<td>8106 SWING DR</td>
<td>HILLS, INDIAN INV</td>
<td>PO BOX 3617</td>
<td>JURUPA VALLEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>166-560-017</td>
<td>7992 PUTTER CIR</td>
<td>HILLS, INDIAN INV</td>
<td>PO BOX 3617</td>
<td>JURUPA VALLEY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTACHMENT 2 – ADJACENT PROPERTIES TO PROPOSED STREET VACATION**
EXHIBIT "B"
VACATION PORTION
OF KACHINA DRIVE
VAC MP 18-005

PRIVATE ROAD
EASEMENT FROM LOT
23 TO HOA

LOT 23
TRACT NO. 20249
MB 222 / 27-31

LOT 1
TRACT NO.
22730
MB 210 / 97-108

EASEMENT NOTES

⚠️ JURUPA COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT, HOLDER
OF AN EASEMENT FOR PIPELINES, SEC.
6-19-1987 AS INST. NO. 174551, D.R.

⚠️ STORM DRAIN EASEMENT PER TRACT NO. 20249,
MB 222/27-31

⚠️ PUBLIC UTILITIES EASEMENT PER TRACT NO.
20249, MB 222/27-31

SEC. 24, T. 25S., R. 6W.,
SECTIONALIZED SURVEY OF THE
JURUPA RANCHO MB 9/33 SB. Co.

ATTACHMENT 6 – CONFIGURATION PROPOSED PRIVATE GATED ACCESS
(SUPERIMPOSED OVER VACATION & DEDICATION)
ATTACHMENT 7 – CONCEPT OF PROPOSED LANDSCAPING AND TRAFFIC FLOW
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 7, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER

BY: ALAN KREIMEIER, ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 16.A

MID-YEAR BUDGET PRESENTATION

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the City Council receive and file the Mid-Year Budget Presentation.

ANALYSIS

The FY 2018-19 Budget was adopted in June of 2018. Expenditures are typically budgeted based upon the anticipated level of activity. However, it is often the case that as the fiscal year progresses some activities may need to be either increased or decreased to reflect changing circumstances. Consequently, most cities evaluate financial activities at or shortly after the midpoint of the budget year to determine if changes in resource allocation are necessary to meet these changing circumstances.

Staff does not believe adjustments to the Budget are necessary at this time.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

No Financial Impact

ALTERNATIVES

1. Provide other direction to staff

Prepared by: Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Submitted by: Gary S. Thompson
City Manager

www.jurupavalley.org
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 7, 2019
TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER
SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 16.B

AUTHORIZING CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS TO SIGN A LETTER PROTESTING FALSE AND MISLEADING STATEMENTS BY THE CITY OF RIVERSIDE AND THE RIVERSIDE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE LETTER SOLICITING PUBLIC LOBBYING IN SUPPORT OF THE RIVERSIDE TRANSMISSION RELIABILITY PROJECT (RTRP) AND UPDATE ON STATUS OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

RECOMMENDATION

That the City Council:

1) Review the draft letter protesting false and misleading statements by the City of Riverside and the Riverside Chamber of Commerce letter soliciting public lobbying in support of the RTRP and authorize each member of the City Council to sign the letter.

2) Receive update report from Staff on the status of RTRP proceedings before the California Public Utilities Commission.

ANALYSIS

Letter to Riverside Chamber of Commerce and City of Riverside protesting false and misleading statements

In an effort to generate public support for the Riverside Transmission Reliability Project (RTRP), the Riverside Chamber of Commerce and the City of Riverside are soliciting residents and businesses to sign a petition and send a letter to the California Public Utilities Commission lobbying for the approval of the RTRP.

The Riverside Chamber of Commerce and the City of Riverside are providing false and misleading information to residents and businesses about the Riverside Transmission
Reliability Project in an effort to obtain the signatures of residents and business on a petition urging the California Public Utilities Commission to approve the RTRP.

The City of Jurupa Valley supports the undergrounding of the RTRP within the City of Jurupa Valley as opposed to the overhead routing currently proposed. Undergrounding the RTRP within Jurupa Valley will provide the residents and businesses in the City of Riverside with the same electrical security as would exist with the above-ground option.

Undergrounding the RTRP high-voltage transmission lines in Jurupa Valley will not be expensive for the residents and businesses in the City of Riverside. According to Dr. Keith Casey, California Independent System Operators (CAISO) V.P. Infrastructure, Riverside’s share of the costs of the RTRP, including any undergrounding in Jurupa Valley, is a mere 1.04% to 1.07% of the costs of the RTRP paid over the life of the facilities. CAISO is the entity that ordered City of Riverside and SCE to create the secondary connection for Riverside in 2006.

By undergrounding the RTRP’s high-voltage transmission lines, the City of Riverside and Southern California will save millions of dollars in the costs of acquiring private land for the transmission line towers. Under its franchise agreement with the City of Jurupa Valley, Southern California Edison will not need to pay for the right to use the City street to construct the lines underground. Despite being requested by City staff to provide cost information, the City of Riverside and Southern California Edison have either refused or are unable to justify their statements that the undergrounding will be expensive, and will significantly impact the City of Riverside ratepayers to the extent being represented by Riverside and the Riverside Chamber of Commerce.

The people of Jurupa Valley will unjustly bear all of the burdens resulting from the RTRP lines being constructed above ground within Jurupa Valley but will not receive any benefits from this project. Undergrounding mitigates many of the adverse effects of the RTRP above-ground lines on the City of Jurupa Valley documented in the Commission’s Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the RTRP. The Supplement Environmental Impact Report found that undergrounding the RTRP in Jurupa Valley is the “environmentally superior alternative,” the best option for the RTRP.

Therefore, Staff recommends that the Council authorized each Council Member to sign the proposed letter to the Riverside Chamber of Commerce and the City of Riverside.

**Update on the Status of RTRP Proceedings.**

The City of Riverside and Southern California Edison have applied to the California Public Utilities Commission for a permit to construct up to and exceeding 100 foot tall high-voltage 230kv electrical transmission towers and lines along the I-15 Freeway in Jurupa Valley, known as the Riverside Transmission Reliability Project (RTRP). City of Riverside and SCE have agreed to underground the lines from Limonite Avenue south to the Santa Ana River, but the 100 foot towers and transmission lines will be above ground north of Limonite.
The City of Jurupa Valley and property owners under the proposed lines support the undergrounding of the RTRP in Jurupa Valley but have actively opposed the above-ground lines.

The Administrative Law Judge assigned to the RTRP Application has set the following schedule for a decision on the Application:

A. March 1, 2019: Southern California Edison and City of Riverside submit written direct testimony in support of Application

B. May 31, 2019: City and the other opponents submit written direct testimony in opposition to the Application.

C. July 12, 2019: Southern California Edison and City of Riverside submit rebuttal testimony

D. August 6, 7, and 8, 2019: Evidentiary Hearing will be held before the Administrative Law Judge in San Francisco with no general public testimony.

E. August 30, 2019: Both sides submit Opening Briefs.

F. September 20, 2019: Southern California Edison and City of Riverside submit Reply Brief.

G. September 20 to December 19, 2019: During this period, the Administrative Law Judge will submit a Proposed Decision on the RTRP Application to the Commission.

H. No earlier than 30 days after submission of the Administrative Law Judge's Proposed Decision, the California Public Utilities Commission will issue a Final Decision on the RTRP Application at a public meeting of the Commission in San Francisco.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Approval of the RTRP with above ground high voltage transmission towers and lines will have a devastating negative impact on the people of the City of Jurupa Valley.

Submitted by: 

Gary Thompson  
City Manager

Reviewed by: 

Peter M. Thorson  
City Attorney

www.jurupavalley.org
Attachments:

1. Proposed letter to Riverside Chamber of Commerce and City of Riverside
2. Petition of Riverside Chamber of Commerce and City of Riverside
Mr. Joseph Ortiz  
Chairman of the Board  
Riverside Chamber of Commerce  
3985 University Avenue  
Riverside, CA 92501

Mayor Rusty Bailey  
City of Riverside  
3900 Main Street  
Riverside, CA 92522

Re: Riverside Transmission Reliability Project

Dear Mr. Ortiz and Mayor Bailey:

The Riverside Chamber of Commerce and the City of Riverside are providing false and misleading information to residents and businesses about the Riverside Transmission Reliability Project (RTRP) in an effort to obtain the signatures of residents and businesses on a petition urging the California Public Utilities Commission to approve the RTRP.

The City of Jurupa Valley supports the undergrounding of the RTRP within the City of Jurupa Valley. Undergrounding the RTRP within Jurupa Valley will provide the residents and businesses in the City of Riverside with the same electrical security as would exist with the above-ground option.

Undergrounding the RTRP high-voltage transmission lines in Jurupa Valley will not be expensive for the residents and businesses in the City of Riverside. According to Dr. Keith Casey, California Independent System Operators (CAISO) V.P. Infrastructure, Riverside’s share of the costs of the RTRP, including any undergrounding in Jurupa Valley, is a mere 1.04% to 1.07% of the costs of the RTRP paid over the life of the facilities. CAISO is the entity that ordered City of Riverside and SCE to create the secondary connection for Riverside in 2006.
By undergrounding the RTRP’s high-voltage transmission lines, the City of Riverside and Southern California will save millions of dollars in the costs of acquiring private land for the transmission line towers. Under its franchise agreement with the City of Jurupa Valley, Southern California Edison will not need to pay for the right to use the City street to construct the lines underground. Despite being requested by Jurupa Valley City staff to provide cost information, the City of Riverside and Southern California Edison have either refused or are unable to justify their statements that the undergrounding will be expensive, and will significantly impact the City of Riverside ratepayers to the extent being represented by Riverside and the Riverside Chamber of Commerce.

The people of Jurupa Valley will unjustly bear all of the burdens resulting from the RTRP lines being constructed above ground within Jurupa Valley but will not receive any benefits from this project. Undergrounding mitigates many of the adverse effects of the RTRP above-ground lines on the City of Jurupa Valley documented in the Commission’s Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the RTRP. The Supplement Environmental Impact Report found that undergrounding the RTRP in Jurupa Valley is the “environmentally superior alternative,” the best option for the RTRP.

Sincerely yours,

Brian Berkson
Mayor

Chris Barajas
Council Member

Anthony Kelly, Jr.
Mayor pro Tempore

Lorena Barajas
Council Member

Micheal Goodland
Council Member
cc. Congressman Mark Takano
    Senator Richard Roth
    Assemblymember Sabrina Cervantes
    City Council, City of Riverside
    Cindy Roth, Executive Director, Riverside Chamber of Commerce
    Al Zelinka, City Manager, City of Riverside
    Gary Thompson, City Manager, City of Jurupa Valley
    Todd Corbin, General Manager, Riverside Public Utilities
    George Hanson, Riverside Public Utilities
I support the Riverside Transmission Reliability Project (RTRP) Hybrid Project!

Our community needs the RTRP Project! Without it, Riverside's 326,000 residents are at risk of a power blackout if the area's single connection to the California electric grid goes down due to a natural disaster, accident, or any other unanticipated event.

Losing our only connection to the grid would adversely impact hospitals and trauma centers, jails, emergency response teams, fire stations, traffic signals, universities, schools, colleges, businesses and families.

Every other California city our size has multiple connections to the power grid. Even much smaller cities have multiple connections. Riverside residents deserve the same reliable energy that other cities have.

The alternatives you are considering call for more of the transmission line to be installed underground. I'm concerned that this is going to be expensive and that I'm going to have to pay for those additional costs, and I can't afford it. This is not fair to our hard-working residents and small business owners who strive to make Riverside a great place to live, work, and play.

In 2006, the California Independent System Operator ordered Southern California Edison to create a second connection for Riverside to ensure the same reliability as other cities. In the best-case scenario, if all approvals are obtained, the line will be built and energized in 2025. Nineteen years is an extraordinarily long time to wait for a basic protection that all of our neighbors in adjacent cities already enjoy.

I urge the California Public Utilities Commission to approve the RTRP project without further delay.

Name of Business:

First Name:

Last Name:

Email Address:

Address: