REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
OF THE JURUPA VALLEY CITY COUNCIL
Thursday, March 21, 2019
Workshop: 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 P.M. - CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL FOR WORKSHOP
   ● Brian Berkson, Mayor
   ● Anthony Kelly, Jr., Mayor Pro Tem
   ● Chris Barajas, Council Member
   ● Lorena Barajas, Council Member
   ● Micheal Goodland, Council Member

2. SUMMARY OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND BROWN ACT
   A. PRESENTED BY CITY ATTORNEY PETER THORSON

3. 7:00 P.M. - RECONVENE IN OPEN 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. RECOGNITION TO RUBIDOUX HIGH SCHOOL JROTC

B. JURUPA PRO RODEO COMMITTEE

C. UPDATE ON LIMONITE AVENUE/I-15 INTERCHANGE PROJECT

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. MARCH 7, 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 $1,272,930.15

Requested Action: That the City Council ratify the check registers dated February 28 and March 7 as well as the payroll registers dated February 27 and March 5, 13, 2019.

C. ACCEPTANCE OF COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT PREPARED BY THE CITY’S AUDITORS, VAVRINEK TRINE DAY & CO.

Requested Action: That the City Council receive and file the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report prepared by the City’s Auditors, Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co.

D. AWARD OF CONSTRUCTION AGREEMENT TO HARDY & HARPER, INC. FOR VAN BUREN BOULEVARD PAVEMENT REHABILITATION – PH. 2B, RUTILE TO BELLEGRAVE

1. Requested Action: That the City Council approve and award a Construction Agreement to Hardy & Harper, Inc. in the amount of $432,349 for the Van Buren Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation, Ph.2B Project for the work included in its proposal and authorize the City Manager to execute the Agreement 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. Appropriate $500,000 of Road Maintenance & Rehabilitation Account (RMRA) funds from the Rubidoux Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation Project (Account No. 71338) 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.
E. AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES BETWEEN THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY AND DOKKEN ENGINEERING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION SERVICES FOR THE VAN BUREN BOULEVARD WIDENING, LIMONITE TO SANTA ANA RIVER PROJECT, CIP PROJECT NO. 17-B.1

1. Requested Action: That the City Council approve an agreement between Dokken Engineering and the City of Jurupa Valley for Environmental Documentation Services for the Van Buren Boulevard Widening, Limonite to Santa Ana River Project in an amount not-to-exceed $120,340 and authorize the City Manager to execute the Agreement in such final form as approved by the City Attorney; and

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

F. AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES BETWEEN THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY AND EPIC LAND SOLUTIONS, INC. FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY APPRAISAL AND ACQUISITION SERVICES FOR THE VAN BUREN BOULEVARD WIDENING, LIMONITE TO SANTA ANA RIVER PROJECT, CIP PROJECT NO. 17-B.1

1. Requested Action: That the City Council approve an agreement between Epic Land Solutions, Inc., and the City of Jurupa Valley for Right-of-Way Appraisal and Acquisition Services for the Van Buren Boulevard Widening, Limonite to Santa Ana River Project in an amount not-to-exceed $42,885 and authorize the City Manager to execute the Agreement in such final form as approved by the City Attorney; and

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

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. 2019-23, 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. 2019-14 FOR THE EMERGENCY REPAIR OF LIMONITE AVENUE BETWEEN BAIN
14. CONSIDERATION OF ANY ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR

15. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NO. 19002 TO AMEND THE 2017 GENERAL PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT TO REFLECT CHANGES REQUESTED BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (HCD); INITIATION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE GENERAL PLAN MAP AND ZONING MAP TO IMPLEMENT THE HOUSING ELEMENT; AND RECEIVE THE GENERAL PLAN ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL

1. Requested Action: That the City Council approve General Plan Amendment No. 19002 to amend the 2017 General Plan Housing Element to reflect changes requested by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), initiate amendments to the General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map implement the 2017 General Plan Housing Element, and receive the General Plan Annual Progress Report.

2. That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-16, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY APPROVING GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 19002 TO AMEND THE 2017 GENERAL PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT TO REFLECT CHANGES REQUESTED BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, AND DETERMINING NO FURTHER CEQA REVIEW REQUIRED

B. PUBLIC HEARING FOR RECONSIDERATION OF MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 17099: CHANGE OF ZONE (CZ) NO. 17003 TO CHANGE THE ZONING CLASSIFICATION OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY FROM R-1 (ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS) TO R-4 (PLANNED RESIDENTIAL) AND TO CONSIDER AN APPEAL OF TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 37211, SUBDIVISION OF SAID PROPERTY INTO 48 LOTS FOR FUTURE SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, THREE LETTERED STREET LOTS, 2 LETTERED LOTS FOR DRAINAGE FACILITIES, AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF ASSOCIATED ON-SITE AND OFF-SITE INFRASTRUCTURE LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018). APPLICANT: (SEQUANATA PARTNERS, LP) (CONTINUED FROM THE NOVEMBER 18, 2018 MEETING)
1. Requested Action: That the City Council approve Change of Zone (CZ) No. 17003, approve Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211, approve an Exception to Subsection G of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and approve the Development Plan approving the project as follows:

a. That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-17, entitled:

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

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

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

c. That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-18, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, SUSTAINING THE PLANNING COMMISSION’S ADOPTION OF A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR A SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION PROJECT LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018), APPROVAL OF AN EXCEPTION TO SUBSECTION G OF SECTION 7.10.080 OF CHAPTER 7.10 OF TITLE 7 OF THE JURUPA VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE, APPROVAL OF TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 37211, AND APPROVAL OF A DEVELOPMENT PLAN TO PERMIT A
SCHEDULE “A” SUBDIVISION OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) INTO 48 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS

ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATION

2. That the City Council deny Change of Zone (CZ) No. 17003, approve the revised Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211, proposing 41 lots with minimum 7,200 square foot lot sizes and approve an Exception to Subsection G of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code approving the alternative project as follows:

a. That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-17, entitled:

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

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

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

c. That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-18(a), entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, SUSTAINING, IN PART, AND

C. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 18089 (CZ18001, TTM37470, VAR18004, AND EXCEPTION TO SECTION 7.10.080 (C) OF TITLE 7) FOR 34 SINGLE-FAMILY LOT SUBDIVISION OF A 6.74 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED SOUTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF 30TH STREET AND SIERRA AVENUE, APNS: 177-020-018; 177-020-012; 177-110-005 (APPLICANT: JA BRAY, LLC) (CONTINUED FROM THE NOVEMBER 15, 2018 MEETING)

1. That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-10, entitled:


2. That the City Council conduct a first reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2019-02, entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
OFFICIAL ZONING MAP CHANGING THE ZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 6.74 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED SOUTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF 30TH STREET AND SIERRA AVENUE (APNS: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) FROM RURAL RESIDENTIAL (R-R) ZONE TO ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE, AND MAKING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA;

3. That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-19, entitled:


4. That the City Council initiate an amendment to Title 9 of the Zoning Ordinance to remove Sec. 9.100.030 entitled “Minimum area for zone”; and

5. That the City Council initiate a Change of Zone for the real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNS: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) zone to Planned Residential (R-4) zone.

16. COUNCIL BUSINESS

A. APPOINTMENTS TO THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Requested Action: That Mayor Brian Berkson, Mayor Pro Tem Anthony Kelly, Council Member Chris Barajas, Council Member Lorena Barajas, and Council Member Micheal Goodland nominate one member each to serve on the Community Development Advisory Committee for a term of four (4) years, or until the Community Development Advisory Committee member’s successors are appointed and sworn-in, whichever is later and which nomination shall be ratified by a majority vote of the entire City Council, pursuant to Chapter 2.36 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.
B. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS REGARDING THE ANNEXATION OF
ZONE 2-C (TR 32722) TO CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND
LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO. 89-1-CONSOLIDATED (“CITY OF
JURUPA VALLEY L&LMD 89-1-C”) VOLUME 2, TRACT 32722 NORTH OF
MISSION BOULEVARD AT SUNNYHILL DRIVE

1. Requested Action: That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-19, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA
VALLEY INITIATING PROCEEDINGS FOR THE ANNEXATION OF
TERRITORY TO CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND
LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO. 89-1-CONSOLIDATED AS
ZONE 2-C AND THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF ASSESSMENTS
WITHIN SUCH TERRITORY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020 PURSUANT
TO THE PROVISIONS OF PART 2 OF DIVISION 15 OF THE
CALIFORNIA STREETS AND HIGHWAYS CODE AND ARTICLE XIII D
OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION

2. That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-20, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA
VALLEY APPROVING THE REPORT OF THE ENGINEER REGARDING
THE PROPOSED ANNEXATION OF TERRITORY TO CITY OF JURUPA
VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO.
89-1-CONSOLIDATED AS ZONE 2-C AND THE LEVY AND
COLLECTION OF ASSESSMENTS WITHIN THE CITY OF JURUPA
VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO.
89-1-CONSOLIDATED FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020

3. That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-21, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA
VALLEY DECLARING ITS INTENTION TO ANNEX TERRITORY TO
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING
MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO. 89-1-CONSOLIDATED AS ZONE 2-C
AND TO LEVY AND COLLECT ASSESSMENTS WITHIN SUCH
TERRITORY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020 PURSUANT TO THE
PROVISIONS OF PART 2 OF DIVISION 15 OF THE CALIFORNIA
STREETS AND HIGHWAYS CODE AND ARTICLE XIII D OF THE
CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION AND APPOINTING A TIME AND PLACE
FOR HEARING PROTESTS
17. CITY COUNCIL MEMBER ORAL/WRITTEN REPORTS REGARDING REGIONAL BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

A. MAYOR BRIAN BERKSON

1. UPDATE ON THE METROLINK/SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY MEETING OF MARCH 8, 2019

2. UPDATE ON THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING OF MARCH 13, 2019

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

B. MAYOR PRO TEM ANTHONY KELLY, JR.

1. UPDATE ON THE NORTHWEST MOSQUITO AND VECTOR CONTROL DISTRICT MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2019

C. COUNCIL MEMBER CHRIS BARAJAS

1. UPDATE ON THE WESTERN COMMUNITY ENERGY BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING OF MARCH 13, 2019

18. CITY ATTORNEY’S REPORT

19. COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS AND COMMENTS

20. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn to the Regular Meeting of April 4, 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
March 7, 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 6:12 p.m. Council Member Lorena Barajas was absent.

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 7:01 p.m. Council Member Lorena Barajas was absent.

5. **INVOCATION** was given by Pastor Sean Ortiz, New Beginnings Community Church.

6. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** was led by Thomas Merrell, Planning Director

7. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

   A motion was made by Council Member Micheal Goodland, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Anthony Kelly, to approve the Agenda and pull Item 15.A from the Agenda.

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

8. **PRESENTATIONS**

   A. **REACH OUT GRANT UPDATE**

   Diana Fox, Executive Director, Reach Out gave an update on the Healthy Jurupa Valley Initiative. She highlighted many of the community organizations that are working with Healthy Jurupa Valley and the establishment of policy initiatives and networking opportunities that connect residents with the services they need. She highlighted several upcoming community events and thanked her staff.

9. **PUBLIC APPEARANCE/COMMENTS**

   Diana Leja, representing the Jurupa Valley Chamber of Commerce announced the following upcoming events: 1) A ribbon cutting will be held on March 14th at 5:30 p.m. to celebrate the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District’s new District Office. 2) On March 29th at 10:00 a.m., a ribbon cutting will be held to celebrate the grand opening of the new Waba Grill. 3) A “members blend” will be held at Galleano Winery on April 17th at 5:00 p.m. 4) The Mayor’s Prayer Breakfast will take place on May 2nd at 7:00 a.m. at the Indian Hills Golf Club. 5) On May 9th, the Chamber will host a special meeting regarding the Riverside Transmission Reliability Project. City Manager Gary Thompson will facilitate the meeting.

   Eddy Torres, representing Assemblymember Sabrina Cervantes reported on the following bills that were sponsored by Ms. Cervantes: AB 477 will require regional and local emergency transportation plans to include input from the senior, mental health, and disabled community. This bill is a result of the Paradise Fire that killed 86 individuals, of which 75% were senior citizens. AB187 will provide employers with a tax credit to employ and train apprentices. He announced a workshop that will teach individuals how to apply for various State Boards and Commissions on Saturday, March 23rd at 10 a.m. at the Renck Community Center in Riverside.

   Adriana Alvarado and Rosamaria Lopez introduced themselves as social work majors from Cal State San Bernardino. They explained their school project to identify the needs of the
community and learned that there are valuable resources available through the Jurupa Unified School District; however, there is a lack of communication between the parents and the schools. As a result, they created school supply kits that would promote the JUSD’s services in an effort to bridge the communication gap.

Bill Rattazzi, representing Invision Community stated that he is currently developing a 55-unit housing project near Indian Hills. He believes in giving back to the communities where he builds. He offered to work with the city as a community partner.

10. INTRODUCTIONS, ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, COUNCIL COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council Member Micheal Goodland announced that he was asked by County Supervisor Karen Spiegel to serve as an alternate member on the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority. He gave a brief update of the meeting of March 4, 2019. He reported on his attendance at a tour of the Sacramento Delta that was hosted by the Metropolitan Water District.

The following item was taken out of order:

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

A. MAYOR PRO TEM ANTHONY KELLY, JR.


B. COUNCIL MEMBER MICHEAL GOODLAND

1. Council Member Goodland gave an update on the Western Riverside Council of Governments Executive Committee meeting of March 4, 2019.

2. Council Member Goodland gave an update on the Healthy Jurupa Valley Community meeting of March 5, 2019.

11. CITY MANAGER’S UPDATE

City Manager Gary Thompson announced that the City’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan was recently approved by the Federal Emergency Management Authority. The plan will allow the City to apply for federal grant funds following an emergency declaration.

12. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. FEBRUARY 21, 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 February 21, 2019 regular meeting.

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

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 $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) – REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

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; 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)

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 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.

A motion was made by Council Member Micheal Goodland, seconded by Council Member Chris Barajas, to approve the Consent Calendar, with the exception of Item No. 13.E, which was removed for further discussion.

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

14. CONSIDERATION OF ANY ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR

13.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 NOTIFYING 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)
Mayor Pro Tem Anthony Kelly requested that Item 13.E be removed from the Consent Calendar for further discussion.

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

A motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Anthony Kelly, seconded by Council Member Chris Barajas, to receive and file the Notice of Decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ayes:</th>
<th>C. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noes:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent:</td>
<td>L. Barajas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. PUBLIC HEARING

16. COUNCIL BUSINESS

A. MID-YEAR BUDGET PRESENTATION

Alan Kreimeier, Administrative Services Director, presented the staff report.

Further discussion followed.

A motion was made by Council Member Micheal Goodland, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Anthony Kelly, to receive and file the Mid-Year Budget Presentation and appropriate $20,000 towards a parade consultant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ayes:</th>
<th>C. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noes:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent:</td>
<td>L. Barajas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

City Manager Gary Thompson presented the staff report.

City Attorney Peter Thorson gave an update on the timeline for legal arguments before the Public Utilities Commission.
Betty Anderson stated that the Riverside Public Utilities has consistently lied about the Riverside Transmission Reliability project. She asked that the City’s website on the RTRP be kept up to date.

Further discussion followed.

A motion was made by Council Member Micheal Goodland, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Anthony Kelly, to authorize each member of the City Council to sign the letter.

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

18. CITY ATTORNEY’S REPORT

City Attorney Peter Thorson had no report.

19. COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS AND COMMENTS

There were no additional Council comments.

20. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the City Council, Mayor Berkson adjourned the meeting at 8:32 p.m.

The next meeting of the Jurupa Valley City Council will be held March 21, 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 21, 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 28 and March 7 as well as the payroll registers dated February 27 and March 5, 13, 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. The check register dated March 7, 2019 included a $3,285.34 payment to Chase Card Services. The Statement, with purchase details, is attached herewith.

OTHER INFORMATION

None.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Check registers:

02/28/19 $ 82,693.46
03/07/19 $ 1,083,041.07
Payroll registers:

02/27/19  $ 44,437.17
03/05/19  $ 3,388.61
03/13/19  $ 59,369.84

TOTAL      $ 1,272,930.15

ALTERNATIVES

1. Not ratify the attached check registers.

Prepared by:

[Signature]
Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Submitted by:

[Signature]
Gary S. Thompson
City Manager

Attachments:

2. Payroll Registers dated February 27 and March 5, 13, 2019.
3. Chase Card Statement
<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>11273</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>ADLERHORST INTERNATIONAL/102106</td>
<td>21929</td>
<td>1/22/2019</td>
<td>JAN 2019 TRAINING</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11274</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>ALL PRINT USA</td>
<td>71738</td>
<td>2/8/2019</td>
<td>CITY RESOURCE INFORMATI</td>
<td>474.10</td>
<td>474.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11275</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>AMERICAN FORENSIC NURSE71721</td>
<td>71722</td>
<td>1/15/2019</td>
<td>LAB WORK - SHERIFF'S DEP^</td>
<td>155.00</td>
<td>155.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/15/2019</td>
<td>LAB WORK - SHERIFF'S DEP^</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/15/2019</td>
<td>LAB WORK - SHERIFF'S DEP^</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11278</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>CDG MATERIALS, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>SAND FOR SANDBAGS</td>
<td>290.75</td>
<td>290.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11279</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>CITY OF BREA, - ACCOUNT RASIT000643</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>JAN 2019 IT SERVICES</td>
<td>2,450.00</td>
<td>2,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14195</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5440 FLABOB A^</td>
<td>30.30</td>
<td>30.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11282</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>DICAB VETERINARY MNGMN133071</td>
<td>13837</td>
<td>1/14/2019</td>
<td>SHERIFF'S DEPT K9 HYDE VA</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11283</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>ECS IMAGING, INC</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/25/2019</td>
<td>LSAP ANNUAL RENEWAL</td>
<td>8,461.00</td>
<td>8,461.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td>Check Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11284</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>EDISON - SOUTHERN CALIF.</td>
<td>2-41-364-7926</td>
<td>2/16/2019</td>
<td>LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>115.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-41-438-9403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-010-3776</td>
<td></td>
<td>CFD IRR ELECTRICAL CHARGE</td>
<td>32.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-39-859-5173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-41-136-1215</td>
<td></td>
<td>CFD IRR ELECTRICAL CHARGE</td>
<td>28.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-41-380-0798</td>
<td></td>
<td>LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>28.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-39-859-5223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8035</td>
<td></td>
<td>LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>27.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-010-3867</td>
<td></td>
<td>CFD IRR ELECTRICAL CHARGE</td>
<td>27.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-506-3359</td>
<td>2/12/2019</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT ELECTRIC</td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-8175</td>
<td></td>
<td>LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>26.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-380-7605</td>
<td></td>
<td>CFD IRR ELECTRICAL CHARGE</td>
<td>26.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-010-3974</td>
<td></td>
<td>CFD IRR ELECTRICAL CHARGE</td>
<td>26.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-885-5948</td>
<td></td>
<td>LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>25.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-010-3693</td>
<td></td>
<td>CFD IRR ELECTRICAL CHARGE</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0718</td>
<td></td>
<td>LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-508-0767</td>
<td></td>
<td>LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>25.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-40-885-6102</td>
<td></td>
<td>LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>25.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-7615</td>
<td></td>
<td>LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>24.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-7821</td>
<td></td>
<td>LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>24.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-38-507-7961</td>
<td></td>
<td>LLMD ELECTRIC CHARGES</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>666.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11285</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>EPIC LAND SOLUTIONS, INC.</td>
<td>0119-0834</td>
<td>2/7/2019</td>
<td>JV LIMONITE AVE PROJECT</td>
<td>3,757.00</td>
<td>3,757.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11287</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>HD SUPPLY CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>500098393610</td>
<td>2/20/2019</td>
<td>COLD MIX ASPHALT</td>
<td>3,371.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50009827363</td>
<td>2/19/2019</td>
<td>COLD MIX ASPHALT</td>
<td>1,885.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50009757471</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>COLD MIX ASPHALT</td>
<td>1,584.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50009878074</td>
<td>2/11/2019</td>
<td>COLD MIX ASPHALT</td>
<td>606.83</td>
<td>7,248.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11289</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>ITAY, YOGEN</td>
<td>203890</td>
<td>2/25/2019</td>
<td>REPLACE LEVER HANDLE/NE</td>
<td>495.00</td>
<td>495.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td>Check Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11290</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>JURUPA COMMUNITY SERVICE</td>
<td>40264-002</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>132.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40265-002</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>132.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41009-002</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>69.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42064-002</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>64.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40164-002</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>IRR WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>64.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40916-002</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>64.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21722-002</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>52.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21723-002</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>41.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21845-002</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>LLMD WATER CHARGES</td>
<td>38.82</td>
<td>659.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-12145</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-12034 SANTIAM</td>
<td>283.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14496</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-12067 MEANDEI</td>
<td>249.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14497</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-12055 MEANDEI</td>
<td>249.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14498</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-12043 MEANDEI</td>
<td>249.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-12149</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-12051 SANTIAM</td>
<td>212.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-12148</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-12070 SANTIAM</td>
<td>185.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14504</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-12062 MEANDEI</td>
<td>177.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14505</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-6979 HOUSATO</td>
<td>177.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14506</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-6967 HOUSATO</td>
<td>177.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14507</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-6955 HOUSATO</td>
<td>177.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14508</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-6950 HOUSATO</td>
<td>177.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-12146</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-12046 SANTIAM</td>
<td>138.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2016-12147</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-12058 SANTIAM</td>
<td>138.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2017-14509</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-6962 HOUSATO</td>
<td>104.71</td>
<td>3,585.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1901038</td>
<td>2/8/2019</td>
<td>JAN 2019 ADD SVCS-TRACTC</td>
<td>1,560.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>190136</td>
<td>2/8/2019</td>
<td>JAN 2019 ADD SVCS-VARIOUS</td>
<td>703.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1901039</td>
<td>2/8/2019</td>
<td>JAN 2019 ADD SVCS-TRACTC</td>
<td>658.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1901037</td>
<td>2/8/2019</td>
<td>JAN 2019 ADD SVCS-STORM</td>
<td>567.64</td>
<td>8,278.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11295</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>MOBILE MODULAR STORAGE</td>
<td>1875682</td>
<td>2/12/2019</td>
<td>CONTAINER #55294 RENTAL</td>
<td>104.85</td>
<td>104.85</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>11296</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>ORTIZ, ROGELIO</td>
<td>19085</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>BUSINESS CARDS</td>
<td>64.65</td>
<td>64.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11297</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>PUBLIC AGENCY RETIREMENTS</td>
<td>42300</td>
<td>2/12/2019</td>
<td>DEC 2018 REP FEES</td>
<td>327.82</td>
<td>327.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11298</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>RUBIO, BERTHA</td>
<td>MA17116</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>PLANNING DEPT REIMBURSE</td>
<td>1,785.00</td>
<td>1,785.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11299</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>SHIELD TECH LLC</td>
<td>MA17245</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>PLANNING DEPT REIMBURSE</td>
<td>4,092.45</td>
<td>4,092.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11300</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>SHRED-IT USA</td>
<td>8126623355</td>
<td>2/15/2019</td>
<td>JAN-FEB 2019 RECYCLE</td>
<td>206.27</td>
<td>206.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11301</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>SOFTSCAPES CORPORATION</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>2/1/2019</td>
<td>LLMD LANDSCAPE MAINT-FE</td>
<td>8,200.00</td>
<td>8,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/1/2019</td>
<td>LLMD LANDSCAPE MAINT-FE</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11303</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>TOTALFUNDS</td>
<td>021719</td>
<td>2/17/2019</td>
<td>FEB 2019 POSTAGE</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11304</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>TUCKER, KALYN</td>
<td>BD2018-16519</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5088 SULPHUR</td>
<td>943.74</td>
<td>943.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11306</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>VAN DYKE LANDSCAPE ARCH</td>
<td>20989</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>JAN 2019 LLMD INSPECTION</td>
<td>8,515.00</td>
<td>8,515.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td>ARCH20989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11307</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>WEST VALLEY WATER DISTRIBUTION</td>
<td>93757-45400</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td>METER#83339266-1090 HALL</td>
<td>46.56</td>
<td>46.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub total for CHASE BANK: 82,693.46
<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>230</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>ICMA-RC</td>
<td>021419</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>PLAN #307290 CITY OF JURU</td>
<td>1,573.00</td>
<td>1,573.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK USA</td>
<td>021419</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>PARS CONTRACT #86360-00-</td>
<td>7,772.21</td>
<td>7,772.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK USA</td>
<td>022819</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>PARS CONTRACT #86360-00-</td>
<td>7,769.85</td>
<td>7,769.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>ICMA-RC</td>
<td>022819</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>PLAN #307290 CITY OF JURU</td>
<td>1,023.00</td>
<td>1,023.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>APOOL ELECTRIC</td>
<td>BD2018-16819</td>
<td>3/6/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11900 RIVERSIE</td>
<td>110.03</td>
<td>110.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2018-16725</td>
<td>3/6/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11900 RIVERSIE</td>
<td>56.15</td>
<td>56.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>AWESOME AWARDS</td>
<td>25529</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>NAME PLATES</td>
<td>277.94</td>
<td>277.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>BADGER CONTROLS INC.</td>
<td>BD2017-12973</td>
<td>1/23/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-9670 GALENA S</td>
<td>149.53</td>
<td>149.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPERS</td>
<td>00011232858</td>
<td>2/8/2019</td>
<td>NIB-VAN BUREN BLVD PAVE F</td>
<td>514.80</td>
<td>514.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0011234549</td>
<td>2/14/2019</td>
<td>NOTICE OF PROPOSED ORD</td>
<td>497.20</td>
<td>497.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>COLONIAL LIFE INS CO</td>
<td>4522090-030167</td>
<td>2/22/2019</td>
<td>MAR 2019 EMP. CAFETERIA F</td>
<td>682.20</td>
<td>682.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>DE LAGE LANDEN FINANCIAL</td>
<td>62589366</td>
<td>2/23/2019</td>
<td>2/15/19 - 3/14/19 COPIER LEA</td>
<td>1,174.88</td>
<td>1,174.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>GRC ASSOCIATES, INC.</td>
<td>46-0118</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>9/1-11/18/18 2018-19 CDBG ADI</td>
<td>9,360.00</td>
<td>9,360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46-0119</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>11/7/18-1/31/19 2019-20 CDBG</td>
<td>5,400.00</td>
<td>5,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,031.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>HERNANDEZ, ANA</td>
<td>BD2017-14652</td>
<td>3/6/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-3412 NOVAK ST.</td>
<td>1,827.38</td>
<td>1,827.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>HR GREEN</td>
<td>124152</td>
<td>1/21/2019</td>
<td>DEC 2018 PROF SVCS</td>
<td>593,791.77</td>
<td>593,791.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page: 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Invoice</th>
<th>Inv Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
<th>Check Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11320</td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>IK CONSULTING, LLC</td>
<td>IK-JV0319</td>
<td>3/4/2019</td>
<td>ACCELA AUTOMATION IMPLP</td>
<td>21,600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voucher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IK-JV1218</td>
<td>3/4/2019</td>
<td>ACCELA AUTOMATION IMPLP</td>
<td>5,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IK-JV0219</td>
<td>3/4/2019</td>
<td>ACCELA AUTOMATION IMPLP</td>
<td>2,160.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>JOE A. GONSALVES &amp; SON</td>
<td>157233</td>
<td>2/20/2019</td>
<td>MAR 2019 LEGISLATIVE SERV</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>LIEBERT CASSIDY WHITMOR</td>
<td>1473982</td>
<td>2/19/2019</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS C</td>
<td>2,371.50</td>
<td>2,371.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>OFFICE DEPOT, INC</td>
<td>279705602001</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>98.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>ORTIZ, ROGELIO</td>
<td>279822051001</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>59.70</td>
<td>157.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>P.F. PETTIBONE &amp; CO</td>
<td>19076</td>
<td>2/15/2019</td>
<td>50 VINYL DECALS</td>
<td>233.82</td>
<td>233.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>PARADISE JURUPA LLC</td>
<td>MA14115</td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>REIMBURSEMENT FOR DUPL</td>
<td>14,382.00</td>
<td>14,382.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>PATH OF LIFE MINISTRIES</td>
<td>021919</td>
<td>2/19/2019</td>
<td>CDBG CITY OF JURUPA VALL</td>
<td>5,610.00</td>
<td>5,610.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Inv Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Paid</td>
<td>Check Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT-SEP 2018 - ZON</td>
<td>7,485.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT-SEP 2018 - HAR</td>
<td>3,440.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT-SEP 2018 - ZON</td>
<td>2,896.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT-NOV 2018 - VAN</td>
<td>2,884.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT-NOV 2018 - ZON</td>
<td>2,794.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT-NOV 2018-MISSI</td>
<td>2,684.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT-NOV 2018 - ZON</td>
<td>2,411.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT-SEP 2018-RANG</td>
<td>1,282.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT-NOV 2018 - ZON</td>
<td>1,280.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT-NOV 2018 - ZON</td>
<td>1,026.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT-NOV 2018 - INLA</td>
<td>932.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT-SEP 2018 - ETIV</td>
<td>569.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT-NOV 2018 - ZON</td>
<td>366.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT-NOV 2018 - ZON</td>
<td>359.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT-NOV 2018 - ZON</td>
<td>340.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT-NOV 2018 - ZON</td>
<td>332.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>2/6/2019</td>
<td>LLMD MAINT-SEP 2018 - LIMC</td>
<td>319.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD2018-16274</td>
<td>3/6/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11175 INLAND A</td>
<td>328.70</td>
<td>42,231.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02115</td>
<td>3/6/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11093 VENTURE</td>
<td>328.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SPRINT</td>
<td>BD2018-16999</td>
<td>3/6/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-11093 VENTURE</td>
<td>292.74</td>
<td>292.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11335</td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>THE AUSTIN COMPANY</td>
<td>02024</td>
<td>18-0111</td>
<td>WREATHS/SNOWFLAKES-JV</td>
<td>840.00</td>
<td>840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THE CHRISTMAS KINGS</td>
<td>18-0111</td>
<td>3/6/2019</td>
<td>BLDG REIMB-5885 POLARIS</td>
<td>167.07</td>
<td>167.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11339</td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>WRCOG, WESTERN RIVERSII</td>
<td>00029</td>
<td>3/6/2019</td>
<td>FEBRUARY 2019 TUMF</td>
<td>212,140.00</td>
<td>212,140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11340</td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>XCS DOCUMENT MGMT SOLL050409</td>
<td>00042</td>
<td>2/15/2019</td>
<td>1/11-2/11/19 COPY COST ID#1</td>
<td>2,257.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>050408</td>
<td>2/15/2019</td>
<td>1/11-2/11/19 COPY COST ID#1</td>
<td>1,434.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>049984</td>
<td>12/3/2018</td>
<td>10/24-11/24/18 COPY COST ID</td>
<td>1,231.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>050407</td>
<td>2/15/2019</td>
<td>1/11-2/11/19 COPY COST ID#1</td>
<td>691.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>049965</td>
<td>12/3/2018</td>
<td>10/24-11/24/18 COPY COST ID</td>
<td>453.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sub total for CHASE BANK: 1,083,041.07
# CASH REQUIREMENTS

CASH REQUIRED FOR NEGOTIABLE CHECKS &/OR ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFERS (EFT) FOR CHECK DATE 02/27/19: $44,737.17

## TRANSACTION SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFT</td>
<td>44,737.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Required</td>
<td>44,737.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Remaining</td>
<td>9,023.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities</td>
<td>53,760.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TRANSACTION DETAIL

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANS. DATE</th>
<th>BANK NAME</th>
<th>ACCOUNT NUMBER</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/26/19</td>
<td>JPMORGAN CHASE BANK,</td>
<td>xxxxxx8176</td>
<td>Direct Deposit</td>
<td>Net Pay Allocations</td>
<td>34,933.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/27/19</td>
<td>JPMORGAN CHASE BANK,</td>
<td>xxxxxx8176</td>
<td>Taxpay®</td>
<td>Employee Withholdings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>714.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fed Income Tax</td>
<td>5,685.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Income Tax</td>
<td>2,100.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Disability</td>
<td>493.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Withholdings</td>
<td>9,003.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employer Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>714.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Unemployment</td>
<td>82.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Emp Train</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Liabilities</td>
<td>799.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EFT FOR 02/26/19**

34,933.83

**EFT FOR 02/27/19**

9,803.34

**TOTAL EFT**

44,737.17

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANS. DATE</th>
<th>BANK NAME</th>
<th>ACCOUNT NUMBER</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/27/19</td>
<td>Refer to your records for account information</td>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Employee Deductions</td>
<td>1,807.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>401A Contributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>401a EE Pretax</td>
<td>2,536.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>457b EE Catch Up</td>
<td>230.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>457b EE Pretax</td>
<td>792.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Pretax FSA</td>
<td>180.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Deductions</td>
<td>5,547.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>401a ER</td>
<td>3,476.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

5,547.58
# CASH REQUIREMENTS

**CASH REQUIRED FOR NEGOTIABLE CHECKS &/OR ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFERS (EFT) FOR CHECK DATE 03/05/19: $3,388.61**

## TRANSACTION SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFER (EFT)</td>
<td>3,388.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH REQUIRED FOR NEGOTIABLE CHECKS &amp;/OR EFT</td>
<td>3,388.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REMAINING DEDUCTIONS / WITHHOLDINGS / LIABILITIES</td>
<td>4,349.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH REQUIRED FOR CHECK DATE 03/05/19</td>
<td>7,738.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TRANSACTION DETAIL

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trans. Date</th>
<th>Bank Name</th>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/04/19</td>
<td>JPMORGAN CHASE BANK,</td>
<td>xxxxxxx8176</td>
<td>Direct Deposit</td>
<td>Net Pay Allocations</td>
<td>2,881.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/05/19</td>
<td>JPMORGAN CHASE BANK,</td>
<td>xxxxxxx8176</td>
<td>Taxpay®</td>
<td>Employee Withholdings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>97.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fed Income Tax</td>
<td>26.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Disability</td>
<td>67.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Withholdings</td>
<td>193.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employer Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>97.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Unemployment</td>
<td>206.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Emp Train</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Liabilities</td>
<td>318.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EFT for 03/04/19</td>
<td>2,881.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EFT for 03/05/19</td>
<td>507.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL EFT</td>
<td>3,388.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trans. Date</th>
<th>Bank Name</th>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/05/19</td>
<td>Refer to your records for account information</td>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Employee Deductions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>457b EE Pretax</td>
<td>3,554.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Post-Tax Other In</td>
<td>112.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Pretax Den Vis Ch</td>
<td>84.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Pretax FSA</td>
<td>225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Pretax Other Ins</td>
<td>149.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Deductions</td>
<td>4,124.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CASHREQ
# CASH REQUIREMENTS

CASH REQUIRED FOR NEGOTIABLE CHECKS & OR ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFERS (EFT) FOR CHECK DATE 03/13/19: $59,369.84

## TRANSACTION SUMMARY

| TOTAL ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFER (EFT) | $59,369.84 |
| CASH REQUIRED FOR NEGOTIABLE CHECKS & OR EFT | $59,369.84 |
| TOTAL REMAINING DEDUCTIONS / WITHHOLDINGS / LIABILITIES | $17,832.54 |
| CASH REQUIRED FOR CHECK DATE 03/13/19 | $77,202.38 |

## TRANSACTION DETAIL

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANS. DATE</th>
<th>BANK NAME</th>
<th>ACCOUNT NUMBER</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NET PAY ALLOCATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/12/19</td>
<td>JPMORGAN CHASE BANK,</td>
<td>xxxxxx8176</td>
<td>Direct Deposit</td>
<td>Net Pay Allocations</td>
<td>44,335.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/19</td>
<td>JPMORGAN CHASE BANK,</td>
<td>xxxxxx8176</td>
<td>Taxpay®</td>
<td>Employee Withholdings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>928.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fed Income Tax</td>
<td>9,026.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Income Tax</td>
<td>3,436.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Disability</td>
<td>640.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Withholdings</strong></td>
<td>14,031.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employer Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>928.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Unemploy</td>
<td>72.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA Emp Train</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>1,002.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EFT FOR 03/12/19</strong></td>
<td>44,335.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EFT FOR 03/13/19</strong></td>
<td>15,034.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL EFT</strong></td>
<td>59,369.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANS. DATE</th>
<th>BANK NAME</th>
<th>ACCOUNT NUMBER</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/13/19</td>
<td>Refer to your records for account Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Employee Deductions</td>
<td>1,807.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>401A Contributions</td>
<td>2,532.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>401a EE Pretax</td>
<td>230.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>457b EE Catch Up</td>
<td>792.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Post-Tax Other In</td>
<td>282.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Pretax Den Vis Ch</td>
<td>508.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Pretax FSA</td>
<td>180.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Pretax Medical</td>
<td>7,825.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cash Requirements**

Run Date 03/11/19 12:21 PM

**Period Start - End Date**

| Period Start - End Date | 02/24/19 - 03/09/19 |

**Check Date**

| Check Date | 03/13/19 |
## ACCOUNT ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Transaction</th>
<th>Merchant Name or Transaction Description</th>
<th>$ Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/05</td>
<td>Payment ThankYou Image Check</td>
<td>-1,760.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/26</td>
<td>ZAGG INC SALT LAKE CITY UT</td>
<td>-20.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/26</td>
<td>Amazon Prime Amzn.com/bill WA</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/30</td>
<td>ZAGG INC 800-7C09244 UT</td>
<td>20.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04</td>
<td>PELICAN WIRELESS 1923891198 CA</td>
<td>38.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/15</td>
<td>VIRTUAL GRAFFITI, INC 949-6703501 CA</td>
<td>1,233.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/18</td>
<td>VIRTUAL GRAFFITI, INC 949-8703501 CA</td>
<td>1,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TERRI ROLLINGS TRANSACTIONS THIS CYCLE (CARD 4916) $3386.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21</td>
<td>PRECISION SIGN &amp; GRAPHICS MIRA LOMA CA</td>
<td>140.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22</td>
<td>HIT TROPHY INC 419-445-6356 OH</td>
<td>97.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22</td>
<td>HIT TROPHY INC 419-445-6356 OH</td>
<td>97.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29</td>
<td>AMZN Mktg US*MBS939HA2 Amzn.com/bill WA</td>
<td>51.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/13</td>
<td>JOBS AVAILABLE INC JOBSAVAILABLEOA</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/13</td>
<td>PAYPAL *CALPELRA 402-935-7733 CA</td>
<td>350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VICTORIA WASKO TRANSACTIONS THIS CYCLE (CARD 4932) $781.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03</td>
<td>MSFT * E07007 JWDM 800-642-7676 WA</td>
<td>118.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GARY THOMPSON TRANSACTIONS THIS CYCLE (CARD 4940) $118.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2019 Totals Year-to-Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total fees charged in 2019</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total interest charged in 2019</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year-to-date totals do not reflect any fee or interest refunds you may have received.

## INTEREST CHARGES

Your **Annual Percentage Rate (APR)** is the annual interest rate on your account:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance Type</th>
<th>Annual Percentage Rate (APR)</th>
<th>Balance Subject To Interest Rate</th>
<th>Interest Charges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PURCHASES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases</td>
<td>15.49%/(v)(d)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH ADVANCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Advances</td>
<td>26.49%/(v)(d)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCE TRANSFERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Transfer</td>
<td>15.49%/(v)(d)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(v) = Variable Rate
(d) = Daily Balance Method (including new transactions)
(a) = Average Daily Balance Method (including new transactions)

Please see Information About Your Account section for the Calculation of Balance Subject to Interest Rate, Annual Renewal Notice, How to Avoid Interest on Purchases, and other important information, as applicable.
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 21, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

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

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 13.C

ACCEPTANCE OF COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT (CAFR) PREPARED BY THE CITY’S AUDITORS, VAVRINEK TRINE DAY & CO.

RECOMMENDATION

That the City Council receive and file the attached CAFR prepared by the City’s Auditors, Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co. (VTD)

BACKGROUND

Each year the City contracts with outside, independent auditors, to review the City’s finances, report to Council on the City’s financial position and offer an opinion on the accuracy of the information.

The report summarizes the financial condition of the City at June 30, 2018 and is the result of the annual audit of the City’s finances.

In the opinion of the auditors, the attached financial statements fairly represent the financial position of the City.

FISCAL IMPACT

The final audited balance for the General Fund of the City was determined to be $4,790,657 for the year ended June 30, 2019.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Not receive and file the CAFR prepared by VTD.
Prepared by:

Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Submitted by:

Gary Thompson
City Manager

Attachments:
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March 7, 2019

Honorable Mayor, City Council,
And Citizens of the City of Jurupa Valley
City of Jurupa Valley
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509

Letter of Transmittal
Fiscal Year 2017-18 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR)

To the Honorable Mayor, Members of the City Council, and Citizens of the City of Jurupa Valley, California:

It is with great pleasure that we present to you the City of Jurupa Valley's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2018. This report gives its readers a comprehensive view of the City's financial activities during the fiscal year and the financial position at the end of the fiscal year. The basic financial statements are presented in conformity with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). They were audited in accordance with Generally Accepted Auditing Standards (GAAS) by a firm of licensed certified public accountants.

This report consists of management representations concerning the finances of the City of Jurupa Valley in its seventh year of incorporation. Consequently, management assumes full responsibility for the completeness and reliability of all information presented in the report. To provide a reasonable basis for making these representations, management has implemented a comprehensive internal control framework that is designed both to protect the City's assets from loss, theft, or misuse and to compile sufficient reliable information to prepare the City's financial statements in conformity to GAAP. The City's internal control procedures are established on the principle that the cost of internal controls should not outweigh their benefits. As a result the City has designed the internal control systems to provide reasonable rather than absolute assurance that the financial statements are free from material misstatements. As management, we assert that, to the best of our knowledge and belief, this financial report is complete and reliable in all material respects.

Management also recognizes that the internal control environment changes over time due to changes in operation or the personnel performing various duties. As a result, the internal control environment is continuously being assessed to ensure that adequate controls still exist within the City to achieve the City's objectives.

The City's financial statements have been audited by Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co., LLP, Certified Public Accountants, an independent firm of certified public accountants. The purpose of an independent audit is to provide reasonable assurance that the financial statements of the City of Jurupa Valley for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2018, are free of any material misstatements. The independent auditors' report is presented as the first component of the financial section of this report. GAAP require that management provide a narrative of introduction, overview, and analysis to accompany the basic financial statements in the form of Management's Discussion and Analysis (MD&A).
This letter of transmittal is designed to complement the MD&A and should be read in conjunction with it. The MD&A can be found immediately following the report of the independent auditors in the financial section of this report.

Profile of the Government

The City of Jurupa Valley, California was incorporated as a general law city effective July 1, 2011. Jurupa Valley is the 28th city in Riverside County and newest city in California. The City is located approximately 50 miles southeast of Los Angeles. Located in Western Riverside County, in an area also known as the Inland Empire, the city covers approximately 46 square miles, with the borders running along the 15 freeway to the west, the Santa Ana River to the south and east and San Bernardino County to the north.

A community of communities the City of Jurupa Valley joined together the unincorporated areas of Riverside County previously known as Mira Loma, Glen Avon, Pedley, Indian Hills, Jurupa Hills, Sunnyslope, Crestmore Heights, Rubidoux, and Belltown.

The City operates under a Council-Manager form of government. Under this form of government, policy-making and legislative authority are vested in the City Council consisting of five (5) members elected by district. The City Council responsibilities include, but are not limited to, passing ordinances, adopting the budget, appointing committees and commissions, and hiring both the City Manager and City Attorney. The Council Members serve four (4) year terms and the Mayor is appointed annually by and from the City Council. As Chief Executive Officer, the City Manager is responsible for administering programs in accordance with policies established by the City Council and within the guidelines of the annual budget adopted by the City Council.

This report includes all funds of the City. It includes all governmental organizations and activities for which the City of Jurupa Valley's City Council is financially accountable. The City provides a wide range of services including planning, building, public works, engineering, code enforcement, and general administrative activities. Services including library, police, animal control and fire protection are also provided to the City and its citizens through contracts with the County of Riverside. Other services are provided directly through other agencies. Water and sewer services are delivered by the Jurupa Community Services District, the Rubidoux Community Services District and Santa Ana River Water Company. Parks and recreation services are provided by the Jurupa Area Recreation and Parks District. Public transit is provided through the Riverside Transit Agency. The City has franchise agreements for electricity service through Southern California Edison, natural gas through the Gas Company, refuse collection through Waste Management and Burrtec, and cable service through state franchise agreements with Pacific Bell (AT&T), and Charter Communications.

City Milestones

Vehicle License Fee (VLF) Restored- VLF added $7 Million annually in tax revenue which eliminated the major budget structural deficit the City of Jurupa Valley was faced with since VLF funding was taken away by the State when the City incorporated.
SB 132 funding- The City of Jurupa Valley entered into Amendment 1 to a Cooperative Agreement with the County of Riverside, RCTC, and City of Eastvale for the Limonite Avenue and Interstate 15 Interchange Improvements in the amount of $48 Million. The City also entered into an agreement with County of Riverside Transportation Department and RCTC for Grade Separation Improvement to Jurupa Road in the amount of $108.4 Million.

TUMF- The City of Jurupa Valley obtained funding for Limonite Ave. (Bain to Homestead) Widening in the amount of $1,710,000 along with funding for Van Buren Blvd. (Limonite Ave to Santa Ana River) Widening, in the amount of $5,980,000. Both projects are in the design phase.

Jurupa Valley High School SR2S- The City of Jurupa Valley obtained a grant from Active Transportation Program for Safe Route to Schools to provide curb, gutter, sidewalk and dirt trails along Martin St, 48th St and Troth St and provided a curb bump out at the Bellegrave and Martin intersection. This project is complete.

Relevant Financial Policies

The City has a set of financial policies that it abides by and continually reviews and updates the policies as the needs of the City change and, when necessary, to comply with any new and applicable legislation. Initially following incorporation, the City adopted all of Riverside County’s Ordinances. As the City develops its own unique needs, it will continue to create and tailor these former County Ordinances to directly address the City’s goals.

The Budget Process

Beginning at incorporation, and continuing each year thereafter, the City embarks on a strategic budget process beginning in the spring with a discussion of the City Council goals and priorities. The annual budget serves as the foundation for the City of Jurupa Valley’s financial planning and control of both operating and capital expenditures.

The City maintains budgetary controls to ensure compliance with the legal provisions embodied in the annual appropriated budget approved by the City Council. The proposed budget is submitted to the City Council and a public meeting is conducted to allow taxpayers the opportunity to comment on the proposed budget. Subsequently, the budget is adopted by the City Council through the passage of resolutions. Throughout the year the City Council may amend the budget to add or remove appropriations, transfer appropriations within a fund or change appropriations between funds.

Local Economy

This information presented in the financial statements is perhaps best understood when it is considered within the specific environment that the City of Jurupa Valley operates.

The Center for Economic Forecasting and Development at the University of California Riverside reported that 2018 was another strong year for the Inland Empire. The regions unemployment rate decreased as of June 2018 to 4.1%, a 1.1% decrease when comparing to 2017. In the same period the Inland Empire experienced 2.4% growth in employee payroll.
The City of Jurupa Valley saw a 5.9% increase in the Certificates of Occupancy issued in Fiscal Year 2017-18. The very large Inland Empire housing price advantage compared to the coastal counties continued in second quarter of 2018. Housing affordability in the inland areas for local residents was 49% in Riverside County and 52% in San Bernardino County.

Riverside County new home sales realized a median home price of $429,000 for the second quarter of 2018. This was 1.1% higher than the second quarter of 2017 when the median price was $424,500.

Riverside County experienced an increase in the median existing home price of 6.1% in the second quarter of 2018 as compared to second quarter 2017, from $358,000 to $380,000.

City of Jurupa Valley Assessed Valuation

Property Tax Revenue
The City will continue to realize increases in property tax revenues. This is primarily due to existing vacant land being transformed into residential and commercial properties and the continued increase in existing home sale prices.

Since incorporation, the City has experienced a steady increase in the number of Building Permits issued each year with 2,850 issued in Fiscal Year 2014-15, significant increase of 49% compared to Fiscal Year 2013-14. In Fiscal Years 2015-16 and 2016-17 permits remained stagnant since new homes sales decreased because of lack of supply, high FICO score requirements and the low ceiling on FHA, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac confirming loans. Building Permits showed an increase of 11% in Fiscal Year 2017-18 which was in the range of the increase in new home sales that Riverside County saw of 9.8%. New homes sold in the second quarter of 2018 were 1,356 as compared with new homes sold in 2017 which were 1,235.

Long-term Financial and Strategic Planning

The General Plan sets forth the goals, policies and directions the City will take in managing its future. The General Plan is the citizens’ “blueprint” for development; the guide to achieving our vision. California law requires each local government to adopt a local General Plan, which must contain at least seven elements: Land Use, Transportation, Housing, Conservation, Noise, Open Space and Safety. The City of Jurupa Valley City Council, adopted the City’s first General Plan in September of 2017.

The Engineering Department has developed a five year Capital Improvement Plan that includes plans for Street, Traffic and Transportation, Drainage and other miscellaneous infrastructure improvements.
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INDEPENDENT AUDITORS’ REPORT

To the Members of the City Council
City of Jurupa Valley, California

Report on the Financial Statements

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the governmental activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information of the City of Jurupa Valley (City), California, as of and for the year ended June 30, 2018, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the City’s basic financial statements as listed in the table of contents.

Management’s Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; this includes the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditors’ Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express opinions on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditors’ judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity’s preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity’s internal control. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinions.

Opinions

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the respective financial position of the governmental activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information of the City, as of June 30, 2018, and the respective changes in financial position and, where applicable, cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.
**Other Matters**

**Required Supplementary Information**

Accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America require that the management’s discussion and analysis on pages 3 through 12, and the schedule of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance – budget and actual for the General Fund, Gas Tax Fund, and Measure A fund and related note on pages 45 through 48 be presented to supplement the basic financial statements. Such information, although not a part of the basic financial statements, is required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, who considers it to be an essential part of financial reporting for placing the basic financial statements in an appropriate operational, economic, or historical context. We have applied certain limited procedures to the required supplementary information in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, which consisted of inquiries of management about the methods of preparing the information and comparing the information for consistency with management’s responses to our inquiries, the basic financial statements, and other knowledge we obtained during our audit of the basic financial statements. We do not express an opinion or provide any assurance on the information because the limited procedures do not provide us with sufficient evidence to express an opinion or provide any assurance.

**Other Information**

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming opinions on the financial statements that collectively comprise the City’s basic financial statements. The introductory section, combining and individual non major fund financial statements and budgetary comparison schedules, and statistical section, are presented for purposes of additional analysis and are not a required part of the basic financial statements.

The combining and individual nonmajor fund financial statements and budgetary comparison schedules are the responsibility of management and were derived for and relate directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements or the basic financial statements themselves, and other additional procedures in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. In our opinion, the combining and individual nonmajor fund financial statements and budgetary comparison schedules are fairly stated, in all material respects, in relation to the basic financial statements as a whole.

The introductory and statistical sections have not been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements, and accordingly, we do not express an opinion or provide any assurance on them.

**Other Reporting Required by Government Auditing Standards**

In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we have also issued our report dated February 22, 2019, on our consideration of the City’s internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of that report is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the effectiveness of the City’s internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with Government Auditing Standards in considering the City’s internal control over financial reporting and compliance.

Yavrinek, Trine, Day & Co., LLP

Riverside, California

February 22, 2019
Management's Discussion and Analysis

The following Management Discussion and Analysis (MD&A) of the City of Jurupa Valley’s (City) financial condition and performance provides an introduction and overview of the financial activities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2018. Since the Management’s Discussion and Analysis (MD&A) is designed to be condensed, we encourage readers to consider the information presented here in conjunction with additional information that we have furnished in our letter of transmittal and the basic financial statements including the accompanying notes to the basic financial statements.

Financial Highlights

- Total assets of the City at June 30, 2018 were $64.82 million and exceeded total liabilities of $19.34 million by $45.48 million. The difference between total assets and total liabilities is referred to as total net position.

- As of June 30, 2018, the City’s governmental funds reported combined fund balances of $15.01 million. This does not include Investments in capital assets of $32.27 million. Approximately $10.66 million of the governmental funds’ fund balance is restricted. The remaining fund balance of $4.36 million, or 29.02%, is unassigned.

- Debt service payments are pledged from County Measure A sales tax override funds and eight principal payments totaling $7.74 million remain. The proceeds of the $8,165,000 Certificates of Participation Series 2016, have been, and continue to be, used to finance the design, acquisition and construction of certain local roadway improvements and street resurfacing projects within the jurisdiction of the City.

- Due to other governments increased by $279 thousand as the revenue neutrality payment to the County of Riverside for fiscal year ended June 30, 2018 was properly accrued in accordance with the Revenue and Neutrality Agreement by and between the County of Riverside and the City of Jurupa Valley.

Overview of the Financial Statements

The financial statements presented herein include all of the activities of the City of Jurupa Valley as prescribed by GASB Statement No. 34. The MD&A is intended to serve as an introduction to the City’s financial statements. The City’s basic financial statements are comprised of the following three components: 1) government-wide financial statements, 2) fund financial statements, and 3) notes to the basic financial statements. This report also contains other supplementary information in addition to the basic financial statements themselves.

Government-wide financial statements: The government-wide financial statements are designed to provide readers with a broad overview of the City's finances, in a manner that is similar to a private-sector business.

Government-wide financial statements include a statement of net position and a statement of activities. The statement of net position presents information on all of the City’s assets and liabilities, with the difference between the two reported as net position. Over time, increases or decreases may provide a useful indicator on whether the financial position of the City is improving or deteriorating.
The statement of activities provides information showing how the City’s net position changed during the most recent fiscal year. These changes are reported using the full accrual basis of accounting, that is, when the economic event occurs, rather than when cash is received or paid. Under this basis of accounting, revenues and expenses are reported in the statement for some items that will only result in future cash inflows or outflows such as vacation earned but not paid and uncollected taxes.

Both of the government-wide financial statements distinguish functions of the City that are principally supported by taxes and intergovernmental revenues (government activities) from other functions that are intended to recover all or a significant portion of their costs through user fees and charges (business-type activities). The governmental activities of the City include general government, community development, public works, and public safety. The City does not have any business-type activities.

The government-wide financial statements can be found in the Table of Contents under the heading Basic Financial Statements.

**Fund financial statements:** A fund is a grouping of related accounts that is used to maintain control over resources that have been segregated for specific activities or objectives. The City, like other state and local governments, uses fund accounting to ensure and demonstrate compliance with finance-related legal requirements.

**Governmental funds:** Governmental funds are used to account for essentially the same functions reported as governmental activities in the government-wide financial statements. However, unlike government-wide financial statements, governmental fund financial statements focus on near-term inflows and outflows of spendable resources, as well as on balances of spendable resources available at the end of the fiscal year. Such information may be useful in evaluating the City’s near-term financing requirements.

Because the focus of governmental funds is narrower than that of the government-wide financial statements, it is useful to compare the information presented for governmental funds with similar information presented for governmental activities in the government-wide financial statements. By doing so, readers may better understand the long-term impact of the City’s near-term financing decisions. Both the governmental fund balance sheet and the governmental fund statement of revenues, expenditures and changes in fund balances provide a reconciliation to facilitate this comparison between governmental funds and governmental activities.

The City maintains eighteen individual governmental funds for financial reporting purposes. Information is presented separately in the governmental fund balance sheet and in the governmental fund statement of revenues, expenditures and changes in fund balance for the General Fund, Gas Tax Special Revenue Fund, Measure A Special Revenue Fund, Development Impact Fee Capital Project Fund, and Measure A COP Series 2016 Capital Project Fund which are considered to be major funds. Data from the remaining governmental funds are combined into a single, aggregated presentation. Individual fund data for each of these nonmajor governmental funds is provided in the form of combining statements elsewhere in this report.
The City adopts an annual appropriated budget for its general fund, special revenue funds and capital projects funds. A budgetary comparison statement has been provided for the General Fund to demonstrate compliance with this budget.

The governmental fund financial statements can be found in the Table of Contents under the heading Basic Financial Statements.

**Proprietary Funds:** Proprietary funds account for two types of services – enterprise and internal services funds. The City maintains only internal service funds. Internal service funds are an accounting device used to accumulate and allocate costs internally among the City’s various functions and departments. The City uses internal service funds to account for self-funded insurance and information services activities. Because these funds predominantly benefit governmental activities rather than business-type functions, they have been included within governmental activities in the government-wide financial statements.

The basic proprietary fund financial statements can be found in the Table of Contents under the heading Basic Financial Statements.

**Fiduciary Funds:** Fiduciary funds are used to account for resources held for the benefit of parties outside the City. In these cases, the City has a fiduciary responsibility and is acting as a trustee. The Statement of Fiduciary Assets and Liabilities separately reports all of the City’s fiduciary activities. Fiduciary funds are not included in the government-wide financial statements because the resources of those funds are not available to support the City’s own programs. The City uses a fiduciary fund to account for development deposits made in conjunction with certain building, planning and engineering permits issued.

The basic fiduciary fund financial statements can be found in the Table of Contents under the heading Basic Financial Statements.

**Notes to the basic financial statements:** The notes to the basic financial statements provide additional information that is essential for a full understanding of the data provided in the government-wide and fund financial statements. The notes to the basic financial statements can be found in the Table of Contents under the heading Notes to Basic Financial Statements.

**Other supplementary information:** In addition to the basic financial statements and accompanying notes, this report also presents certain required supplementary information (RSI), about the City’s General Fund, the Gas Tax Fund and Measure A Fund budgetary comparison. The combining statements referred to earlier in connection with nonmajor governmental funds are presented for all non-major Special Revenue and Capital Projects Funds. The supplementary financial information also includes budgetary comparison schedules for the nonmajor governmental funds to demonstrate compliance with the annual budget as adopted and amended. The Required Supplementary Information can be found following the Notes to Basic Financial Statements.

The combining statements for nonmajor governmental funds and the budgetary comparison schedules for the nonmajor governmental funds can be found following the Required Supplementary Information.
Government-wide financial analysis

The government-wide financial statements provide long-term and short-term information about the City’s overall financial condition. This analysis addresses the financial statements of the City as a whole.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2018, City assets exceeded liabilities by $45.48 million as summarized below:

Total assets increased $3.92 million as a result of a $5.47 million of capital assets being recorded. Resources are utilized for investment in infrastructure and city vehicles. Depreciation expense for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2018 was $3.41 million.

Total Liabilities decreased by $1.74 million primarily due to decrease in accounts payable for the year end accruals. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2018 the City had $7.92 million in long term liabilities.
Net investment in capital assets represents 70.94% of the City’s net position due to the initial transfer of fixed assets from the County of Riverside and the subsequent accounting for donated assets and fixed assets acquired since incorporation. The City uses capital assets to provide services to citizens; consequently, these assets are not available for future spending.

**Statement of Activities:** The statement of activities shows how the City’s net position changed during the fiscal year 2017-2018. Provided below is a summary of changes in net position:

### City of Jurupa Valley
**Statement of Activities**
*As of the Years Ended June 30, 2018 and June 30, 2017*  
*($ in thousands)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for services</td>
<td>$6,382</td>
<td>$6,218</td>
<td>$ 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating grants and contributions</td>
<td>8,891</td>
<td>8,214</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital grants and contributions</td>
<td>2,443</td>
<td>3,566</td>
<td>(1,123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General revenues</td>
<td>28,904</td>
<td>21,623</td>
<td>7,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenues</td>
<td>$46,620</td>
<td>$39,621</td>
<td>$ 6,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General government</td>
<td>$10,175</td>
<td>$7,969</td>
<td>$ 2,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>5,621</td>
<td>5,556</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works</td>
<td>5,564</td>
<td>6,332</td>
<td>(768)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td>19,474</td>
<td>18,356</td>
<td>1,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and fiscal charges</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>(354)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenses</td>
<td>$40,961</td>
<td>$38,696</td>
<td>$ 2,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in net position:</strong></td>
<td>$5,659</td>
<td>$925</td>
<td>$ 4,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net position, beginning of year</td>
<td>$39,823</td>
<td>$38,898</td>
<td>$925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net position, end of year</td>
<td>$45,482</td>
<td>$39,823</td>
<td>$5,659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total revenues increased by $7.00 million over the prior year. The increase is related to the City receiving revenues from Vehicle License Fees in the amount of $6.78 million.
Total expenses increased by $2.27 million over the prior year. Increases in General Government and Community Development were due to an increase in infrastructure engineering and planning as well as increase housing and commercial development within the city. The increase in Public Safety expenditures of $1.12 million was primarily due to the increased cost of the contract with the Riverside County Sheriff’s Department.

The charts below provide graphic representation of the City’s expenses compared to program revenues by function and its revenue by source.
The governmental activities’ expense and program revenue chart is designed to reflect expenses associated with each City function and the revenues that are directly attributable to each function. It is important to note that general revenues such as property, sales, and other taxes are not directly attributable to specific functions and are therefore used to support program activities citywide.

Financial Analysis of City’s Funds

As noted earlier, the City uses fund accounting to ensure and demonstrate compliance with finance related legal requirements.

**Governmental Funds**: The focus of the City’s governmental funds is to provide information on near-term inflows, outflows, and balances of spendable resources. Such information is useful in assessing the City’s ability to meet financial obligations in the short-term. As example, assigned and unassigned fund balance could serve as a useful measure of the City’s net resources available for spending at the end of the fiscal year.

As of June 30, 2018, the City’s governmental funds reported combined ending fund balances of $15.01 million. Of the $15.01 million, $10.66 million or 71.0% constitutes restricted fund balance which can only be used for specific purposes due to external restrictions or enabling legislation. The remainder of fund balance is unassigned which represents the amount that is available for any purpose.
**Proprietary Funds:** Proprietary funds provide the same type of information found in the governmental-wide financial statements, but in more detail. The City’s Proprietary funds consist of two Internal Service funds. The Internal Service funds are presented as Governmental Activities in the Statement of Net Position and Statement of Activities. The City uses the two funds to allocate the cost of the City’s information systems and risk management activities to various departments.

**Fiduciary Funds:** The City uses Fiduciary funds to account for development deposits made in conjunction with certain building permits issued.

**General Fund Financial and Budgetary Highlights**

The General Fund is the chief operating fund of the City. At June 30, 2018 unassigned fund balance was $4.79 million. As a measure of the General Fund’s financial condition, it may be useful to compare the unassigned fund balance to total expenditures. Unassigned fund balance represents 13.0% of the General Fund expenditures.

Overall, General Fund revenues for fiscal year ended June 30, 2018 totaled $35.11 million, compared to $28.55 million in the prior year. The major components are property taxes ($6.53 million), sales taxes ($11.27 million), vehicle license fees ($6.78 million), and charges for services ($6.38 million) and franchise taxes ($3.07 million).

General Fund expenditures total $36.85 million for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2018 compared to $33.01 million in the prior year. The major expenditure components are General government ($9.95 million), Community development ($3.91 million), Public works ($3.52 million) and Public safety ($19.47 million).
The difference between General Fund budget and actual are summarized below:

- Actual revenues were above budget by $575 thousand.
- The City had excess revenues of $730 thousand in sales taxes and under budget for $368 thousand in property taxes.
- Developer contributions of .93 thousand was collected for developer agreements to provide constructions of necessary public facilities and to maintain the equestrian lifestyle in the Pedley Village area of Jurupa Valley.

- Actual expenditures were above budget by $1.62. The detailed variances are:
  - General Government expenditures were $2.21 million over budget primarily due to increases in activity in legal consulting, litigation and reimbursable costs related to development processing.
  - Community Development was under budget by $80 thousand due to increases in consulting services in both the building and planning departments. These expenditures corresponded to the increase in charges for services in those departments.
  - Public Safety expenditures were $575 thousand under budget due to cost savings achieved in some of the services provided by the County of Riverside Sheriff.
Capital Assets and Debt Administration

**Capital Assets:** City investment in capital assets for its governmental type activities as of June 30, 2018, amounted to $38.74 million (net of accumulated depreciation). Investment in capital assets includes infrastructure assets as well as land, buildings, improvements, equipment and vehicles.

Additional information on the City’s capital assets can be found in the notes to basic financial statements and a summary is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governmental Activities</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction in progress</td>
<td>$ 6,027</td>
<td>$ 9,010</td>
<td>$ (2,983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>30,280</td>
<td>23,276</td>
<td>7,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and Improvements</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold improvements</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and equipment</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land improvements</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>(79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,735</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,266</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,469</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Long-term debt:** At the end of fiscal year 2017-2018, the City had outstanding long-term debt of $8.72 million.

Economic Factors and Fiscal Year 2018-2019 Budget

The fiscal year 2018-2019 City budget was prepared conservatively. Property tax estimates were projected with minimal growth from the previous fiscal year and there were no tax rate or fee increases as part of the preparation of and adoption of the fiscal year 2018-2019 budget.

Requests for Information

This financial report is designed to provide a general overview of the City’s finances for all those with interest in the government’s finances. Questions concerning any of the information provided in this report, or requests for additional information should be addressed to the City Clerk, City of Jurupa Valley, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509, or call (951) 332-6464.
GOVERNMENT-WIDE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA  
Statement of Net Position  
June 30, 2018

**Governmental Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets:</th>
<th>Governmental Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and investments (note 2)</td>
<td>$ 20,120,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts</td>
<td>43,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from other governments</td>
<td>3,661,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>39,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted cash and investments (note 2)</td>
<td>2,184,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets not being depreciated (note 4)</td>
<td>6,027,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets net of accumulated depreciation (note 4)</td>
<td>32,707,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>64,820,924</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Liabilities: | |
| Accounts payable | 6,553,239 |
| Accrued liabilities | 32,330 |
| Due to other governments | 3,719,329 |
| Deposits payable | 265,057 |
| Interest payable | 51,620 |
| Noncurrent liabilities: | |
| Due within one year: | |
| Compensated absences | 57,455 |
| Certificates of Particpation | 745,000 |
| Due in more than one year: | |
| Compensated absences | 5,961 |
| Certificates of Particpation | 7,908,832 |
| **Total Liabilities** | **19,338,823** |

| Net Position: | |
| Net investment in capital assets | 32,265,638 |
| Restricted for: | |
| Community development | 2,090,305 |
| Public works | 9,016,192 |
| Unrestricted | 2,109,966 |
| **Total Net Position** | **$ 45,482,101** |

*The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.*
### CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA

**Statement of Activities**

**For the Year Ended June 30, 2018**

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions/Programs</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Operating Charges for Services</th>
<th>Operating Grants and Contributions</th>
<th>Capital Grants and Contributions</th>
<th>Net (Expense) Revenue and Changes in Net Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governmental Activities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General government</td>
<td>$10,174,615</td>
<td>$422,202</td>
<td>$114,815</td>
<td>$31,154</td>
<td>$(9,606,444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>5,620,957</td>
<td>3,328,952</td>
<td>3,638,673</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,346,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works</td>
<td>5,563,655</td>
<td>2,266,457</td>
<td>4,855,182</td>
<td>2,411,850</td>
<td>3,969,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td>19,474,227</td>
<td>364,250</td>
<td>282,473</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(18,827,504)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and fiscal charges</td>
<td>127,335</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(127,335)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Governmental Activities</strong></td>
<td>$40,960,789</td>
<td>$6,381,861</td>
<td>$8,891,143</td>
<td>$2,443,004</td>
<td>(23,244,781)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Revenues:**

**Taxes:**
- Property taxes $6,528,839
- Sales taxes $11,273,075
- Franchise taxes $2,790,268
- Transient occupancy taxes $283,529
- Property transfer tax $484,192
- Property taxes in lieu of motor vehicle fee $6,775,334
- Investment income, unrestricted $157,448
- Other $611,567

- **Total general revenues $28,904,252**
- **Change in net position $5,659,471**

- **Net position, beginning of year $39,822,630**
- **Net position, end of year $45,482,101**
GENERAL FUND

The General Fund has been classified as a major fund and is used to account for revenues and expenditures that are not required to be accounted for in another fund.

MAJOR SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS

Special Revenue Funds are used to account for specific revenues that are legally restricted to expenditure for a particular purpose. The following funds have been classified as major funds. The budget to actual comparison for these funds have been presented in the accompanying financial statements as Required Supplementary Information:

Gas Tax Fund

To account for revenue received for gasoline taxes under Sections 2105, 2106, 2107, 2107.5 and 2032(h)(2) of the Street and Highway Code to be used solely for transportation related purposes.

Measure A Fund

To account for revenue received from the State of California from a special ½% sales tax to be used for street maintenance and improvements only. In addition, the fund accounts for the repayment of the Measure A COP Series 2016 payable from Measure A revenue.

MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECT FUNDS

Major Capital Projects Funds are used to account for capital expenditures funded from general revenues and to account for the financing, construction, and administrative activities of the City.

Development Impact Fees

This fund is used to account for the receipt of fees for development related activities such as infrastructure and public facilities.

Measure A COP Series 2016

This fund is used to account for the construction of all capital projects that utilize the resources from the Certificate of Participation Series 2016.
## CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA
### Governmental Funds
#### Balance Sheet
##### June 30, 2018

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

### Assets
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Measure A</th>
<th>Developer Impact Fees</th>
<th>Measure A COP Series 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and investments</td>
<td>$ 9,320,824</td>
<td>$ 721,041</td>
<td>$ 263,643</td>
<td>$ 6,203,971</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>6,141</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental receivable</td>
<td>1,863,043</td>
<td>375,158</td>
<td>556,360</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from other funds (note 3)</td>
<td>1,882,275</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance from other funds (note 3)</td>
<td>367,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits receivable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest receivable</td>
<td>19,306</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>11,256</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and investments - restricted</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,184,443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total assets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Measure A</th>
<th>Developer Impact Fees</th>
<th>Measure A COP Series 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total assets</td>
<td>$ 13,458,589</td>
<td>$ 1,097,428</td>
<td>$ 820,453</td>
<td>$ 6,215,227</td>
<td>$ 2,221,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Liabilities, deferred inflows of resources, and fund balances

#### Liabilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Measure A</th>
<th>Developer Impact Fees</th>
<th>Measure A COP Series 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>$ 4,698,105</td>
<td>$ 754,591</td>
<td>$ 270,417</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 263,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued liabilities</td>
<td>32,330</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to other governments</td>
<td>3,719,329</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to other funds (note 3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>367,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances to other funds (note 3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,459,294</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits payable</td>
<td>218,168</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total liabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Measure A</th>
<th>Developer Impact Fees</th>
<th>Measure A COP Series 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities</td>
<td>8,667,932</td>
<td>754,591</td>
<td>663,009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,723,191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Deferred inflows of resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Measure A</th>
<th>Developer Impact Fees</th>
<th>Measure A COP Series 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unavailable revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37,247</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fund balances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Measure A</th>
<th>Developer Impact Fees</th>
<th>Measure A COP Series 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>342,837</td>
<td>120,197</td>
<td>6,215,227</td>
<td>498,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td>4,790,657</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total fund balances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Measure A</th>
<th>Developer Impact Fees</th>
<th>Measure A COP Series 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total fund balances</td>
<td>4,790,657</td>
<td>342,837</td>
<td>120,197</td>
<td>6,215,227</td>
<td>498,399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total liabilities, deferred inflows of resources and fund balances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Measure A</th>
<th>Developer Impact Fees</th>
<th>Measure A COP Series 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities, deferred inflows of resources and fund balances</td>
<td>$ 13,458,589</td>
<td>$ 1,097,428</td>
<td>$ 820,453</td>
<td>$ 6,215,227</td>
<td>$ 2,221,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
Fund Balances of the governmental funds $15,014,581

Amounts reported for governmental activities in the Statement of Net Position are different because:

- Capital assets net of depreciation have not been included as financial resources in governmental fund activity.
  - Nondepreciable assets 6,027,197
  - Depreciable assets, net of accumulated depreciation 32,707,830

- Revenues reported as deferred inflows in the governmental funds do not provide current financial resources but are recognized in the Statement of Activities. 449,741

- Long-term liabilities are not due and payable in the current period and therefore are not reported in governmental funds. Those long-term liabilities consist of:
  - Certificates of Participation (8,653,832)
  - Compensated Absences (63,416)

Net Position of Governmental Activities $45,482,101

*The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.*
## Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balances

### Governmental Funds

For the Year Ended June 30, 2018

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Revenue Funds</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Measure A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>$28,135,237</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses and permits</td>
<td>1,645,374</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>161,180</td>
<td>2,720,342</td>
<td>2,517,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for services</td>
<td>4,017,571</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer impact fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines and forfeitures</td>
<td>574,488</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer contributions</td>
<td>93,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>53,044</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>2,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>434,345</td>
<td>5,641</td>
<td>146,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td>35,114,239</td>
<td>2,727,902</td>
<td>2,665,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General government</td>
<td>9,946,383</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>3,911,240</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works</td>
<td>3,516,817</td>
<td>2,385,065</td>
<td>1,632,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td>19,474,227</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal retirement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and fiscal charges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>317,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditures</strong></td>
<td>36,848,667</td>
<td>2,385,065</td>
<td>2,100,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess (deficiency) of revenues over (under) expenditures</strong></td>
<td>(1,734,428)</td>
<td>342,837</td>
<td>565,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other financing sources (uses):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers in (note 3)</td>
<td>1,447,156</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>539,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers out (note 3)</td>
<td>(236,204)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(534,936)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total other financing sources (uses)</strong></td>
<td>1,210,952</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net changes in fund balances</strong></td>
<td>(523,476)</td>
<td>342,837</td>
<td>570,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund balances, beginning of year</strong></td>
<td>5,314,133</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(450,249)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund balances, end of year</strong></td>
<td>$4,790,657</td>
<td>$342,837</td>
<td>$120,197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
Net change in fund balances - total governmental funds $ (164,836)

Amounts reported for the governmental activities in the Statement of Activities are different because:

   Governmental funds report capital outlays as expenditures. However, in the statement of activities, the costs of these assets are allocated over their estimated useful lives as depreciation expense.

   Capital expenditures $ 8,878,858
   Depreciation (3,409,956) 5,468,902

Revenues that are measurable but not available are not recorded as revenues in the governmental funds. 7,504

Bond proceeds provide current financial resources to governmental funds, but issuing debt increases long-term liabilities in the statement of net position. Repayment of principal is an expenditure in the governmental funds, but the repayment reduces long-term liabilities in the statement of net position. Also, governmental funds report the effect of premiums when debt is first issued, whereas these amounts are deferred and amortized in the statement of activities:

   Certificates of Participation - repayment and amortization of premium 339,929
   Changes in compensated absences 7,972

Change in net position of governmental activities $ 5,659,471

*The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.*
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA  
Proprietary Funds  
Statement of Net Position  
June 30, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governmental Activities</th>
<th>Internal Service Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current assets:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cash and investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current liabilities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Position:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total net position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA
Proprietary Funds
Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position
Year Ended June 30, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governmental Activities</th>
<th>Internal Service Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenues:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for services</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual services</td>
<td>236,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>236,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating income (loss)</td>
<td>(236,204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers in (note 3)</td>
<td>236,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in net position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net position, beginning of year</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net position, end of year</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
Governmental Activities
Internal Service Funds

Cash flows from operating activities
Cash payments to suppliers of goods and services $ (240,329)

Net cash provided by (used for) operating activities (240,329)

Cash flows from noncapital financing activities
Cash received from other funds 236,204

Net cash provided by (used for) noncapital financing activities 236,204

Net increase (decrease) in cash and cash equivalents (4,125)

Cash and cash equivalents at beginning of year 4,558

Cash and cash equivalents at end of year 433

Reconciliation of operating income (loss) to net cash provided by (used for) operating activities:
Operating income (loss) (236,204)

Adjustments to reconcile operating income (loss) to net income provided by (used for) operating activities:
(Decrease) in accounts payable (4,125)

Net cash provided by (used for) operating activities $ (240,329)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
### Statement of Fiduciary Assets and Liabilities

**Agency Funds**  
**June 30, 2018**

#### Assets:
- Cash and investments (note 2) $2,664,225
- Due from others $1,461,485

**Total assets** $4,125,710

#### Liabilities:
- Accounts payable $386,402
- Deposits payable $3,739,308

**Total liabilities** $4,125,710

*The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.*
NOTE 1 – SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

The accounting policies of the City of Jurupa Valley (the “City”) conform to generally accepted accounting principles as applicable to governments. The Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) is the accepted standard-setting body for establishing governmental accounting and financial reporting principles.

A) Reporting Entity

The City was incorporated July 1, 2011, under the general laws of the State of California. The City operates under the Council-Manager form of government. The City provides the following services as authorized by its general laws: public safety, public works, community development and general administrative services. Generally accepted accounting principles require that these financial statements present the City and its component units, entities for which the City is considered to be financially accountable.

B) Basis of Presentation, Measurement Focus and Financial Statement Presentation

The basic financial statements of the City are composed of the following:

- Government-wide financial statements
- Fund financial statements
- Notes to the basic financial statements

Government-wide financial statements display information about the reporting government as a whole, except for its fiduciary activities. These statements include a single column for the governmental activities of the primary government. The City has no business-type activities. Eliminations have been made in the Statement of Activities so that certain allocated expenses are recorded only once (by the function to which they were allocated). However, general government expenses have not been allocated as indirect expenses to the various functions of the City.

Government-wide financial statements are presented using the economic resources measurement focus and the accrual basis of accounting. Under the economic resources measurement focus, all (both current and long-term) economic resources and obligations of the reporting government are reported in the government-wide financial statements. Basis of accounting refers to when revenues and expenses are recognized in the accounts and reported in the financial statements. Under the accrual basis of accounting, revenues, expenses, gains, losses, assets, and liabilities resulting from exchange and exchange-like transactions are recognized when the exchange takes place.

Program revenues include charges for services, special assessments, and payments made by parties outside of the reporting government’s citizenry if that money is restricted to a particular program. Program revenues are netted with program expenses in the Statement of Activities, to present the net cost of each program.

Amounts paid to acquire capital assets are capitalized as assets in the government-wide financial statements, rather than reported as an expenditure. Proceeds of long-term debt are recorded as a liability in the government-wide financial statements, rather than as another financing source. Amounts paid to reduce long-term indebtedness of the reporting government are reported as a reduction of the related liability, rather than as an expenditure.
NOTE 1 – REPORTING ENTITY AND SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES
(Continued)

B) Basis of Presentation, Measurement Focus and Financial Statement Presentation, (Continued)

Fund Financial Statements

The underlying accounting system of the City is organized and operated on the basis of separate funds, each of which is considered to be a separate accounting entity. The operations of each fund are accounted for with a separate set of self-balancing accounts that comprise its assets, liabilities, fund balances, revenues and expenditures or expenses, as appropriate. Governmental resources are allocated to and accounted for in individual funds based upon the purposes for which they are to be spent and the means by which spending activities are controlled.

Fund financial statements for the primary government’s governmental, proprietary, and fiduciary funds are presented after the government-wide financial statements. These statements display information about major funds individually and non-major funds in the aggregate for governmental funds. Proprietary statements include financial information for proprietary funds. Proprietary funds of the City represent operating revenues and expenses from providing services and producing and delivering goods in connection with a proprietary fund principal ongoing operations. Fiduciary statements include financial information for fiduciary funds. Fiduciary funds of the City primarily represent assets held by the City in a custodial capacity for other individuals or organizations.

Governmental Funds

In the fund financial statements, governmental funds are presented using the modified-accrual basis of accounting. Their revenues are recognized when they become measurable and available as net current assets. Measurable means that the amounts can be estimated, or otherwise determined. Available means that the amounts were collected during the reporting period or soon enough thereafter to be available to finance the expenditures accrued for the reporting period. The City uses an availability period of 90 days except for property taxes, which is 60 days.

Sales taxes, property taxes (including those in lieu of motor vehicle license fee), franchise taxes, gas taxes, transient occupancy taxes, grants and interest associated with the current fiscal period are all considered to be susceptible to accrual and so have been recognized as revenues of the current fiscal period to the extent normally collected within the availability period. Other revenue items are considered to be measurable and available where cash is received by the government.

Revenue recognition is subject to the measurable and availability criteria for the governmental funds in the fund financial statements. Exchange transactions are recognized as revenues in the period in which they are earned (i.e., the related goods or services are provided). Locally imposed derived tax revenues are recognized as revenues in the period in which the underlying exchange transaction upon which they are based takes place. Imposed non-exchange transactions are recognized as revenues in the period for which they were imposed. If the period of use is not specified, they are recognized as revenues when an enforceable legal claim to the revenues arises or when they are received, whichever occurs first. Government-mandated and voluntary non-exchange transactions are recognized as revenues when all applicable eligibility requirements have been met.
NOTE 1 – REPORTING ENTITY AND SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES
(Continued)

B) Basis of Presentation, Measurement Focus and Financial Statement Presentation, (Continued)

Governmental Funds, (Continued)

In the fund financial statements, governmental funds are presented using the current financial resources measurement focus. This means that only current assets and current liabilities are generally included on their balance sheets. The reported fund balance (net current assets) is considered to be a measure of “available spendable resources.” Governmental fund operating statements present increases (revenues and other financing sources) and decreases (expenditures and other financing uses) in net current assets. Accordingly, they are said to present a summary of sources and uses of “available spendable resources” during a period.

Non-current portions of long-term receivables due to governmental funds are reported on their balance sheets in spite of their spending measurement focus. However, special reporting treatments are used to indicate that they should not be considered “available spendable resources,” since they do not represent net current assets.

Recognition of governmental fund type revenue represented by non-current receivables are deferred until they become current receivables. Non-current portions of other long-term receivables are offset by fund balance reserve accounts. Because of their spending measurement focus, expenditure recognition for governmental fund types excludes amounts represented by non-current liabilities. Since they do not affect net current assets, such long-term amounts are not recognized as governmental fund type expenditures or fund liabilities. Amounts expended to acquire capital assets are recorded as expenditures in the year that resources were expended, rather than as fund assets. The proceeds of long-term debt are recorded as other financing sources rather than as a fund liability. Amounts paid to reduce long-term indebtedness are reported as fund expenditures.

Proprietary and Fiduciary Funds

The City’s internal service funds are proprietary funds. Agency funds are custodial in nature (assets equal liabilities) and do not involve the recording of the City revenues and expenses. In the fund financial statements, the proprietary funds and fiduciary funds are presented using the accrual basis of accounting. Revenues are recognized when they are earned and expenses are recognized when the related goods or services are delivered. In the fund financial statements, proprietary funds are presented using the economic resources measurement focus. This means that all assets and all liabilities (whether current or noncurrent) associated with their activity are included on their statements. Proprietary fund type operating statements present increases (revenues) and decreases (expenses) in total net position.

Proprietary fund operating revenues, such as charges for services, result from exchange transactions associated with the principal activity of the fund. Exchange transactions are those in which each party receives and gives up essentially equal values. Non-operating revenues, such as subsidies, taxes, and investment earnings result from non-exchange transactions or ancillary activities. Amounts paid to acquire capital assets are capitalized as assets in the proprietary fund financial statements, rather than reported as an expense. Proceeds of long-term debt are recorded as a liability in the proprietary fund financial statements, rather than as another financing source. Amounts paid to reduce long-term indebtedness of the proprietary fund are reported as a reduction of the related liability, rather than as an expense.
NOTE 1 – REPORTING ENTITY AND SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES (Continued)

C) Fund Classifications

The City reports the following major governmental funds:

**General Fund** - The General Fund is the general operating fund of the City. It is used to account for all financial resources except those required to be accounted for in another fund.

**Gas Tax Special Revenue Fund** - To account for revenue received for gasoline taxes under Sections 2105, 2106, 2107, 2107.5, and 2032(h)(2) of the Street and Highway Code to be used solely for transportation related purposes.

**Measure A Special Revenue Fund** - To account for revenue received from the State of California from a special ½% sales tax to be used for street maintenance and improvements only. In addition, to account for the related principal and interest payments for the 2016 COP’s.

**Development Impact Fees Capital Projects Fund** - This fund is used to account for the receipt of fees for development related activities such as infrastructure and public facilities.

**Measure A Certificate of Participation (COP) Series 2016 Capital Projects Fund** - This fund is used to account for the construction of all capital projects that utilize the resources from the Certificate of Participation Series 2016.

The City’s fund structure also includes the following fund type:

**Nonmajor Special Revenue Funds** - These funds are used to account for the proceeds of specific revenue sources that are legally restricted or committed to expenditures for specified purposes.

**Nonmajor Capital Projects Funds** – These funds are used to account for financial resources used for the acquisition or construction of major capital facilities.

**Internal Service Funds** - These funds are used to account for self-funded insurance and information services activities.

**Agency Funds** - To account for development deposits made in conjunction with certain building, planning, and engineering permits issued. Upon satisfactory completion of the project, any unused deposit is returned to the depositor.

D) Cash and Investments

Investments are reported in the accompanying statement of net position at fair value. Changes in fair value that occur during a fiscal year are recognized as investment income reported for that fiscal year. Investment income includes interest earnings and changes in fair value. The City pools cash and investments of all funds. Each fund’s share in this pool is displayed in the accompanying financial statements as cash and investments. Investment income earned by the pooled investments is allocated to the various funds based on each fund’s average cash and investment balance, except for investment income associated with funds not legally required to receive pooled investment income which has been assigned to and recorded as revenue of the General Fund, as provided by California Government Code Section 53647. For purposes of the statement of cash flows of the proprietary fund types, cash and cash equivalents include all investments, as the City operates an internal cash pool that maintains the general characteristics of a demand deposit account.
NOTE 1 – REPORTING ENTITY AND SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES (Continued)

E) Capital Assets

Capital assets (including infrastructure) are recorded at cost where historical records are available and at an estimated historical cost where no historical records exist. Contributed capital assets are valued at their acquisition value at the date of the contribution. Generally, capital asset purchases in excess of $5,000 are capitalized if they have an expected useful life of three years or more (one year for furniture and equipment, and five years for infrastructure). Capital assets include public domain general capital assets (infrastructure) consisting of certain improvements including roads, streets, sidewalks, medians, and storm drains.

Capital assets used in operations are depreciated over their estimated useful lives. The City uses the straight-line method in the government-wide financial statements. Depreciation is charged as an expense against operations and accumulated depreciation is reported on the statement of net position. The range of lives used for depreciation purposes for each capital-asset class are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Useful Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>20-100 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold Improvements</td>
<td>5-20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Improvements</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F) Fair Value Measurements

Certain assets and liabilities are required to be reported at fair value. The fair value framework provides a hierarchy that prioritizes the inputs to valuation techniques used to measure fair value. The hierarchy gives the highest priority to unadjusted quoted prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities (Level 1 measurements) and the lowest priority to unobservable inputs (Level 3 measurements). The three levels of fair value hierarchy are as follows:

Level 1 - Inputs to the valuation methodology are unadjusted quoted prices for identical assets or liabilities in active markets.

Level 2 - Inputs other than quoted prices included within Level 1 that are observable for the asset or liability, either directly or indirectly and fair value is determined through the use of models or other valuation methodologies including:

- Quoted prices for similar assets or liabilities in active markets;
- Quoted prices for identical or similar assets or liabilities in markets that are inactive; inputs other than quoted prices that are observable for the asset or liability;
- Inputs that are derived principally from or corroborated by observable market data by correlation or other means.

Level 3 - Inputs to the valuation methodology are unobservable and significant to the fair value measurement. These unobservable inputs reflect the City’s own assumptions about the inputs market participants would use in pricing the asset or liability (including assumptions about risk). These unobservable inputs are developed based on the best information available in the circumstances and may include the City’s own data.
G) Property Taxes

Under California law, property taxes are assessed and collected by the counties up to 1% of assessed value, plus other increases approved by the voters. The property taxes go into a pool, and are then allocated to the cities based on complex formulas.

Accordingly, the City accrues only those taxes that are received within 60 days after year-end. Property taxes are attached as a lien on property as of March 1. Taxes are levied on July 1 and are payable in two installments on December 10 and April 10.

H) Fund Equity

Fund balances are reported in the fund statements in the following classifications:

- **Nonspendable** – Items that cannot be spent because they are either not spendable in form (such as prepaid or inventory) or items that are legally or contractually required to be maintained intact (such as endowments).

- **Restricted** – Items subject to externally enforceable legal restrictions. This includes externally imposed restrictions by creditors, such as through debt covenants, grantors, contributors, laws or regulations of other governments, as well as restrictions imposed by law through constitutional provisions or enabling legislation.

- **Committed** – Items which are constrained by limitations that the government imposes upon itself at its highest level of decision-making. To be reported as committed, amounts cannot be used for any other purpose unless the government takes the same highest level action to remove or change the constraint. The City Council establishes (and modifies or rescinds) fund balance commitments by passage of a resolution.

- **Assigned** – Amounts that are designated or expressed by the City Council, but does not require a formal action like a resolution. The City Council may delegate the authority, but such delegation of authority has not yet been granted to persons or bodies other than City Council.

- **Unassigned** – The excess remaining amounts in the General Fund and the residual deficit of all other governmental funds, which have not been restricted, committed, or assigned to specific purposes.

It is the City’s policy that restricted resources will be applied first, followed by (in order of application) committed, assigned, and unassigned resources, in the absence of a formal policy adopted by the Council.

I) Net Position

In the governmental-wide financial statements and proprietary fund financial statements, net position is classified as follows:

- **Net Investment in Capital Assets** – This amount consists of capital assets net of accumulated depreciation and reduced by outstanding debt that is attributed to the acquisition, construction, or improvement of the assets.
NOTE 1 – REPORTING ENTITY AND SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES
(Continued)

I) Net Position (Continued)

Restricted Net Position – This amount is restricted by external creditors, grantors, contributors, or laws or regulations of other governments. As of June 30, 2018, $11,016,813 of net position is restricted by enabling legislation.

Unrestricted Net Position – This amount is all net position that do not meet the definition of “net investment in capital assets” or “restricted net position.”

Sometimes the City will fund outlays for a particular purpose from both restricted (e.g., restricted bond or grant proceeds) and unrestricted resources. In order to calculate the amounts to report as restricted – net position and unrestricted – net position in the government-wide and proprietary fund financial statements, a flow assumption must be made about the order in which the resources are considered to be applied. It is the government’s policy to consider restricted – net position to have been depleted before unrestricted – net position is applied.

J) Deferred Outflows and Deferred Inflows of Resources

When applicable, the statement of net position and balance sheet will report a separate section for deferred outflows of resources. Deferred outflows of resources represent outflows of resources (consumption of net position) that apply to future periods and therefore, are not recognized as an expense or expenditure until that time.

When applicable, the statement of net position and the balance sheet will report a separate section for deferred inflows of resources. Deferred inflows of resources represent inflows of resources (acquisition of net position) that apply to future periods and therefore, are not recognized as an inflow of resources (revenue) until that time. The City has one item that qualifies for reporting in this category. The governmental funds report unavailable revenues for certain revenue sources not received during the availability period.

K) Compensated Absences

It is the City’s policy to permit employees to accumulate earned but unused vacation (compensated absences). For governmental activities, this accumulation is recorded as an expense and liability in the fiscal year earned. For the governmental funds, the amount of accumulated unpaid vacation, which is payable from available resources, is recorded as liability of the fund when it has matured (i.e. when due and payable).

L) Use of Estimates

The preparation of basic financial statements in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenue and expense/expenditures during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.
M) New GASB Pronouncements

Effective in Future Years

GASB Statement No. 83 – In November 2016, GASB issued Statement No. 83, *Certain Asset Retirement Obligations*. This Statement addresses accounting and financial reporting for certain asset retirement obligations (AROs). An ARO is a legally enforceable liability associated with the retirement of a tangible capital asset. A government that has legal obligations to perform future asset retirement activities related to its tangible capital asset should recognize a liability based on the guidance in this Statement. This Statement also requires disclosure of information about the nature of a government’s ARO, the methods and assumptions used for the estimates of the liabilities, and the estimated remaining useful life of the associated tangible capital assets. The requirements of this Statement are effective for reporting periods beginning after June 15, 2018, or the 2018-2019 fiscal year. The City has not determined the effect of the Statement.

GASB Statement No. 84 – In January 2017, GASB issued Statement No. 84, *Fiduciary Activities*. The objective of this Statement is to improve guidance regarding the identification of fiduciary activities for accounting and financial reporting purposes and how those activities should be reported. The requirements of this Statement are effective for reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2018, or the 2019-2020 fiscal year. The City has not determined the effect of this Statement.

GASB Statement No. 87 – In June 2017, GASB issued Statement No. 87, *Leases*. The objective of this Statement is to better meet the information needs of financial statement users by improving accounting and financial reporting for leases by governments. This Statement increases the usefulness of governments’ financial statements by requiring recognition of certain lease assets and liabilities for leases that previously were classified as operating leases and recognized as inflows of resources or outflows of resources based on the payment provisions of the contract. It establishes a single model for lease accounting based on the foundational principle that leases are financings of the right to use an underlying asset. Under this Statement, a lessee is required to recognize a lease liability and an intangible right-to-use lease asset, and a lessor is required to recognize a lease receivable and a deferred inflow of resources, thereby enhancing the relevance and consistency of information about governments’ leasing activities. The Statement is effective for the reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2019, or 2020-2021 fiscal year. The City has not determined the effect of the Statement.

GASB Statement No. 88 – In April 2018, GASB issued Statement No. 88, *Certain Disclosures Related to Debt, including Direct Borrowings and Direct Placements*. The objective of this Statement is to improve the information that is disclosed in notes to government financial statements related to debt, including direct borrowings and direct placements. It also clarifies which liabilities governments should include when disclosing information related to debt. The Statement is effective for the reporting periods beginning after June 15, 2018, or 2018-2019 fiscal year. The City has not determined the effect of the Statement.

GASB Statement No. 89 – In June 2018, the GASB issued Statement No. 89, *Accounting for Interest Cost Incurred Before the End of a Construction Period*. The objectives of this Statement are (a) to enhance the relevance and comparability of information about capital assets and the cost of borrowing for a reporting period and (b) to simplify accounting for certain interest costs. This Statement is effective for reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2019, or 2020-2021 fiscal year. The City has not determined the effect of the Statement.
NOTE 1 – REPORTING ENTITY AND SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES
(Continued)

M) New GASB Pronouncements (Continued)

Effective in Future Years (Continued)

GASB Statement No. 90 – In September 2018, the GASB issued Statement No. 90, Majority Equity Interests, an amendment of GASB Statements No. 14 and No. 61. The objectives of this Statement are to improve the consistency and comparability of reporting a government’s majority equity interest in a legally separate organization and to improve the relevance of financial statement information for certain component units. The Statement is effective for reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2018, or 2019-2020 fiscal year. The City has not determined the effect of the Statement.

NOTE 2 – CASH AND INVESTMENTS

Cash and investments as of June 30, 2018, are classified in the accompanying financial statements as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Net Position</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and investments</td>
<td>$20,120,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and investments - restricted</td>
<td>2,184,443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiduciary Funds</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and investments</td>
<td>2,664,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash and Investments</td>
<td>$24,968,783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cash and investments as of June 30, 2018, consist of the following:

| Cash on hand (petty cash)                          | 434   |
| Deposits with financial institutions               | 14,527,390 |
| Investments                                       | 8,256,516 |
| Restricted - Money Market Funds                    | 2,184,443 |
| Total Cash and Investments                         | $24,968,783 |
**NOTE 2 – CASH AND INVESTMENTS (Continued)**

Investments Authorized by the California Government Code and the City’s Investment Policy

The following table identifies the investment types that are authorized for the City by the California Government Code or the City’s Investment Policy, where more restrictive. The table also identifies certain provisions of the California Government Code or the City’s Investment Policy, where more restrictive that address interest rate risk and concentration of credit risk. For bond proceeds or restricted cash and investments, the trustee holds money market mutual funds in accordance with the provision of the debt agreements of the City, rather than the general provisions of California Government Code or the City’s Investment Policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Types Authorized by State Law</th>
<th><strong>Maximum Maturity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Maximum Percentage of Portfolio</strong></th>
<th><strong>Maximum Investment In One Issuer</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Treasury Obligations</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Agency Securities</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiable Certificates of Deposit</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market Funds</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$65,000,000</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on state law requirements or investment policy requirements, whichever is more restrictive.

**No more than 1/3 in excess of 2 years to maturity.
NOTE 2 – CASH AND INVESTMENTS (Continued)

Disclosures Relating to Interest Rate Risk

Interest rate risk is the risk that changes in market interest rates will adversely affect the fair value of an investment. Generally, the longer the maturity of an investment the greater the sensitivity of its fair value to changes in market interest rates.

Information about the sensitivity of the fair values of the City’s investments to market interest rate fluctuations is provided by the following table that shows the distribution of the City’s investments by maturity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>12 Months Or Less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund</td>
<td>$ 8,256,516</td>
<td>$ 8,256,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held by bond trustee:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money market funds</td>
<td>$2,184,443</td>
<td>$2,184,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$10,440,959</td>
<td>$10,440,959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disclosures Relating to Credit Risk

Generally, credit risk is the risk that an issuer of an investment will not fulfill its obligation to the holder of the investment. This is measured by the assignment of a rating by a nationally recognized statistical rating organization. Presented below is the minimum rating required by (where applicable) the California Government Code, the City’s Investment Policy, or debt agreements, and the Standard and Poor’s actual rating as of year-end for each investment type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Minimum Legal Rating</th>
<th>Rating as of Year End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund</td>
<td>$8,256,516</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>AAA $ - $ 8,256,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held by bond trustee:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money market funds</td>
<td>$2,184,443</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>2,184,443 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$10,440,959</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,184,443 $ 8,256,516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE 2 – CASH AND INVESTMENTS (Continued)

Custodial Credit Risk

Custodial credit risk for deposits is the risk that, in the event of the failure of a depository financial institution, a government will not be able to recover its deposits or will not be able to recover collateral securities that are in the possession of an outside party. The custodial credit risk for investments is the risk that, in the event of the failure of the counterparty (e.g., broker-dealer) to a transaction, a government will not be able to recover the value of its investment or collateral securities that are in the possession of another party. The California Government Code and the City’s investment policy do not contain legal or policy requirements that would limit the exposure to custodial credit risk for deposits or investments, other than the following provision for deposits: The California Government Code requires that a financial institution secure deposits made by state or local governmental units by pledging securities in an undivided collateral pool held by a depository regulated under state law (unless so waived by the governmental unit). The market value of the pledged securities in the collateral pool must equal at least 110% of the total amount deposited by the public agencies. California law also allows financial institutions to secure City deposits by pledging first trust deed mortgage notes having a value of 150% of the secured public deposits. Of the City’s deposits with financial institutions, $17,385,389 was in excess of federal depository insurance limits. This amount is collateralized pursuant to California Government Code.

Fair Value Measurements

Fair value measurements are categorized based on valuation inputs used to measure the fair value of the asset. Level 1 inputs are quoted prices in active markets for identical assets; Level 2 inputs are significant other observable inputs, including matrix pricing models; Level 3 inputs are significant unobservable inputs. Investments in LAIF are uncategorized as deposits and withdrawals are made on the basis of $1 and not fair value. Money market mutual funds are valued at net asset value $1 dollar per share (amortized cost) and as such are uncategorized in the fair value hierarchy. Balances as of June 30, 2018 are as follows:

Uncategorized Investments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund</td>
<td>8,256,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held by bond trustee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market Funds (amortized cost)</td>
<td>2,184,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investment Portfolio</strong></td>
<td>$10,440,959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investment in State Investment Pool

The City is a voluntary participant in the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) that is regulated by the California Government Code Section 16429 under the oversight of the Treasurer of the State of California. The fair value of the City’s investment in this pool is reported in the accompanying financial statements at an amount based upon the City’s pro-rata share of the fair value provided by LAIF for the entire LAIF portfolio (in relation to the amortized cost of that portfolio). The balance is available for withdrawal on demand based on the accounting records maintained by LAIF, which are recorded on an amortized cost basis. LAIF is not registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission and is not rated.
NOTE 3 – INTERFUND TRANSACTIONS

Interfund transfers for the year ended June 30, 2018, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfers In:</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Measure A</th>
<th>Developer Impact Fees</th>
<th>Non-major governmental funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General fund</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$125,208</td>
<td>$401,581</td>
<td>$920,367</td>
<td>$1,447,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>539,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Impact Fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,625</td>
<td>25,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A COP Series 2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>409,728</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>409,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-major governmental funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66,481</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal service funds</td>
<td>236,204</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>236,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$236,204</td>
<td>$534,936</td>
<td>$1,007,787</td>
<td>$945,992</td>
<td>$2,724,919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interfund transfers from the General Fund to the Internal Service Funds were to close out the Internal Service Funds at year-end.

The interfund transfer from Measure A to the General Fund was to cover administrative expenses.

The interfund transfers from the Developer Impact Fees fund of $1,007,787 to the General Fund, Measure A fund, and non-major governmental funds were for contributions to various capital projects.

The interfund transfer from the Measure A to Measure A COP Series 2016 Fund of $409,728 was to reimburse the Measure A COP Series 2016 for costs incurred in fund during previous year for debt service.

The interfund transfer from non-major governmental funds to the Developer Impact Fees fund of $25,625 was to reimburse the Developer Impact Fees fund for costs incurred during the previous year.

The interfund transfers from non-major governmental funds to the General fund of $920,367 were for costs covered by grants for safety ($283,349), community development ($16,271), administrative expense recognition for Landscape and Lighting Maintenance Districts Fund and Community Facilities District Fund ($131,087), and for portions of the Riverside Drive capital project ($489,660).

Due From/Due To Other Funds

The composition of interfund balances at June 30, 2018 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Due to Other Funds:</th>
<th>Due From Other Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure A COP Series 2016</td>
<td>$1,459,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmajor Governmental Funds</td>
<td>422,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,882,275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interfund balances reflected above represent short-term borrowings of cash pending receipt of reimbursements.
NOTE 3 – INTERFUND TRANSACTIONS (Continued)

Advances From/To Other Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure A</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advances From Other Funds</td>
<td>$ 367,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances to Other Funds</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In December 2017, the General Fund advanced the Measure A Fund $1,167,000 to fund the Widening of Limonite Avenue between Etiwanda and Bain Street. In June 2018, the Measure A fund repaid $800,000 to the General Fund leaving a balance of $367,000 as of June 30, 2018.

NOTE 4 – CAPITAL ASSETS

Capital asset activity for the year ended June 30, 2018, was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governmental Activities:</th>
<th>Beginning Balance</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Deletions</th>
<th>Ending Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets not being depreciated:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>$161,760</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$226,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction in progress</td>
<td>8,848,568</td>
<td>4,521,862</td>
<td>(7,569,993)</td>
<td>5,800,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total capital assets not being depreciated</td>
<td>9,010,328</td>
<td>4,586,862</td>
<td>(7,569,993)</td>
<td>6,027,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets being depreciated:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>38,732,842</td>
<td>10,265,686</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48,998,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and Improvements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,577,450</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,577,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold improvements</td>
<td>506,187</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>506,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and equipment</td>
<td>78,932</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Improvements</td>
<td>40,510</td>
<td>18,853</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>547,751</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>547,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total capital assets being depreciated</td>
<td>39,906,222</td>
<td>11,861,989</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51,768,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less accumulated depreciation for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>(15,456,884)</td>
<td>(3,262,121)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(18,719,005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and Improvements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(29,671)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(29,671)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold improvements</td>
<td>(61,780)</td>
<td>(25,309)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(87,089)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and equipment</td>
<td>(28,190)</td>
<td>(11,276)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(39,466)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land improvements</td>
<td>(1,350)</td>
<td>(3,329)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(4,679)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>(102,221)</td>
<td>(78,250)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(180,471)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total accumulated depreciation</td>
<td>(15,650,425)</td>
<td>(3,409,956)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(19,060,381)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total capital assets being depreciated, net</td>
<td>24,255,797</td>
<td>8,452,033</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,707,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total capital assets net of accumulated depreciation</td>
<td>$33,266,125</td>
<td>$13,038,895</td>
<td>(7,569,993)</td>
<td>$38,735,027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Depreciation expense in the amount of $3,409,956 was charged to Public Works.
NOTE 4 – CAPITAL ASSETS (Continued)

Construction Commitments

The City had active construction projects as of June 30, 2018. The following table identifies the largest remaining commitments on projects as of June 30, 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Contract Amount</th>
<th>Remaining Commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Pavement Rehabilitation - Phase 4</td>
<td>$1,395,000</td>
<td>$33,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Dr Pavement Rehabilitation</td>
<td>129,265</td>
<td>99,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limonite Traffic Signal Project</td>
<td>136,144</td>
<td>67,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedley Road Improvements</td>
<td>141,535</td>
<td>67,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Pavement Rehabilitation - Management</td>
<td>63,995</td>
<td>63,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slurry Seal</td>
<td>513,665</td>
<td>46,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Dr. Pavement Rehabilitation Wineville to Etiwanda</td>
<td>$1,325,595</td>
<td>$1,015,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limonite Widening, Baker to Pedley</td>
<td>38,481</td>
<td>20,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley High School - safe routes</td>
<td>98,260</td>
<td>2,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa/Galena Modification</td>
<td>34,067</td>
<td>2,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,876,007</td>
<td>$1,420,303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE 5 – RISK MANAGEMENT

The City is a member of the Public Entity Risk Management Authority (PERMA), a joint powers insurance authority formed under Section 990 of the California Government Code for the purpose of jointly funding programs of insurance coverage for its members. PERMA is comprised of thirty-two participating agencies, twenty-two cities, four transit agencies and six special districts. The City participates in the liability, property, auto physical damage, crime, and cyber liability insurance programs of PERMA.

The liability program provides coverage up to $50 million per occurrence for personal injury, bodily injury, property damage and public officials’ errors and omissions. The City has selected a $0 self-insured retention for this coverage and participates in risk sharing pools for losses up to $1 million, followed by PERMA’s membership in the CSAC Excess Insurance Authority (EIA) for $49 million of excess liability coverage. The property insurance program is group purchased under a master property insurance policy with accumulated values from all participants effecting lower rates and broader coverage for members. The program covers real property, business personal property, inland mariner coverage for special mobile equipment and business interruption. Commercial property coverage is written on a replacement cost basis and all risk, eliminating the traditional commercial “named peril” policy. Property coverage is limited to $100 million ($2.5 million for flood), with deductibles of $5,000 per occurrence except $100,000 for flood and 24 hour service interruption.

The auto physical damage insurance program is also group purchased under a master insurance policy with accumulated values from all participants effecting lower rates for members. Auto physical damage coverage is provided up to $100 million, with self-insured retention limits of $2,500 for all vehicles. The crime insurance program provides public employee dishonesty, forgery or alteration, and computer fraud coverage under a master insurance policy up to $5 million, with a $2,500 deductible per occurrence. For cyber liability, the City is covered up to $2 million, with a $50,000 deductible per claim. The City is insured with the State Compensation Insurance Fund for workers’ compensation claims. There is no deductible requirement for this coverage.
NOTE 6 – CONTINGENT LIABILITIES

Various claims and suits have been filed against the City in the normal course of business. Although the outcome of these matters is not presently determinable in the opinion of legal counsel, the resolutions of these matters will not have a material adverse effect on the financial condition of the City.

NOTE 7 – REVENUE NEUTRALITY PAYMENT COMMITMENTS

As part of the formation of the City, the County of Riverside (“County”) and City entered into a revenue neutrality agreement to be paid to the County annually. Upon reaching property and sales taxes of at least $15,840,000 the City is required to pay a percentage of such property and sales taxes to the County at escalating rates in accordance with the terms of the agreement.

During the fiscal year-ended June 30, 2015, the Governor signed SB 107 to provide a one-time funding to the County in exchange for the County retiring approximately $21 million in first year service cost reimbursements, deferred revenue neutrality payments and deferred sheriff payments, which included a portion of the amounts above. Under the Revenue Neutrality Agreement, the City shall continue to pay the County each year a portion of its tax revenues as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Property and Sales Taxes in excess of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16% of total</td>
<td>$15,840,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% of total</td>
<td>$16,880,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22% of total</td>
<td>$17,940,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24% of total</td>
<td>$19,030,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per the agreement, section 3.1.9, the City shall pay the County the total annual amount owed no later than 60 days following the end of the City’s fiscal year. At June 30, 2018, the City reported Due to other Governments of $3,719,329 to accrue for payments of $57,100 for amounts due for FY 2016-17 and $3,662,219 as estimated amounts due for FY 2017-18 under the agreement.

NOTE 8 – EXCESS OF EXPENDITURES OVER APPROPRIATIONS

Expenditures for the year ended June 30, 2018, exceeded appropriations in the following funds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Excess Over Appropriations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$ 35,492,216</td>
<td>$ 37,084,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Major Funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS Grant Fund</td>
<td>159,000</td>
<td>283,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Transportation Program (ATP) Grant Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management Performance Grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities Districts</td>
<td>164,373</td>
<td>192,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape &amp; Lighting Maintenance Districts Fund</td>
<td>1,020,606</td>
<td>1,042,286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE 9 – LONG TERM LIABILITIES

The following is a summary of long-term liabilities of the City for the year ended June 30, 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificates of Participation:</th>
<th>Beginning Balance</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Deletions</th>
<th>Ending Balance</th>
<th>Due within one year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Series 2016</td>
<td>$ 7,895,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ (150,000)</td>
<td>$ 7,745,000</td>
<td>$ 745,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus deferred amount for issuance premium</td>
<td>1,098,761</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ (189,929)</td>
<td>908,832</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Certificates of Participation</td>
<td>8,993,761</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ (339,929)</td>
<td>8,653,832</td>
<td>745,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensated absences</td>
<td>71,388</td>
<td>92,947</td>
<td>(100,919)</td>
<td>63,416</td>
<td>57,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 9,065,149</td>
<td>$ 92,947</td>
<td>$ (440,848)</td>
<td>$ 8,717,248</td>
<td>$ 802,455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certificates of Participation Series 2016

In October 2016, pursuant to an Installment Sales Agreement (Agreement) between the City and the California Municipal Finance Authority (Authority) for the Local Measure A Sales Tax Revenue (Installment Sale) Certificate of Participation, Series 2016 (Jurupa Valley Pavement Rehabilitation Project), the Authority issued $8,165,000 of Certificates of Participation Series 2016, the proceeds of which were used to (i) finance the design, acquisition, and construction of certain local roadway improvements and street resurfacing projects within the jurisdiction of the City, (ii) fund a reserve fund for the certificates, and (iii) pay the costs incurred in connection with the execution, sale, and delivery of the Certificates.

Measure A revenues are the sole source of repayment. Payments remitted by the City to the Authority will in turn be remitted to owners of the Certificates of Participation, with principal amounts due annually each June 1, commencing June 1, 2017. The Certificates bear interest rates of 2 percent to 5 percent, and interest is payable semi-annually on December 1 and June 1, beginning on December 1, 2016.

The certificates maturing on June 1, 2027 are subject to optional prepayment prior to maturity after June 1, 2026. The Certificates are subject to mandatory prepayment prior to maturity, in whole or in part, on any date, from amounts received upon the acceleration of Installment Sale Payments upon the occurrence of any event of default under the 2016 Agreement, at a prepayment price equal to the principal amount to be prepaid, plus accrued interest to the date fixed for prepayment, without premium.

For the current year, principal and interest paid on the bonds was $150,000 and $343,292, respectively. The outstanding balance on the bonds was $7,745,000 as of June 30, 2018. The Measure A revenues were $2,517,367 for the year ended June 30, 2018.
NOTE 9 – LONG TERM LIABILITIES (Continued)

The annual debt service requirements on these bonds are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$745,000</td>
<td>$314,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>765,000</td>
<td>292,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>790,000</td>
<td>269,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>820,000</td>
<td>237,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>855,000</td>
<td>205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024-2027</td>
<td>3,770,000</td>
<td>464,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$7,745,000</td>
<td>$1,783,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City is required to maintain a Reserve Fund in the amount equal to the least of: 10% of the initial stated principal amount of the Certificates of Participation, Series 2016, 125% of the average annual installment sales payments, or the maximum annual debt service. The City has satisfied the reserve requirement through purchase of a surety bond, as allowed by the debt agreement.

Compensated Absences

The City’s liability for accrued and unpaid compensated absences in the governmental activities totaled $63,416 at June 30, 2018. The compensated absences are liquidated through the General Fund.

NOTE 10 – ACCUMULATED FUND DEFICITS

The following individual funds reported deficit fund balances as of June 30, 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Major Funds:</th>
<th>Deficit Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grant</td>
<td>$ (303,343)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUMF Grant</td>
<td>(80,752)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Initiative Grant</td>
<td>(48,737)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City plans to eliminate the deficits in each fund with intergovernmental receivables to be collected in future periods.
NOTE 11 FUND BALANCES

The following table summarizes the fund balance of the governmental funds as of June 30, 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Governmental Funds</th>
<th>Capital Developer Measure A</th>
<th>Nonmajor Funds</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>Measure A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works</td>
<td></td>
<td>342,837</td>
<td>120,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td>342,837</td>
<td>120,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td>4,790,657</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fund Balance</td>
<td>4,790,657</td>
<td>342,837</td>
<td>120,197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUIRED SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION
## Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance – Budget and Actual
Year Ended June 30, 2018

### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budgeted Amounts</th>
<th>Actual Amounts</th>
<th>Variance with Final Budget - Positive Amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxes</strong></td>
<td>27,512,136</td>
<td>27,512,136</td>
<td>$ 28,135,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses, fees and permits</td>
<td>1,821,000</td>
<td>1,821,000</td>
<td>$ 1,645,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>43,800</td>
<td>43,800</td>
<td>161,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for services</td>
<td>4,507,500</td>
<td>4,507,500</td>
<td>4,017,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines and forfeitures</td>
<td>501,500</td>
<td>501,500</td>
<td>574,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>53,400</td>
<td>53,400</td>
<td>53,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>93,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>434,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td>34,539,336</td>
<td>34,539,336</td>
<td>35,114,239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budgeted Amounts</th>
<th>Actual Amounts</th>
<th>Variance with Final Budget - Positive Amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General government</td>
<td>6,162,819</td>
<td>7,737,819</td>
<td>9,946,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>3,992,095</td>
<td>3,992,095</td>
<td>3,911,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works</td>
<td>3,448,868</td>
<td>3,448,868</td>
<td>3,516,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td>20,049,294</td>
<td>20,049,294</td>
<td>19,474,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditures</strong></td>
<td>33,653,076</td>
<td>35,228,076</td>
<td>36,848,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess (deficiency) of revenues over (under) expenditures</td>
<td>886,260</td>
<td>(688,740)</td>
<td>(1,734,428)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other financing sources (uses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budgeted Amounts</th>
<th>Actual Amounts</th>
<th>Variance with Final Budget - Positive Amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers in</td>
<td>171,243</td>
<td>171,243</td>
<td>1,447,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers out</td>
<td>(264,140)</td>
<td>(264,140)</td>
<td>(236,204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total other financing sources (uses)</strong></td>
<td>(92,897)</td>
<td>(92,897)</td>
<td>1,210,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net change in fund balance</td>
<td>793,363</td>
<td>(781,637)</td>
<td>(523,476)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance, beginning of year</td>
<td>5,314,133</td>
<td>5,314,133</td>
<td>5,314,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund balance, end of year</strong></td>
<td>$ 6,107,496</td>
<td>$ 4,532,496</td>
<td>$ 4,790,657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompany Notes to the Required Supplementary Information.
## Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance – Budget and Actual

### Year Ended June 30, 2018

See accompany Notes to the Required Supplementary Information.
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA  
Major Special Revenue Fund  
Measure A Fund  
Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance – Budget and Actual  
Year Ended June 30, 2018  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Budgeted Amounts</th>
<th>Actual Amounts</th>
<th>Variance with Final Budget - Positive (Negative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>$1,896,000</td>
<td>$1,896,000</td>
<td>$2,517,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>146,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenues</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>2,665,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works</td>
<td>510,800</td>
<td>1,765,993</td>
<td>1,632,970</td>
<td>133,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal retirement</td>
<td>1,634,700</td>
<td>1,634,700</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>1,484,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and fiscal charges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>317,264</td>
<td>(317,264)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditures</td>
<td>2,145,500</td>
<td>3,400,693</td>
<td>2,100,234</td>
<td>1,300,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess (deficiency) of revenues over (under) expenditures</td>
<td>(245,500)</td>
<td>(1,500,693)</td>
<td>565,657</td>
<td>2,066,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Other financing sources (uses) |                      |                |                                |                                |
| Transfers in                  | -                  | -              | 539,725                        | 539,725                        |
| Transfers out                 | (17,700)          | (17,700)       | (534,936)                      | (517,236)                      |
| Total other financing sources (uses) | (17,700) | (17,700)       | 4,789                          | 22,489                         |
| Net change in fund balance    | (263,200)         | (1,518,393)    | 570,446                        | 2,088,839                      |
| Fund balance, beginning of year | (450,249)       | (450,249)      | (450,249)                      | -                              |
| Fund balance, end of year     | $ (713,449)       | $ (1,968,642)  | $120,197                       | $2,088,839                     |

See accompany Notes to the Required Supplementary Information.
Budgetary Accounting

The City Manager shall prepare and submit the proposed annual budget to the City Council for its approval for the General Fund, Gas Tax fund, Measure A funds, and other restricted revenues, which includes AQMD, CDBG, COPS, ATP Grant, EMP Grant, Community Facilities Districts, and Landscape and Lighting Maintenance Districts funds. The agenda for the budget workshops and budget meetings are noted in accordance with the Brown Act. After reviewing the same and making such revisions as it may deem advisable and public input, the budget is then adopted annually by the Council at a regularly held meeting. The budget is adopted prior to the beginning of the fiscal year and serves as the foundation for the City’s financial plan.

The level of budgetary control (the level at which expenditures cannot legally exceed the appropriated amount) is established at the fund level. Transfers of appropriations between department budgets can be made with the City Manager/Director of Administrative Services approval. City Council’s approval is required for all budget amendments that result in a change to the adopted budget of the fund.

Budgets are prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles using the modified accrual basis of accounting.

Appropriations lapse at the end of the fiscal year unless they are re-appropriated through the formal budget process. Open encumbrances will be paid by subsequent year’s budget appropriations. Encumbrances do not constitute expenditures or liabilities of the City.

Budgeted amounts are as originally adopted, or as amended in accordance with prescribed procedures throughout the fiscal year.

The following major funds had expenditures in excess of appropriations for the year ended June 30, 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Final Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Excess Over Appropriations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$ 35,492,216</td>
<td>$ 37,084,871</td>
<td>$ (1,592,655)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following funds do not have a legally adopted budget for the year ended June 30, 2018:

- TUMF Grant Special Revenue Fund
- CalRecycle Grant Special Revenue Fund
- Beyond Initiative Grant Special Revenue Fund
- TDA Article 3 Special Revenue Fund
- Surface Transportation Grant Special Revenue Fund
- All Capital Projects Funds
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA
Nonmajor Governmental Funds
June 30, 2018

NON-MAJOR SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS

Air Quality Improvement District (AQMD) Fund
To account for the City’s share of vehicle registration fees that the State of California has allocated to address air quality concerns in Southern California. These monies are to be used in air quality maintenance programs locally and/or regionally.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Fund
To account for receipt and disbursement of the Community Development Block Grant Program of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development Program. Accountability follows the guidelines of Office Management and Budget Circulars A102 and A87.

COPS Fund
To account for revenue received from the State of California for front line public safety purposes.

TUMF Grant Fund
To account for revenues and expenditures associated with the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) Program’s agreement to reimburse a portion of the improvements to Limonite Avenue.

Alternative Transportation Program (ATP) Grant Fund
To account for revenues and expenditures related to alternative transportation capital projects, specifically sidewalks on Troth Street and Pyrite Street that are partially funded by the State of California ATP grant.

Emergency Management Performance (EMP) Grant Fund
To account for revenues and expenditures associated with the Emergency Management Performance Grant that are utilized to support the building, sustainment, and delivery of core capabilities essential to achieving security and resilience at the City.

CalRecycle Grant Fund
To account for revenues and expenditures associated with the various CalRecycle Grants received from the State of California for use by local governments. The City was granted funds to construct pavement projects using rubberized pavement, to assist in the removal and disposal of materials illegally dumped in the public right of way, to enhance public outreach and education, and to incorporate preventative security measures.

Beyond Initiative Grant Fund
To account for revenue and expenditures associated with the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) grants to member cities for Economic Development and Sustainability Framework Goals.
Community Facilities District Fund

To account for the revenues and expenditures associated with a geographic area where a special property tax on real estate (a parcel tax) is assessed for the services within the district. The City currently has seven CFDs: CFD 13-001 Bellegrave, CFD 14-001 Harvest, CFD 14-002 Mission Estates, CFD 14-003 Granite Ridge, CFD 15-001 Riverbend, CFD 15-002 Skypark and CFD 16-001 Quarry.

Landscape and Lighting Maintenance Districts (LLMD) Fund

To account for the revenues and expenditures associated with a geographic area where a special assessment on real estate is assessed for the services within the district. Beginning in fiscal year 2015-2016, the City assumed responsibility for the administration of the districts, which includes managing the required services to be provided within the LLMDs.

Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Fund

To account for the monies received from the State of California under Article 3 of the TDA. These funds may be used for local street and road expenditures.

Surface Transportation Grant Fund

To account for the monies received for the Surface Transportation Grant monies. These funds may be used for local street and road expenditures.

NON-MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECT FUND

Road and Bridge Benefit District

To account for the receipt of fees for development related activities such as road & bridge projects.
## CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA
Non-Major Governmental Funds
Combining Balance Sheet
June 30, 2018

### Special Revenue Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>AQMD</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>COPS</th>
<th>TUMF Grant</th>
<th>ATP Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and investments</td>
<td>$135,139</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental receivable</td>
<td>33,356</td>
<td>231,481</td>
<td>80,012</td>
<td>153,560</td>
<td>214,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits receivable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest receivable</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total assets**: $168,725 $231,481 $80,012 $153,560 $214,238

| Liabilities, deferred inflows of resources, and fund balances |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|

**Liabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities:</th>
<th>AQMD</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>COPS</th>
<th>TUMF Grant</th>
<th>ATP Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>$1,135</td>
<td>$277,474</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$105,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to other funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,869</td>
<td>80,012</td>
<td>48,109</td>
<td>192,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits payable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total liabilities**: $1,135 $303,343 $80,012 $153,560 $204,365

**Deferred inflows of resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unavailable revenue</th>
<th>AQMD</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>COPS</th>
<th>TUMF Grant</th>
<th>ATP Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>231,481</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80,752</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fund balances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restricted for: community development</th>
<th>AQMD</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>COPS</th>
<th>TUMF Grant</th>
<th>ATP Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted for: public works</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(303,343)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(80,752)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total fund balances**: $167,590 $303,343 - (80,752) 9,873

**Total liabilities, deferred inflows of resources and fund balances**: $168,725 $231,481 $80,012 $153,560 $214,238

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMP Grant</th>
<th>CalRecycle Grant</th>
<th>Beyond Initiative Grant</th>
<th>Community Facilities District</th>
<th>Landscape &amp; Lighting Maint. Districts</th>
<th>TDA Article 3 Grant</th>
<th>Surface Transportation Grant</th>
<th>Road and Bridge Benefit District</th>
<th>Special Revenue Funds</th>
<th>Capital Project Fund</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ - $54,424</td>
<td>$ - $1,205,677</td>
<td>$655,372</td>
<td>$31,444</td>
<td>$ - $1,528,147</td>
<td>$3,610,203</td>
<td>$ - $25,294</td>
<td>$48,737</td>
<td>$5,702</td>
<td>$23,409</td>
<td>$51,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ - $79,811</td>
<td>$48,737</td>
<td>$1,213,433</td>
<td>$679,899</td>
<td>$82,968</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>$1,531,588</td>
<td>$1,621,272</td>
<td>$432,832</td>
<td>$1,061,694</td>
<td>$46,889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA
Non-Major Governmental Funds
Combining Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balances
For the Year Ended June 30, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AQMD</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>COPS</th>
<th>TUMF Grant</th>
<th>ATP Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>$128,185</td>
<td>$107,828</td>
<td>$282,473</td>
<td>$183,252</td>
<td>$22,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer impact fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td>$128,859</td>
<td>$107,828</td>
<td>$283,349</td>
<td>$183,252</td>
<td>$22,238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Expenditures**     |       |       |       |            |           |
| Community development| 18,976 | -     | -     | -          | -         |
| Public works         | -     | 408,149 | -     | 215,895 | 12,365  |
| **Total expenditures**| 18,976 | 408,149 | -     | 215,895 | 12,365  |

| **Excess (deficiency) of revenues over (under) expenditures** |       |       |       |            |           |
|                                                              | 109,883 | (300,321) | 283,349 | (32,643) | 9,873    |

| **Other financing sources (uses)** |       |       |       |            |           |
| Transfers in            | -     | -     | -     | -          | -         |
| Transfers out           | -     | -     | (283,349) | (25,625) | -         |
| **Total other financing sources (uses)** |       |       |       | (283,349) | (25,625) |

<p>| <strong>Net change in fund balances</strong> | 109,883 | (300,321) | - | (58,268) | 9,873 |
| <strong>Fund balances at beginning of year</strong> | 57,707 | (3,022) | - | (22,484) | - |
| <strong>Fund balances at end of year</strong> | $167,590 | $(303,343) | - | $(80,752) | $9,873 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMP Grant</th>
<th>CalRecycle Grant</th>
<th>Beyond Initiative Grant</th>
<th>Community Facilities District</th>
<th>Landscape &amp; Lighting Maint. Districts</th>
<th>TDA Article 3 Grant</th>
<th>Surface Transportation Grant</th>
<th>Road and Bridge Benefit District</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 25,294</td>
<td>$ 62,007</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 811,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 650,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,207</td>
<td>4,115</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 25,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,193</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 24,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,578</td>
<td>62,007</td>
<td>789,944</td>
<td>861,403</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 663,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>82,759</td>
<td>166,478</td>
<td>934,288</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 1,202,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,699</td>
<td>47,898</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 687,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>82,759</td>
<td>166,478</td>
<td>936,987</td>
<td>47,898</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 1,889,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,146</td>
<td>(20,752)</td>
<td>623,466</td>
<td>(75,584)</td>
<td>(47,898)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 1,238,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>25,146</td>
<td>(20,752)</td>
<td>597,678</td>
<td>(180,883)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 358,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,146</td>
<td>54,665</td>
<td>(27,985)</td>
<td>734,757</td>
<td>(18,583)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 2,688,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 79,811</td>
<td>$ (48,737)</td>
<td>$ 1,128,360</td>
<td>$ 562,874</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,047,264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original and Final Budgeted Amounts</th>
<th>Actual Amounts</th>
<th>Variance with Final Budget - Positive (Negative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>$ 121,000</td>
<td>$ 128,185</td>
<td>$ 7,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>121,150</strong></td>
<td><strong>128,859</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,709</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Expenditures:

**Current:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original and Final Budgeted Amounts</th>
<th>Actual Amounts</th>
<th>Variance with Final Budget - Positive (Negative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>18,976</td>
<td>62,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net change in fund balance</td>
<td>40,150</td>
<td>109,883</td>
<td>69,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance, beginning of year</td>
<td>57,707</td>
<td>57,707</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund balance, end of year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 97,857</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 167,590</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 69,733</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues:</td>
<td>Original and Final Budgeted Amounts</td>
<td>Actual Amounts</td>
<td>Variance with Final Budget - Positive Amounts (Negative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>$676,252</td>
<td>$107,828</td>
<td>$568,424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Expenditures:                  |                                    |                |                                                          |
| Current:                       |                                    |                |                                                          |
| Community development          | 15,000                             | -              | 15,000                                                   |
| Public works                   | 661,252                            | 408,149        | 253,103                                                  |
| Total expenditures             | 676,252                            | 408,149        | 268,103                                                  |

| Net change in fund balance     | -                                  | (300,321)      | (300,321)                                                |
| Fund balance, beginning of year| -                                  | (3,022)        | (3,022)                                                  |
| Fund balance, end of year      | $                                  | $ (303,343)    | $ (303,343)                                             |
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA  
Non-Major Special Revenue Fund  
COPS Grant  
Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance – Budget and Actual  
For the Year Ended June 30, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues:</th>
<th>Original and Final Budgeted Amounts</th>
<th>Actual Amounts</th>
<th>Variance with Final Budget - Positive (Negative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>$ 159,000</td>
<td>$ 282,473</td>
<td>$ 123,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenues</td>
<td>159,000</td>
<td>283,349</td>
<td>124,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of revenues over expenditures</td>
<td>159,000</td>
<td>283,349</td>
<td>124,349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other financing sources (uses):</th>
<th>Original and Final Budgeted Amounts</th>
<th>Actual Amounts</th>
<th>Variance with Final Budget - Positive (Negative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer out</td>
<td>(159,000)</td>
<td>(283,349)</td>
<td>(124,349)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net change in fund balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance, beginning of year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance, end of year</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA
Non-Major Special Revenue Fund
Alternative Transportation Program (ATP) Grant
Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance – Budget and Actual
For the Year Ended June 30, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original and Final Budgeted Amounts</th>
<th>Actual Amounts</th>
<th>Variance with Final Budget - Positive Amounts (Negative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>$ 230,000</td>
<td>$ 22,238</td>
<td>$ (207,762)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of revenues over expenditures</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>9,873</td>
<td>(220,127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other financing sources (uses):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer in</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(900,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net change in fund balance</td>
<td>1,130,000</td>
<td>9,873</td>
<td>(1,120,127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance, beginning of year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance, end of year</td>
<td>$ 1,130,000</td>
<td>$ 9,873</td>
<td>$ (1,120,127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other financing sources (uses):</td>
<td>Original and Final Budgeted Amounts</td>
<td>Actual Amounts</td>
<td>Variance with Final Budget - Positive (Negative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer out</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ (16,271)</td>
<td>$ (16,271)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net change in fund balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(16,271)</td>
<td>(16,271)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance, beginning of year</td>
<td>16,271</td>
<td>16,271</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance, end of year</td>
<td>$ 16,271</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ (16,271)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance – Budget and Actual

For the Year Ended June 30, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original and Final Budgeted Amounts</th>
<th>Actual Amounts</th>
<th>Variance with Final Budget - Positive (Negative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment revenue</td>
<td>$274,536</td>
<td>$783,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td>274,536</td>
<td>789,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>164,373</td>
<td>166,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of revenues over expenditures</td>
<td>110,163</td>
<td>623,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other financing sources (uses):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer out</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(25,788)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net change in fund balance</td>
<td>110,163</td>
<td>597,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance, beginning of year</td>
<td>530,682</td>
<td>530,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance, end of year</td>
<td>$640,845</td>
<td>$1,128,360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance – Budget and Actual
### For the Year Ended June 30, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original and Final Budgeted Amounts</th>
<th>Actual Amounts</th>
<th>Variance with Final Budget - Positive Amounts (Negative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments revenue</td>
<td>$880,000</td>
<td>$833,095</td>
<td>$(46,905)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,115</td>
<td>4,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,193</td>
<td>24,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td>880,000</td>
<td>861,403</td>
<td>(18,597)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>1,020,606</td>
<td>934,288</td>
<td>86,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,699</td>
<td>(2,699)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditures</strong></td>
<td>1,020,606</td>
<td>936,987</td>
<td>86,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess (deficiency) of</td>
<td>(140,606)</td>
<td>(75,584)</td>
<td>65,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revenues over(under) expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other financing sources (uses):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers out</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(105,299)</td>
<td>(105,299)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net change in fund balance</td>
<td>(140,606)</td>
<td>(180,883)</td>
<td>(40,277)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund balance, beginning of year</strong></td>
<td>743,757</td>
<td>743,757</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund balance, end of year</strong></td>
<td>$603,151</td>
<td>$562,874</td>
<td>$(40,277)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Internal Service Funds

Risk Management Fund
This fund is used to account for the costs of operating a self-insurance program for general liability, workers’ compensation, long-term disability and unemployment compensation. Such costs to other departments are billed at a predetermined rate set annually during the budget process.

Information System Fund
This fund is used to account for the operations of the City’s internal information technology division. Such costs are billed to the departments and/or division based upon a predetermined rate set during the budget process.
### Internal Service Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Risk Management</th>
<th>Information Systems</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current assets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and investments</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 433</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current liabilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Position:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Position</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA
Proprietary Funds
Combining Statement of Net Position
June 30, 2018
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA
Proprietary Funds
Combining Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position
Year Ended June 30, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Service Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenues:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating income (loss)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transfers:
| Transfers in (note 3) | 69,264 | 166,940 | 236,204 |
| Change in net position | - | - | - |
| Net position, beginning of year | - | - | - |
| Net position, end of year | $ - | $ - | $ - |
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA
Proprietary Funds
Combining Statement of Cash Flows
Year Ended June 30, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Service Funds</th>
<th>Risk Management</th>
<th>Information Systems</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash flows from operating activities</td>
<td>$ (69,264)</td>
<td>$ (171,065)</td>
<td>$ (240,329)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash payments to suppliers of goods and services</td>
<td>$ (69,264)</td>
<td>$ (171,065)</td>
<td>$ (240,329)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash used for operating activities</td>
<td>(69,264)</td>
<td>(171,065)</td>
<td>(240,329)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash flows from non capital financing activities</td>
<td>69,264</td>
<td>166,940</td>
<td>236,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash received from other funds</td>
<td>69,264</td>
<td>166,940</td>
<td>236,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash provided by noncapital financing activities</td>
<td>69,264</td>
<td>166,940</td>
<td>236,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net increase (decrease) in cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(4,125)</td>
<td>(4,125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents at beginning of year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,558</td>
<td>4,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents at end of year</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 433</td>
<td>$ 433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reconciliation of operating income (loss) to net cash provided by (used for) operating activities:

| Operating income (loss) | $ (69,264) | $ (166,940) | $ (236,204) |
| Adjustments to reconcile operating income (loss) to net income provided by (used for) operating activities: | |
| (Decrease) in accounts payable | - | (4,125) | (4,125) |
| Net cash provided by (used for) operating activities | $ (69,264) | $ (171,065) | $ (240,329) |
General Agency Fund

The General Agency Fund is used to account for assets held by the City in a trustee capacity or as an agent for individuals, private organizations, other governments, and/or other funds.
## CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA
### Statement of Changes in Assets and Liabilities
#### Agency Fund
##### As of and For the Year Ended June 30, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Balance at July 1, 2017</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Deletions</th>
<th>Balance at June 30, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and investments</td>
<td>$3,033,003</td>
<td>$13,664,289</td>
<td>$14,033,067</td>
<td>$2,664,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>$488,925</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$488,925</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,461,485</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,461,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,521,928</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,125,774</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,521,992</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,125,710</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>Balance at July 1, 2017</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Deletions</th>
<th>Balance at June 30, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>$1,023,172</td>
<td>$8,022,141</td>
<td>$8,658,911</td>
<td>$386,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits payable</td>
<td>$2,498,756</td>
<td>$14,445,176</td>
<td>$13,204,624</td>
<td>$3,739,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,521,928</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,467,317</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,863,535</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,125,710</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATISTICAL SECTION
(UNAUDITED)
### City of Jurupa Valley, California

#### Net Position by Component
#### Last Seven Fiscal Years

(amounts expressed in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governmental activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Governmental activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Governmental activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Governmental activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Governmental activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Governmental activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Governmental activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net investment in capital assets</td>
<td>$16,666</td>
<td>$14,321</td>
<td>$12,332</td>
<td>$20,858</td>
<td>$22,163</td>
<td>$29,225</td>
<td>$32,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>$5,264</td>
<td>$8,132</td>
<td>$7,617</td>
<td>$7,385</td>
<td>$8,091</td>
<td>$10,388</td>
<td>$11,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>$(5,825)</td>
<td>$(4,206)</td>
<td>$(2,203)</td>
<td>$11,718</td>
<td>$8,662</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>$2,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total governmental activities net assets</td>
<td>$16,105</td>
<td>$18,247</td>
<td>$17,746</td>
<td>$39,961</td>
<td>$38,917</td>
<td>$39,823</td>
<td>$45,482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Due to the City’s incorporation on July 1, 2011, there is no information available prior to FY 2011-2012.

**Source:** City of Jurupa Valley Finance Department
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA
Changes in Net Position
Last Seven Fiscal Years
(amounts expressed in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General government</td>
<td>$1,715</td>
<td>$1,746</td>
<td>$2,207</td>
<td>$3,511</td>
<td>$5,343</td>
<td>$7,969</td>
<td>$10,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>4,429</td>
<td>5,453</td>
<td>5,558</td>
<td>5,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works</td>
<td>5,606</td>
<td>6,974</td>
<td>11,806</td>
<td>4,999</td>
<td>6,852</td>
<td>6,332</td>
<td>5,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td>7,818</td>
<td>12,762</td>
<td>13,827</td>
<td>15,997</td>
<td>17,743</td>
<td>18,356</td>
<td>19,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and fiscal charges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total governmental activities expenses</td>
<td>15,849</td>
<td>21,681</td>
<td>28,034</td>
<td>28,936</td>
<td>35,392</td>
<td>38,696</td>
<td>40,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General government</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>3,684</td>
<td>5,589</td>
<td>3,484</td>
<td>3,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>2,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating contributions and grants</td>
<td>5,566</td>
<td>5,204</td>
<td>6,697</td>
<td>7,570</td>
<td>7,828</td>
<td>8,214</td>
<td>8,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital contributions and grants</td>
<td>18,958</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>3,566</td>
<td>2,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total governmental activities program revenues</td>
<td>25,645</td>
<td>7,992</td>
<td>9,736</td>
<td>12,113</td>
<td>14,316</td>
<td>17,998</td>
<td>17,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total government net (expense)/revenues</td>
<td>$9,796</td>
<td>($14,089)</td>
<td>($18,298)</td>
<td>($16,823)</td>
<td>($21,076)</td>
<td>($20,698)</td>
<td>($23,245)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Revenues and Other Changes in Net Position

| General revenues: |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Taxes: |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Property tax (2) | $181        | $4,528      | $5,597      | $6,097      | $6,468      | $6,649      | $13,304     |
| Sales taxes | 4,220        | 9,316       | 8,969       | 8,744       | 10,407      | 10,211      | 11,273      |
| Franchise taxes | 1,679        | 1,981       | 2,793       | 2,695       | 2,680       | 4,184       | 2,790       |
| Transient occupancy taxes | 149          | 171         | 197         | 208         | 250         | 273         | 284         |
| Property transfer tax (1) | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | -           | 484         |
| Investment income | 3           | 8           | 9           | 9           | 23          | 146         | 157         |
| Other | 76           | 226         | 263         | 15,301      | 202         | 160         | 612         |
| Total governmental activities | 6,309       | 16,230      | 17,799      | 33,054      | 20,031      | 21,623      | 28,904      |
| Total Change in Net Position | $16,105      | $2,141      | ($500)      | $16,231      | ($1,044)    | $924        | $5,659      |

Note: Due to the City's incorporation on July 1, 2011, there is no information available prior to FY 2011-2012.

(1) Property transfer tax was included in the total property taxes amount prior to FY 2017-18.
(2) The City began receiving Property taxes in lieu of motor vehicle fees in FY 2017-18 following adoption of SB130 in May 2017.

Source: City of Jurupa Valley Finance Department
## CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA

### Fund Balances of Governmental Funds
#### Last Seven Fiscal Years
(amounts expressed in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2012</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2013</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2014</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2015</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2016</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2017</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonspendable</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>10,479</td>
<td>11,934</td>
<td>11,712</td>
<td>8,699</td>
<td>5,314</td>
<td>4,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total general fund</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,255</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,484</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,934</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,712</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,699</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,314</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,791</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All other governmental funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonspendable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>5,264</td>
<td>8,132</td>
<td>7,617</td>
<td>7,385</td>
<td>7,944</td>
<td>10,388</td>
<td>10,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(95)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(178)</td>
<td>(522)</td>
<td>(433)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total all other governmental funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,253</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,037</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,617</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,385</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,766</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,865</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,224</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total fund balances of governmental funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,508</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,521</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,551</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,097</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,465</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,179</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,015</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Due to the City's incorporation on July 1, 2011, there is no information available prior to FY 2011-2012.

**Source:** City of Jurupa Valley Finance Department
# CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA

## Changes in Fund Balances of Governmental Funds

### Last Seven Fiscal Years

(\textit{amounts expressed in thousands})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property tax</td>
<td>$181</td>
<td>$4,528</td>
<td>$5,597</td>
<td>$6,096</td>
<td>$6,468</td>
<td>$6,649</td>
<td>$13,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales tax</td>
<td>$4,220</td>
<td>$9,316</td>
<td>$8,969</td>
<td>$8,744</td>
<td>$10,407</td>
<td>$12,211</td>
<td>$11,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise tax</td>
<td>$1,679</td>
<td>$1,981</td>
<td>$2,793</td>
<td>$2,696</td>
<td>$2,680</td>
<td>$4,184</td>
<td>$2,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient occupancy tax</td>
<td>$149</td>
<td>$171</td>
<td>$167</td>
<td>$208</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$273</td>
<td>$284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other taxes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses and permits</td>
<td>$482</td>
<td>$637</td>
<td>$770</td>
<td>$1,342</td>
<td>$1,421</td>
<td>$1,634</td>
<td>$1,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$4,833</td>
<td>$5,889</td>
<td>$5,274</td>
<td>$4,427</td>
<td>$6,710</td>
<td>$6,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for services</td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>$1,436</td>
<td>$2,234</td>
<td>$3,093</td>
<td>$3,147</td>
<td>$4,010</td>
<td>$4,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer impact fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,314</td>
<td>$3,118</td>
<td>$2,703</td>
<td>$3,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating contributions and grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$270</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines and forfeitures</td>
<td>$66</td>
<td>$183</td>
<td>$336</td>
<td>$534</td>
<td>$518</td>
<td>$465</td>
<td>$574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$232</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>$788</td>
<td>$93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments revenue</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income &amp; gain</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenues</td>
<td>$12,985</td>
<td>$23,325</td>
<td>$27,089</td>
<td>$31,033</td>
<td>$34,065</td>
<td>$39,467</td>
<td>$46,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General government</td>
<td>$1,635</td>
<td>$1,737</td>
<td>$2,198</td>
<td>$3,495</td>
<td>$5,316</td>
<td>$7,684</td>
<td>$9,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>$272</td>
<td>$196</td>
<td>$194</td>
<td>$4,408</td>
<td>$5,425</td>
<td>$5,558</td>
<td>$5,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works</td>
<td>$1,924</td>
<td>$4,006</td>
<td>$9,773</td>
<td>$7,941</td>
<td>$8,116</td>
<td>$17,435</td>
<td>$11,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td>$604</td>
<td>$12,698</td>
<td>$13,766</td>
<td>$15,922</td>
<td>$17,652</td>
<td>$18,356</td>
<td>$19,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal retirement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and fiscal charges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of issuance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total debt service</td>
<td>$4,335</td>
<td>$19,239</td>
<td>$25,930</td>
<td>$31,786</td>
<td>$36,509</td>
<td>$49,849</td>
<td>$46,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess (deficit) of revenues over expenditures</td>
<td>$8,650</td>
<td>$4,087</td>
<td>$1,159</td>
<td>(733)</td>
<td>(2,444)</td>
<td>(10,382)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other financing sources/(uses)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds of loan from County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$6,019</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers in</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>2,417</td>
<td>2,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers out</td>
<td>(142)</td>
<td>(248)</td>
<td>(225)</td>
<td>(1,238)</td>
<td>(513)</td>
<td>(2,630)</td>
<td>(2,725)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds issued</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,165</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium on bonds issued</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other financing sources/(uses)</td>
<td>(142)</td>
<td>5,926</td>
<td>(129)</td>
<td>(159)</td>
<td>(188)</td>
<td>9,115</td>
<td>(236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net change in fund balance</td>
<td>$8,508</td>
<td>$10,013</td>
<td>$1,030</td>
<td>(892)</td>
<td>(2,632)</td>
<td>(1,267)</td>
<td>(165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service as a percentage of noncapital expenditures</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Note}: Due to the City’s incorporation on July 1, 2011, there is no information available prior to FY 2011-2012.

\textbf{Source}: City of Jurupa Valley Finance Department
**CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA**

**Tax Revenues by Source - General Fund**

**Last Seven Fiscal Years**

(modified accrual basis of accounting)

(amounts expressed in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Sales &amp; Use</th>
<th>Franchise</th>
<th>Transient Occupancy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$181</td>
<td>$4,220</td>
<td>$1,679</td>
<td>$149</td>
<td>$6,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4,528</td>
<td>9,316</td>
<td>1,981</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>15,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5,597</td>
<td>8,969</td>
<td>2,793</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>17,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6,096</td>
<td>8,744</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>17,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6,468</td>
<td>10,407</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>19,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6,649</td>
<td>10,211</td>
<td>4,184</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>21,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>13,304</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>27,651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Due to the City's incorporation on July 1, 2011, there is no information available prior to that date.

(1) The City began receiving Property taxes in lieu of motor vehicle fees in FY 2017-18 following adoption of SB130 in May 2017.

**Source:** City of Jurupa Valley Finance Department
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA
Assessed and Estimated Actual Value of Taxable Property
Last Seven Fiscal Years
(amounts expressed in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Residential Property</th>
<th>Commercial Property</th>
<th>Industrial Property</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total Assessed Valuation</th>
<th>Less Tax Exempt Property</th>
<th>Total Taxable Assessed Value</th>
<th>Direct Tax Rate (City)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$3,594,252</td>
<td>$427,294</td>
<td>$1,775,487</td>
<td>$599,155</td>
<td>$6,396,187</td>
<td>($43,846)</td>
<td>$6,352,341</td>
<td>0.06933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3,786,080</td>
<td>429,880</td>
<td>1,828,067</td>
<td>1,050,966</td>
<td>7,094,992</td>
<td>($44,707)</td>
<td>7,050,285</td>
<td>0.10347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4,057,672</td>
<td>433,123</td>
<td>1,855,743</td>
<td>1,067,843</td>
<td>7,414,581</td>
<td>($45,601)</td>
<td>7,368,980</td>
<td>0.10196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4,359,971</td>
<td>446,341</td>
<td>1,972,845</td>
<td>1,105,654</td>
<td>7,884,812</td>
<td>($46,292)</td>
<td>7,838,519</td>
<td>0.10011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4,738,804</td>
<td>474,480</td>
<td>2,129,295</td>
<td>1,187,869</td>
<td>8,530,447</td>
<td>($47,027)</td>
<td>8,483,420</td>
<td>0.09838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5,211,669</td>
<td>512,513</td>
<td>2,235,742</td>
<td>1,189,217</td>
<td>9,149,141</td>
<td>($44,814)</td>
<td>9,104,327</td>
<td>0.09650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Due to the City's incorporation on July 1, 2011, there is no data available prior to FY 2012-2013. The County of Riverside assessed and collected all property tax payments as a part of the County's assessment roll for FY 2011-2012. The first year for assessment and collections in the name of Jurupa Valley was FY 2012-2013.

Source: Hdl, Coren & Cone
## City Direct Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Basic County, City, and School Levy</th>
<th>Community College District</th>
<th>Water District</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.06292</td>
<td>0.16600</td>
<td>0.43349</td>
<td>1.66241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.05958</td>
<td>0.16600</td>
<td>0.46506</td>
<td>1.69064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.05721</td>
<td>0.16600</td>
<td>0.43363</td>
<td>1.65684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.05755</td>
<td>0.16600</td>
<td>0.50210</td>
<td>1.72565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.05149</td>
<td>0.16600</td>
<td>0.53743</td>
<td>1.75492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.05376</td>
<td>0.15600</td>
<td>0.51817</td>
<td>1.72793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Due to the City's incorporation on July 1, 2011, there is no historical data available prior to FY 2012-2013. The County of Riverside assessed and collected all property tax payments as a part of the County's assessment roll in FY 2011-2012. The first year for assessment and collections in the name of Jurupa Valley was FY 2012-2013.

**Source:** County of Riverside, Tax Rates by Tax Rate Areas (2017-2018) Schedule; Hdl, Coren & Cone
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxpayer</th>
<th>2018 Taxable Assessed Value</th>
<th>2018 Percentage of Total Taxable Assessed Value</th>
<th>2013 Taxable Assessed Value</th>
<th>2013 Percentage of Total Taxable Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costco Wholesale Corporation</td>
<td>$178,399,760</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>$103,947,782</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPS Supply Chain Solutions General Services Inc.</td>
<td>113,678,683</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>88,302,210</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association</td>
<td>113,154,966</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>104,554,198</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestle Food Company</td>
<td>72,317,255</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesso Mall Dev Jurupa Valley Limited</td>
<td>70,000,000</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Container Corporation</td>
<td>67,205,703</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>66,962,730</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMREF So California Industrial</td>
<td>65,472,394</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMB Institutional Alliance Fund III</td>
<td>56,000,000</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cella</td>
<td>53,563,234</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lineage Master RE 3 LLC</td>
<td>53,308,942</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>63,163,277</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGB X Vernola LLC (Vernola Marketplace)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57,098,070</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Depot USA Inc.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49,463,870</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCAM Core Properties Fund Operating</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48,564,583</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Center Mira Loma Inc.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46,221,295</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefco XVIII Limited</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44,295,358</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 843,100,937</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.26%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 672,573,373</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.59%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Due to the City's incorporation on July 1, 2011, there is no data available prior to FY 2012-2013. The County Riverside assessed and collected all property tax payments as a part of the County's assessment roll in FY 2011-2012. FY 2012-2013 was the first year for assessment and collections in the name of Jurupa Valley.

**Source:** HdL, Coren & Cone
### CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA

Property Tax Levies and Collections

Last Seven Fiscal Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Taxes Levied For the Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Collected within the Fiscal Year of the Levy</th>
<th>Collection in Subsequent Years</th>
<th>Total Collections to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$4,146,481</td>
<td>$4,030,936</td>
<td>97.21%</td>
<td>$115,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4,473,310</td>
<td>4,319,380</td>
<td>96.56%</td>
<td>153,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4,611,753</td>
<td>4,593,320</td>
<td>99.60%</td>
<td>18,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4,740,260</td>
<td>4,690,434</td>
<td>99.85%</td>
<td>49,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4,913,741</td>
<td>4,844,250</td>
<td>98.59%</td>
<td>69,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5,092,844</td>
<td>4,997,898</td>
<td>98.14%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Due to the City's incorporation on July 1, 2011, there is no data available prior to FY 2012-2013. The County of Riverside assessed and collected all property tax payments as a part of the County's assessment roll in FY 2011-2012. The first year for assessment and collections in the name of Jurupa Valley was FY 2012-2013.

Source: City of Jurupa Valley Finance Department; Riverside County Auditor-Controller's "2017-2018 Statement of Original Charge"
## CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA
### Ratios of Outstanding Debt by Type
#### Last Seven Fiscal Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year (1)</th>
<th>General Obligation Bonds</th>
<th>Lease Revenue Certificates of Participation</th>
<th>Unamortized Premium on CoP</th>
<th>Total Governmental Activities</th>
<th>Percentage of Personal Income (2)</th>
<th>Debt per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,895,000</td>
<td>1,098,761</td>
<td>8,993,761</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,745,000</td>
<td>908,832</td>
<td>8,653,832</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
1) The City of Jurupa Valley was incorporated during fiscal year 2011-2012. No information prior to that year is available.
2) These ratios are calculated using personal income and population based on the schedule of demographic and economic statistics.

### Source:
City of Jurupa Valley Finance Department
### CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA

**Ratio of General Bonded Debt**

**Last Seven Fiscal Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>General Obligation Bonds</th>
<th>Tax Allocation of Bonds</th>
<th>Certificates of Participation</th>
<th>Percent of Assessed Value</th>
<th>Debt per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** General bonded debt is debt payable with governmental fund resources (of which the City has none).

Due to the City's incorporation on July 1, 2011, there is no data available prior to FY 2011-2012.

**Source:** City of Jurupa Valley Finance Department
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Assessed Valuation</th>
<th>Legal Debt Limit (15% of Assessed Value)</th>
<th>Amount of Debt Applicable to Limit</th>
<th>Legal Debt Margin</th>
<th>Total Debt Applicable to Limit as a Percentage of the Debt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$6,407,560</td>
<td>$961,134</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$961,134</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$7,160,161</td>
<td>$1,074,024</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,074,024</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$7,429,187</td>
<td>$1,114,378</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,114,378</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$7,838,519</td>
<td>$1,175,778</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,175,778</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$8,483,420</td>
<td>$1,272,513</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,272,513</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$9,104,327</td>
<td>$1,365,649</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,365,649</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Section 43605 of the Government Code of the State of California limits the amount of general bonded indebtedness for public improvements to 15% of the assessed valuation of all real and personal property of the City. The City has no general obligation bonded debt.

Due to the City's incorporation on July 1, 2011, there is no data available prior to FY 2011-2012. The County of Riverside assessed and collected all property tax payments as a part of the County's assessment roll in FY 2011-2012. FY 2012-2013 was the first year for assessment and collections in the name of Jurupa Valley.
## Certificates of Participation - Local Measure A Sales Tax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Measure A Sales Tax Revenue</th>
<th>Debt Service</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3,245,981</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>218,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2,517,367</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>317,265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Due to the City's incorporation on July 1, 2011, there is no data available prior to FY 2011-2012. The City did not issue any debt prior to FY 2016-17; therefore, there is no applicable data for those years.

**Source:** City of Jurupa Valley Finance Department
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Personal Income in Thousands</th>
<th>Per Capita Personal Income</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>96,745</td>
<td>$1,002,805</td>
<td>$10,365</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>97,246</td>
<td>1,039,993</td>
<td>10,694</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>97,774</td>
<td>1,743,702</td>
<td>17,834</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>97,738</td>
<td>1,797,500</td>
<td>18,391</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>98,177</td>
<td>1,806,787</td>
<td>18,403</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>101,315</td>
<td>1,847,987</td>
<td>18,240</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>101,315</td>
<td>1,937,729</td>
<td>19,126</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Due to the City's incorporation on July 1, 2011, there is no prior year information available.

**Sources:**

HdL, Coren & Cone Demographic & Economic Statistics report

1. Population - California Department of Finance
2. Personal Income - California Franchise Tax Board, adjusted gross income for zip code 92509
3. Median Age - U.S. Census Bureau State of California - for zip code 92509
4. Unemployment Rate - California Employment Development Department
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Labor Force</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods Producing</td>
<td>105,500</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation and Utilities</td>
<td>158,800</td>
<td>22.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>21,900</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Business Services</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>9.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Health Services</td>
<td>106,200</td>
<td>14.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Hospitality</td>
<td>90,800</td>
<td>12.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>22,800</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>125,400</td>
<td>17.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>717,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Information on the largest employers for the City of Jurupa Valley is not available. Presented above is the annual average of Industry Employment & Labor Force for Riverside County as of March 2016.

Due to the City's incorporation on July 1, 2011, there is no information available prior to that date.

**Source:** State of California Employment Development Department
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>General Government</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
<th>Public Safety</th>
<th>Community Services</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

(1) The City of Jurupa Valley has staff employed in City Manager, Finance and Administration, and Public Works departments. The City contracts services for the remaining General Government and Public Works functions through third party consultants.

(2) The City of Jurupa Valley contracts Public Safety services through the County of Riverside Sheriff's Department.

(3) Community Services are provided by the Jurupa Community Services District.

Due to the City's incorporation on July 1, 2011, there is no information available prior to that date.

**Sources:** City of Jurupa Valley Finance Department
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA  
Top 25 Sales Tax Producers  
Current Year and Six Years Ago

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Business Category</th>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Business Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arco AM PM</td>
<td>Service Stations</td>
<td>Adler Tank Rentals</td>
<td>Repair Shop/Equip Rentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arco AM PM</td>
<td>Service Stations</td>
<td>Arco AM PM</td>
<td>Service Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arco AM PM</td>
<td>Service Stations</td>
<td>Arco AM PM</td>
<td>Service Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arco AM PM</td>
<td>Service Stations</td>
<td>Arco AM PM</td>
<td>Service Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATN Windows</td>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td>Circle K</td>
<td>Service Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle K</td>
<td>Service Stations</td>
<td>Circle K 76</td>
<td>Service Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crest Steel Corporation</td>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>Costco Distribution Center</td>
<td>Fulfillment Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Don &amp; Company</td>
<td>Food Service Equip/Supplies</td>
<td>Edward Don &amp; Company</td>
<td>Food Service Equip/Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBW Railcar Services</td>
<td>Transportation-Non-Auto</td>
<td>Eldorado National</td>
<td>Trailers/Auto Parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ifco Systems</td>
<td>Light Industrial/Printers</td>
<td>G &amp; M Oil</td>
<td>Service Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Bobcat</td>
<td>Warehouse/Farm/Const Equip</td>
<td>Gasco</td>
<td>Service Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowes</td>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td>Kmart</td>
<td>Discount Dept Stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants Metals</td>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td>Los Compadres Auto Sales</td>
<td>Used Automotive Dealers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Modular Management</td>
<td>Trailers/RVs</td>
<td>Lowes</td>
<td>Building Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orco Block</td>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td>Mostamand Shell</td>
<td>Service Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggs Company</td>
<td>Office Supplies/Furniture</td>
<td>Orco Block</td>
<td>Contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penske Truck Leasing</td>
<td>Transportation/Rentals</td>
<td>Peggs Company</td>
<td>Office Supplies/Furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Family Apparel</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Family Apparel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S W School Supply</td>
<td>Office Supplies/Furniture</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Service Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Service Stations</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Service Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Material Handling</td>
<td>Warehouse/Farm/Const Equip</td>
<td>Southwest Material Handling</td>
<td>Warehouse/Farm/Const Equip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stater Bros</td>
<td>Grocery Stores</td>
<td>Stater Bros</td>
<td>Grocery Stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTX RailCar</td>
<td>Transportation-Non-Auto</td>
<td>Universal Forest Products</td>
<td>Contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Forest Products</td>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td>Walmart Online</td>
<td>Fulfillment Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walmart Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Fiscal Year Total Paid by Top 25 Accounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year 2011-12</th>
<th>54.94%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year 2017-18</td>
<td>46.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Due to the City’s incorporation on July 1, 2011, there is no data available prior to FY 2011-2012.

Source: HdL Reports - Firms listed alphabetically (April through March data for each year)
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 21, 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.D

AWARD CONSTRUCTION AGREEMENT TO HARDY & HARPER, INC. FOR VAN BUREN BOULEVARD PAVEMENT REHABILITATION – PH. 2B, RUTILE TO BELLEGRAVE

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the City Council approve and award a Construction Agreement to Hardy & Harper, Inc. in the amount of $432,349 for the Van Buren Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation, Ph.2B Project 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. Appropriate $500,000 of Road Maintenance & Rehabilitation Account (RMRA) funds from the Rubidoux Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation Project (Account No. 71338) 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 to FY 2019-2020 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). This CIP included the Van Buren Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation - Ph. 2B Project (Project), but is not funded until FY 2019-2020. Throughout the course of the fiscal year it was determined that the Rubidoux Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation Project could be funded by Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. This then freed up funding to move this project into the current fiscal year. The project will provide for the rehabilitation of
approximately 170,000 square feet of AC pavement by grind and overlay on Van Buren Boulevard from Rutile Street to Bellegrave Avenue.

City Staff prepared the bid package for the Project and the City Engineer approved this bid package on February 4, 2019. On February 8, 2019 the Notice Inviting Bids was published in The Press Enterprise. The City Clerk also advised 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. Five (5) bids were received on February 28, 2019 as summarized below.

All bids were reviewed for accuracy and completeness. Hardy & Harper, Inc. submitted the lowest cumulative bid totaling $432,349.00 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. Hardy &amp; Harper, Inc.</td>
<td>$432,349.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All American Asphalt, Inc.</td>
<td>$452,770.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Onyx Paving Company, Inc.</td>
<td>$469,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Eagle Paving Company, Inc.</td>
<td>$517,101.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. R.J. Noble Company</td>
<td>$569,517.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer's Estimate</td>
<td>$493,875.00</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 $40,000.

**OTHER INFORMATION**

Previous Actions:

- None

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The FY 2018-2019 to FY 2019-2020 CIP did not include funding this current fiscal year for the Project. However, due to the Rubidoux Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation Project utilizing CBDG funds, $500,000 of the City’s RMRA funds are available to fund the Van Buren Boulevard Project. The available funds are sufficient for award of this
agreement as recommended and related support services. Award of a construction contract as recommended requires that City Council appropriate $500,000 of the City’s available RMRA funds from the Rubidoux Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation Project, Account No.71338 bringing the project budget to $500,000.

The total estimated project costs for an award of a contract to Hardy & Harper, Inc. as recommended are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Admin/Bid Documents Prep.</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contract</td>
<td>$432,349.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (5%)</td>
<td>$22,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Support Services</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$499,349.00</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:

Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Approved as to form:

Peter Thorson
City Attorney

Reviewed by:

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

Reviewed by:

George A. Wentz
Deputy City Manager

Submitted by:

Gary S. Thompson
City Manager

Attachments:

1) Agreement, Project No. 13-E.b
ATTACHMENT 1

Agreement, Project No. 13-E.b
AGREEMENT

PROJECT NO.13-E.b

VAN BUREN BOULEVARD PAVEMENT REHABILITATION – PH. 2B
Rutile Street to Bellegrave Avenue

THIS Agreement, made and entered into the March 21, 2019, by and between the City of Jurupa Valley, a municipal corporation, hereinafter called the "City" and, Hardy & Harper, Inc. 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 Van Buren Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation – Ph. 2B ("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). 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 **four hundred thirty two thousand three hundred forty nine dollars, ($432,349.00)**, 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.
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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 **Twenty (20) 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 **$1,000.00** 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.
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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
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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. **Debaryd, 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 1080 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
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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
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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 “Indemnities”) 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 Indemnities and shall operate to fully indemnify Indemnities 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 Indemnities may have under the law. Payment is not required as a condition precedent to an Indemnitee’s right to recover under this indemnity provision, and an entry of judgment against an Indemnitee shall be conclusive in favor of the Indemnitee’s right to recover under this indemnity provision. Contractor shall pay Indemnities 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) Indemnities’ 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 Indemnities. The Contractor, on behalf of itself and all parties claiming under or through it, hereby waives all rights of subrogation and contribution against the Indemnities, 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 Indemnities.

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)
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CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY,
Municipal Corporation

BY: __________________________________________
   Gary S. Thompson, City Manager, City of Jurupa Valley

DATE: ________________________________________

HARDY & HARPER, INC.

License No./
Classification: ________________________________

Expiration Date: ______________________________

Federal I.D. No.: ______________________________

PRINT NAME: ________________________________
SIGNATURE: _________________________________
TITLE: ________________________________
DATE: __________________________ Date

INTERNAL USE ONLY

ATTEST:

City Clerk
(only needed if Mayor signs)

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL FORM:

City Attorney

Date

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL:

Department Head

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.
BOND NO.________________
PREMIUM $__________

FAITHFUL PERFORMANCE BOND
(100% of Total Contract Amount)

PROJECT NO. 13-E.b

VAN BUREN BOULEVARD PAVEMENT REHABILITATION – PH. 2B
Rutile Street to Bellegrave Avenue

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 Hardy & Harper, Inc. 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. 13-E.b, Van Buren Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation – Ph. 2B, 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 four hundred thirty two thousand three hundred forty nine dollars ($432,349.00), 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)

Faithful Performance Bond - 1
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, we have hereunto set our hands, and seals on this _____ day of _________ 2019.

HARDY & HARPER, INC.

Contractor Name: ______________________
Address: ________________________________
Telephone No.: _________________________
Print Name: _____________________________
Signature: _______________________________

Approved as to Form this
_____ day of ______________, 2019

City Attorney
City of Jurupa Valley

SURETY

Name: _________________________________
Address: ________________________________
Telephone No.: _________________________
Print Name: _____________________________
Signature: _______________________________

Attorney-in-Fact

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).
LABOR AND MATERIALS PAYMENT BOND
(100% of Total Contract Amount)

PROJECT NO. 13-E.b
VAN BUREN BOULEVARD PAVEMENT REHABILITATION – PH. 2B
Rutile Street to Bellegrave Avenue

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 Hardy & Harper, Inc., 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. 13-E.b, Van Buren Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation – Ph. 2B, 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 four hundred thirty two thousand three hundred forty nine dollars ($432,349.00), 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. 13-E.b

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, we have hereunto set our hands, and seals on this _____ day of _____________ 2019.

HARDY & HARPER, INC.

Contractor Name: ______________________
Address: ________________________________
Telephone No.: __________________________
Print Name: ____________________________
Signature: ______________________________
Approved as to Form this
_____ day of _____________, 2019

SURETY

Name: _________________________________
Address: ________________________________
Telephone No.: __________________________
Print Name: ____________________________
Signature: ______________________________

Attorney-in-Fact

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 21, 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.E

AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES BETWEEN THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY AND DOKKEN ENGINEERING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION SERVICES FOR THE VAN BUREN BOULEVARD WIDENING, LIMONITE TO SANTA ANA RIVER PROJECT, CIP PROJECT NO. 17-B.1

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the City Council approve an agreement between Dokken Engineering and the City of Jurupa Valley for Environmental Documentation Services for the Van Buren Boulevard Widening, Limonite to Santa Ana River Project in an amount not-to-exceed $120,340 and authorize the City Manager to execute the Agreement in substantially the form attached and in such final form as approved by the City Attorney; and

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

BACKGROUND

At its meeting of April 19, 2018, the City Council approved the FY 2018-2019 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). This CIP included the Van Buren Boulevard Widening, Limonite to Santa Ana River Project (Project).

The Project is currently being designed with plans roughly 30% complete. Now that the project’s footprint has been sufficiently established it is appropriate to begin the environmental documentation process. It is assumed that an initial study leading to a mitigated negative declaration (IS/MND) is the appropriate CEQA document. NEPA documentation is not required since no federal dollars are being used.
ANALYSIS

On November 19, 2018 the City released a Request for Proposals (RFP) for environmental documentation services for the Project. On November 29, 2018 the City issued Addendum 1, which modified the conceptual plan exhibits for the project. On December 7, 2018 the City issued Q & A Set 1, which answered all questions received during the RFP process. On December 13, 2018 the City received eight (8) proposals:

- Chambers Group
- Dokken Engineering
- ICF
- Infrastructure Engineering Corporation
- Michael Baker International
- Psomas
- RECON Environmental, Inc.
- Webb Associates

All proposals were reviewed by members of the City’s public works staff in accordance with the selection process identified in the RFP. It was determined that Dokken Engineering (Dokken) was the most qualified firm to provide these services. Dokken prepared the environmental documents for the Van Buren Bridge and is familiar with the project and location.

OTHER INFORMATION

Previous Actions:

- None

FINANCIAL IMPACT

A not-to-exceed fee proposal of $120,340 was negotiated with Dokken for the Project and determined to be fair and reasonable.

The FY 2018-2019 CIP has sufficient budget for award of this contract. The source of funds is a combination of Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) and Development Impact Fees (DIF).

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

ALTERNATIVES

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

Chase Keys
CIP Manager

Reviewed by:

Reviewed by:

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

Reviewed by:

George A. Wentz
Deputy City Manager

Reviewed by:

Submitted by:

Gary S. Thompson
City Manager

Approved as to form:

Peter Thorson
City Attorney

Attachments:

1) Agreement, Project No. 17-B.1
ATTACHMENT 1

Agreement, Project No. 17-B.1
AGREEMENT FOR CONSULTANT SERVICES BETWEEN THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY AND DOKKEN ENGINEERING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION SERVICES FOR VAN BUREN BOULEVARD WIDENING, LIMONITE TO SANTA ANA RIVER IN THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

(PUBLIC WORKS PROFESSIONAL SERVICES)

THIS AGREEMENT is made and effective as of March 21, 2019, between the City of Jurupa Valley ("City") and Dokken Engineering ("Consultant"). In consideration of the mutual covenants and conditions set forth herein, the parties agree as follows:

1. **Term**

This Agreement shall commence on March 21, 2019, and shall remain and continue in effect until tasks described herein are completed in accordance with the Scope of Services, but in no event later than June 30, 2020, unless sooner terminated pursuant to the provisions of this Agreement.

2. **Services**

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

3. **Performance**

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

4. **Payment**

The City agrees to cause Consultant to be paid monthly, in accordance with the payment rates and terms and the schedule of payment as set forth in Exhibit B, Quotation for Service, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference as though set forth in full, based upon actual time spent on the above tasks. This amount shall not exceed one hundred twenty thousand three hundred forty dollars ($120,340.00) for the total term of the Agreement unless additional payment is approved as provided in this Agreement.

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

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

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

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

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

6. **Default Of Consultant**

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

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

7. **Prevailing Wages**

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

8. Ownership Of Documents

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

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

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

9. Indemnification

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

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

10. Insurance Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

11. Independent Contractor

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

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

12. Legal Responsibilities

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

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

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

14. **Assignment**

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

15. **General Provisions**

A. **Notices**

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

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

To Consultant:  
Dokken Engineering  
110 Blue Ravine Road  
Suite 200  
Folsom, CA 95630  
Attention: John Klemunes
B. Licenses. At all times during the term of this Agreement, Consultant shall have in full force and effect, all licenses required of it by law for the performance of the services described in this Agreement.

C. Governing Law; Venue

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

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

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

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

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

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

CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

Gary S. Thompson
City Manager

ATTEST:

Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM

Peter M. Thorson
City Attorney

DOKKEN ENGINEERING

By: __________________________
   Name: ______________________
   Title: _______________________

By: __________________________
   Name: ______________________
   Title: _______________________

[SIGNATURES OF TWO CORPORATE OFFICERS OR CORPORATE AUTHORITY RESOLUTION REQUIRED]
EXHIBIT A

SCOPE OF SERVICES
Bridge Replacement Project and other nearby projects. The Van Buren Bridge report noted that no resources were identified in the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the replacement project which widened Van Buren Boulevard from Jurupa Avenue to Clay Street. Dokken Engineering will build off of the results of these previous cultural resource investigations when preparing the project specific documentation.

**WORK PLAN**

Dokken shall perform all required environmental research and analysis necessary for the project, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The project is proposed by the City of Jurupa Valley and is largely located on City owned road right-of-way; however, some partial acquisitions and temporary construction easements are necessary. It is understood that the City of Jurupa Valley will be the project proponent and the CEQA lead agency.

Standalone environmental technical studies are discussed under separate tasks below, when required. When minimal impacts are expected or no environmental resources are present, those discussions will be provided only in the environmental document (CEQA). Dokken shall perform all environmental documentation and coordination, which shall include the following:

**TASK 1 PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

**TASK 1.1 MEETINGS AND COORDINATION**

Dokken will attend and facilitate meetings as necessary to provide progress updates, coordinate between technical disciplines, and facilitate overall project communication. For each meeting, Dokken's environmental team will provide meeting notices, prepare meeting materials and agenda, attend and facilitate the meeting and prepare meeting minutes. Dokken will consult with the City's project manager prior to each meeting to get input regarding the agenda. Approximately eight (8) Project Development Team (PDT) meetings are anticipated for this project.

**TASK 2 ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNICAL STUDIES**

**TASK 2.1 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES REPORT**

Dokken biologists will conduct fieldwork in order to assess the presence/absence of sensitive biological resources (e.g., species or habitats) and to determine the potential for occurrence of resources that may not be detectable when the fieldwork is conducted. In addition, literature research will be conducted to determine the potential for sensitive plant and animal species in the project area. Literature under review will include Federal and State lists of sensitive species and current database records, including the California Natural Diversity Data Base (California Department of Fish and Wildlife [CDFW] 2018) and the California Native Plant Society, Rare Plant Program, Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California (2018). A list of threatened and endangered species known in the project vicinity will be obtained from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

Based on our research, there is potential that suitable habitat for San Diego ambrosia, Brand’s phacelia, San Miguel savory, and burrowing owl will be present within the project area. Other protected bird species may be present depending on the suitability of habitat. For optimal results, Dokken will conduct fieldwork appropriate to the season; doing focused plant surveys during the blooming season and protocol surveys according to USFWS/CDFW protocols. This will maximize our ability to detect and positively identify sensitive species.

Dokken will prepare a Biological Resources Report. This study will include a description of the field methods used and the results of the biological surveys of the project area. The report will list plant and animal species present, along with a general description of the plant communities occurring within the project area. If any sensitive resources are found on the site, Dokken will prepare and include in the study a graphic displaying the location of the sensitive plant communities on site and any sensitive biological resources observed. The report also will contain tables describing sensitive species and their habitats that are present or potentially present; it also will identify and assess project impacts on the existing biological resources, including any sensitive species. Mitigation measures will be included as necessary.

Dokken wetland specialists will also conduct a wetland delineation, identifying boundaries, types, and acreages of all aquatic resources that are under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water
Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Prior to field work, Dokken will review project-specific hydrological feature data and publicly available information from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory, U.S. Geological Survey Blue-line data, Natural Resource Conservation Service soil survey maps, aerial imagery, and topographic maps. Potential Federal and State waters contained within the survey area will be evaluated using the methodology set forth in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Wetland Delineation Manual (1987) and the Arid West Regional Delineation Supplement (2008). Findings of the delineation will be documented in an Aquatic Resources Delineation Report (ARDR) per USACE standards, and attached to the Biological Resources Report. The ARDR will be submitted to USACE during permitting of the project to support our permit applications.

**TASK 2.2 MSHCP PROJECT CONSISTENCY REVIEW REPORT**

Dokken will prepare a report to demonstrate consistency with the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The report will incorporate prior documentation, research and field surveys, and provide the determination that this project would be consistent with each of the requirements of the MSHCP. Specific evaluations will be provided for each of the plant and animal species protected under the MSHCP as well as a determination regarding their potential to occur within the project area. If the project would result in any impacts to these species, the appropriate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures prescribed by the MSHCP will be incorporated to ensure impacts to those protected species and/or their habitat are reduced to a less than significant level under CEQA.

Once the City has reviewed and approved the MSHCP Consistency Review Report, it will be submitted to the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority along with a Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) prepared by Dokken. Dokken will coordinate with the Regional Conservation Authority to obtain approval of the MSHCP Consistency Review Report DBESP discussed below.

**TASK 2.3 DETERMINATION OF BIOLOGICALLY EQUIVALENT OR SUPERIOR PRESERVATION**

Dokken shall prepare a DBESP which summarizes the unavoidable impacts to riverine/riparian habitat associated with the unnamed drainage crossing under the project area 1,000 feet north of Clay Street and proposes mitigation as defined under Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP. The DBESP will incorporate proposed mitigation measure from the Biological Resources Report and MSHCP Consistency Analysis Report but will also provide a more thorough description of any required mitigation such as off-site bank payments or on-site replanting and/or revegetation as well as any applicable USFWS and CDFW requirements for success rates and long-term monitoring.

**TASK 2.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Dokken Engineering shall conduct cultural resource evaluations in accordance with CEQA for inclusion in the environmental document. This work shall include records and literature searches, pedestrian surveys, and Native American consultation. The results of this work shall identify and evaluate any cultural resources in the project area and evaluate the potential for impacts this project could have on those resources. No standalone cultural report will be prepared; however, this information will be utilized within the Cultural Resource and Tribal Cultural Resource sections of the ISMND.

**TASK 2.4.1 RECORDS AND LITERATURE SEARCH**

A cultural resource records search will be conducted at the Eastern Information Center, located at University of California Riverside. The Information Center is the state-designated repository for records concerning cultural resources in the area. The records search will provide information on known cultural resources and on previous cultural resources investigations within a one-mile radius of the project area. Data sources that will be consulted at the Information Center include archaeological site and artifact records, historic maps, reports from previous studies, and the state's Historic Resource Inventory, which contains listings for National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, California Historical Landmarks, and California Points of Historical Interest. In addition, Dokken Engineering will complete research for the properties within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) to determine built dates for any buildings and structures.

**TASK 2.4.2 NATIVE AMERICAN COORDINATION**

Dokken will contact the City to request a list of tribes that have requested consultation under AB 52. The City will provide a list of Native American groups to contact regarding this project, and with City approval, Dokken will contact each tribe via certified mail. If responses are not received within 30 days, Dokken Engineering will consider consultation to be closed; however,
Dokken will continue to follow up via telephone and in-person meetings for any tribes wishing to consult on the project. Dokken will document all Native American consultation efforts conducted to comply with AB52 requirements in the environmental document.

**Task 2.4.3 Field Survey** | Dokken will conduct a systematic field survey of portions of the APE that are not obscured by asphalt/concrete. The ground surface will be visually examined by an archaeologist for evidence of prehistoric (Native American) or historic (non-Native American) archaeological materials and other potential historic resources (e.g., buildings, bridges, railroads, mines, or canals). To meet State standards, any previously unrecorded resources identified during the survey will be recorded on State of California DPR 523 forms.

**Task 2.5 Noise Memorandum**
Dokken will prepare a Noise Memorandum to support the CEQA environmental documentation. The Noise Memorandum will contain relevant information from the City's General Plan, which evaluated existing and future traffic conditions, and existing noise conditions as well as future noise conditions. The General Plan did identify potential noise impacts to residents along this corridor, and found that noise levels in the future would potentially exceed the thresholds of significance along Van Buren Boulevard. CEQA requires the comparison between existing noise levels and future noise levels with the proposed project. Noise modeling will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts and any necessary abatement measures. This noise modeling will utilize information in the traffic analysis contained within the Mobility Element of the General Plan, as well as additional noise measurements to be conducted by Dokken's in-house noise specialist in outdoor use areas of residents adjacent to the widening project. If soundwalls are needed, Dokken will document the proposed wall heights, locations, and a Dokken engineer will prepare cost estimates for these walls for the City's consideration.

**Task 3 Environmental Document**

**Task 3.1 Prepare Draft Environmental Documents** | Dokken will incorporate the purpose and need, project description, and the technical studies into the draft environmental document, and will prepare sections for Human Environment, Physical Environment, Biological Environment, and Cumulative Impacts. Dokken Engineering has determined a draft Initial Study with Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) under CEQA would be appropriate for this project. The City of Jurupa Valley will be the CEQA lead agency. Dokken Engineering has determined that an IS/MND is appropriate as all potentially significant impacts can be minimized or mitigated.

**Task 3.2 Notice of Availability and Circulation** | Once the draft IS/MND has been approved by the City, it will be circulated for public review for a period of 30 days. The IS/MND has a critical objective of providing a means by which the general public and responsible agencies can participate in the environmental process by providing written comments on issues addressed in the IS/MND. Dokken will coordinate the preparation of the distribution list with the County. Pursuant to CEQA requirements, Dokken will prepare a Notice of Availability for the Draft IS/MND. This notice, along with the draft environmental document, will be made available at the City office during the 30-day public circulation and review period. In addition, the document will be distributed to other reviewing government agencies through the California State Clearinghouse. During the 30-day public review period, Dokken will assist the City to hold a Public Workshop to solicit comments about the project. Dokken Engineering will attend this workshop to answer any questions regarding the project, any potential environmental impacts, as well as the environmental schedule.

**Task 3.3 Prepare Responses to Comments** | At the close of the public review period for the IS/MND, Dokken Engineering will meet with City staff to review any comments on the IS/MND that were received, and to discuss potential responses to these comments. Dokken Engineering will then formulate responses to the comments on the IS/MND. Once draft responses to comments are completed, they will be submitted to the City's staff for review and comment. The City's comments will be incorporated into the response to comments document.

**Task 3.4 Prepare Final IS/MND** | Following public review of the draft IS/MND, Dokken Engineering will incorporate all public comments and final mitigation measures into the final IS/MND document.

**Task 3.5 Document Certification Notice of Determination and Filings** | To complete the CEQA process, Dokken Engineering will file a Notice of Determination with the Riverside County Recorder's Office...
within 5 days of approval of the IS/MND (pursuant to CEQA guidelines).

**TASK 3.6 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program** | Dokken Engineering will prepare a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, to ensure that the environmental measures contained in the IS/MND are properly implemented.

**TASK 4 Permits**

The proposed project is expected to impact Waters of the U.S. and State requiring permits from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). This scope of services assumes the City will pay for all permit application fees.

**TASK 4.1 Section 404 Nationwide 14 Fill Permit** | Dokken will prepare a Preconstruction Notification (PCN) for submittal to the USACE to request authorization for the project under Nationwide Permit 14. Nationwide Permit 14 authorizes the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States for the purpose of construction, modification, or improvement of linear transportation crossings such as highways, provided the discharge does not cause the permanent loss of greater than 0.5-acre of U.S. Waters. Nationwide Permit 14 also authorizes the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States associated with temporary construction, access, and dewatering. This Nationwide Permit is subject to specific and general conditions that must be met for the project to qualify for authorization.

Dokken will prepare the PCN, which will include a project description, construction methodology, quantification of permanent and temporary impacts on waters of the United States, and information to demonstrate compliance with the specific and general conditions applicable to Nationwide Permit 14, including compliance with the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), and with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The PCN will include a copy of the delineation of waters of the United States. Dokken will coordinate directly with USACE staff to ensure the permit is obtained prior to construction bidding which will ensure all permit requirements are included in the final plans and specifications.

**TASK 4.2 Section 401 Water Quality Certification** | Dokken will prepare a Section 401 Water Quality Certification application for filing with the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. The application will include the appropriate fee; a copy of the Corps PCN; the Streambed Alteration Agreement with CDFW, or a copy of the 1602 notification package; and evidence of CEQA compliance. Issuance of a Section 401 Water Quality Certification (that may include waste discharge requirements) also generally constitutes compliance with the State Porter-Cologne Act. Dokken will coordinate directly with RWQCB staff to ensure the certification is obtained prior to construction bidding which will ensure all permit requirements are included in the final plans and specifications.

**TASK 4.3 Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement** | A Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA), in compliance with Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code, is required when a project will substantially divert, obstruct, or change the natural flow of a river, stream or lake; substantially change the bed, channel, or bank of a river, stream, or lake; or use material from a streambed. Dokken will prepare the required notification package for a SAA to be filed with CDFW. The application package will describe, among other items, the project features; construction period; construction methods; impacts on vegetation, fish and wildlife; and the proposed mitigation and restoration plan. Detailed project plans and application fee based will accompany the notification package. As with the CVRWQCB Section 401 water quality certification, CDFW will require evidence of CEQA compliance prior to issuing a SAA for the project. Dokken will coordinate directly with CDFW staff to ensure the agreement is obtained prior to construction bidding which will ensure all permit requirements are included in the final plans and specifications.
# Van Buren Boulevard Widening Environmental Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January 2020</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Award of Contract / Project Initiation [3/21/15]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Biological Resources Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cultural Field Studies and Tribal Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Noise Memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Environmental Document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulate Environmental Document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Public Comments / Finalize ISMND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt Final Environmental Document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Start (2021)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised: March 1, 2019
EXHIBIT B
PAYMENT RATES AND SCHEDULE
## Task Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Environmental Manager</th>
<th>Senior Environmental Planner</th>
<th>Assoc. Environmental Planner</th>
<th>Environmental Planner</th>
<th>Associate Engineer</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
<th>OTHER DIRECT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FULLY BURDENDED RATE</strong></td>
<td>$265.00</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$155.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TASK 1.0 PROJECT MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$10,455.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Meetings and Coordination</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$10,455.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TASK 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNICAL STUDIES</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$49,315.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Biological Resources Report</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>$16,280.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 MSHCP Project Consistency Review Report</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$3,425.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.1 Records and Literature Search</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$2,190.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.2 Native American Coordination</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$7,080.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.3 Field Survey</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$2,220.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Noise Memorandum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>$14,570.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TASK 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>$2,755.00</td>
<td>$41,115.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Prepare Draft Environmental Documents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$20,390.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Notice of Availability and Circulation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$7,910.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Prepare Responses to Comments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$4,045.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Prepare Final IS/MND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$3,685.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Document Certification Notice of Determination and Filings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,350.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$1,780.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$19,455.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Section 404 Nationwide 14 Fill Permit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>$6,485.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Section 401 Water Quality Certification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>$6,485.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Section 1902 Streambed Alteration Agreement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>$6,485.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Hours</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>$3,255.00</td>
<td>$120,340.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
<td>$8,215.00</td>
<td>$16,800.00</td>
<td>$30,510.00</td>
<td>$56,600.00</td>
<td>$4,960.00</td>
<td>$3,255.00</td>
<td>$120,340.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 21, 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.F

AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES BETWEEN THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY AND EPIC LAND SOLUTIONS, INC. FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY APPRAISAL AND ACQUISITION SERVICES FOR THE VAN BUREN BOULEVARD WIDENING, LIMONITE TO SANTA ANA RIVER PROJECT, CIP PROJECT NO. 17-B.1

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the City Council approve an agreement between Epic Land Solutions, Inc. and the City of Jurupa Valley for Right-of-Way Appraisal and Acquisition Services for the Van Buren Boulevard Widening, Limonite to Santa Ana River Project in an amount not-to-exceed $42,885 and authorize the City Manager to execute the Agreement in substantially the form attached and in such final form as approved by the City Attorney; and

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

BACKGROUND

At its meeting of April 19, 2018, the City Council approved the FY 2018-2019 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). This CIP included the Van Buren Boulevard Widening, Limonite to Santa Ana Project (Project).

The Project is currently being designed with plans roughly 30% complete. Now that the required rights-of-way have been sufficiently identified it is appropriate to begin the right-of-way process. There are a total of six (6) properties with six (6) unique owners impacted by the project. The 6 properties will all require temporary construction easements (TCE’s), while one (1) may require a small partial acquisition. No full property takes or relocations are required at this time. The total area of the necessary
right-of-way required at this time is approximately 250 square feet of partial acquisitions and 4,433 square feet of TCEs.

ANALYSIS

On November 19, 2018 the City released a Request for Proposals (RFP) for right-of-way appraisal and acquisition services for the Project. On November 29, 2018, the City issued Addendum 1, which modified the conceptual plan exhibits for the project. On December 7, 2018 the City issued Q & A Set 1, which answered all questions received during the RFP process. On December 13, 2018 the City received six (6) proposals:

- Associated Right of Way Services, Inc.
- Bender Rosenthal Incorporated
- Property Specialists, Inc. (CPSI)
- Epic Land Solutions, Inc.
- Overland, Pacific & Cutler, LLC
- Paragon Partners Ltd.

All proposals were reviewed by members of the City’s public works staff in accordance with the selection process identified in the RFP. It was determined that Epic Land Solutions, Inc. (Epic) was the most qualified firm to provide these services.

It is not known if any right of entry documents will be needed at this time, therefore it is recommended not to award the optional item included in Epic’s fee proposal at this time.

OTHER INFORMATION

Previous Actions:

- None

FINANCIAL IMPACT

A not-to-exceed fee proposal of $42,885 was negotiated with Epic Land Solutions, Inc. for the Project and determined to be fair and reasonable.

The FY 2018-2019 CIP has sufficient budget for award of this contract. The source of funds is a combination of Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) and Development Impact Fees (DIF).

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

ALTERNATIVES

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

Chase Keys
CIP Manager

Reviewed by:

Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Approved as to form:

Peter Thorson
City Attorney

Attachments:

1) Agreement, Project No. 17-B.1

Reviewed by:

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

Reviewed by:

George A. Wentz
Deputy City Manager

Submitted by:

Gary S. Thompson
City Manager
ATTACHMENT 1

Agreement, Project No. 17-B.1
AGREEMENT FOR CONSULTANT SERVICES BETWEEN THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY AND EPIC LAND SOLUTIONS, INC. FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY APPRAISAL AND ACQUISITION SERVICES FOR VAN BUREN BOULEVARD WIDENING, LIMONITE TO SANTA ANA RIVER IN THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

(PUBLIC WORKS PROFESSIONAL SERVICES)

THIS AGREEMENT is made and effective as of March 21, 2019, between the City of Jurupa Valley ("City") and Epic Land Solutions, Inc. ("Consultant"). In consideration of the mutual covenants and conditions set forth herein, the parties agree as follows:

1. **Term**

   This Agreement shall commence on March 21, 2019, and shall remain and continue in effect until tasks described herein are completed in accordance with the Scope of Services, but in no event later than June 30, 2020, unless sooner terminated pursuant to the provisions of this Agreement.

2. **Services**

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

3. **Performance**

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

4. **Payment**

   The City agrees to cause Consultant to be paid monthly, in accordance with the payment rates and terms and the schedule of payment as set forth in Exhibit B, Quotation for Service, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference as though set forth in full, based upon actual time spent on the above tasks. This amount shall not exceed forty two thousand eight hundred eighty five dollars ($42,885.00) for the total term of the Agreement unless additional payment is approved as provided in this Agreement.

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

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

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

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

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

6. **Default Of Consultant**

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

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

7. **Prevailing Wages**

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

8. Ownership Of Documents

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

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

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

9. Indemnification

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

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

10. Insurance Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

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

2) Minimum Limits of Insurance. Consultant shall maintain limits

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

11. Independent Contractor

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

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

12. Legal Responsibilities

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

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

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

14. **Assignment**

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

15. **General Provisions**

A. **Notices**

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

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

**To Consultant:**
Epic Land Solutions, Inc.
3850 Vine Street
Suite 200
Riverside, CA 92507
Attention: Karen Starr
B. **Licenses.** At all times during the term of this Agreement, Consultant shall have in full force and effect, all licenses required of it by law for the performance of the services described in this Agreement.

C. **Governing Law; Venue**

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

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

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

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

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

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

CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

____________________________________
Gary S. Thompson
City Manager

ATTEST:

____________________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM

____________________________________
Peter M. Thorson
City Attorney

EPIC LAND SOLUTIONS, INC.

By: __________________________________
Name: ______________________________
Title: ______________________________

By: __________________________________
Name: ______________________________
Title: ______________________________

[SIGNATURES OF TWO CORPORATE OFFICERS OR CORPORATE AUTHORITY RESOLUTION REQUIRED]
EXHIBIT A

SCOPE OF SERVICES
Approach to Scope of Work

Epic exists to create land solutions for the public good. Our clients’ use of real property to improve infrastructure for the public good is extremely important to us. As we provide right of way and real property services, we understand that our actions ultimately result in improvements the City has envisioned for the benefit of every person living and working in the area.

We will perform the entire Scope of Work described within the RFP. We anticipate that the right of way services delivered as part of the contract for the Van Buren Boulevard Widening, Limonite to Santa Ana River, project will include:

TITLE SERVICES

At the time of Notice to Proceed ("NTP"), Epic will obtain a Preliminary Title Report for the impacted parcels. These reports will provide information required by the appraiser when preparing the Just Compensation analysis. Title Services involve obtaining and reviewing title reports to verify ownership and identify any easements or encumbrances. One report will be obtained for contiguous parcels with the same owner. Updated preliminary title reports will be obtained as needed.

RIGHT OF WAY APPRAISAL SERVICES

Epic in-house appraisal staff will perform the real estate appraisal tasks.

Epic is one of the few firms in Southern California to have a fully staffed appraisal department in-house. Our highly qualified appraisal team works independently within the Epic organization to ensure complete objectivity and impartiality for all appraisal opinions and conclusions. Our appraisers will provide timely estimates of value for properties, conforming to the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice ("USPAP"). All appraisal assignments begin with a detailed approach to understanding property issues and basic property identifications. Appraisers then reconcile these various indications of value into a single estimate. After the appraisal has been performed, an appraisal report is provided which conforms to USPAP standards. Epic appraisers review public and private databases to analyze zoning, general plan, and other public information related to any appraisal assignment.

The Waiver Valuation process provides Agencies with an alternative valuation method to calculate the value of a specific property. An Agency may use a waiver valuation instead of a full appraisal summary report when the value of the property being acquired is estimated at $10,000 or less, and when the valuation problem is uncomplicated. Waiver Valuations can drastically reduce appraisal expenses, and can apply to any property type, not just temporary construction easements (TCEs). There is no standardized format for a waiver valuation, however the appraiser performing the waiver valuation must have sufficient understanding of the local real estate market to be qualified to make the waiver valuation, have no interest in the real property being valued, and can certify that the compensation for making the valuation waiver is not based on the amount of the valuation estimate.

Due to the anticipated impacts, we will provide 2 appraisal reports and 4 appraisal waivers for the 6 parcels within this project’s right of way. As we learn more through project kickoff and initial discovery, we will attempt to condense ownership wherever possible to preserve City funds and save budget. The appraisals will be of the land only and the contributory value of any site improvements will be estimated based on depreciated cost.

For non-structural property improvements, such as fencing, signage, pavement and landscape improvements, the appraisal report will confirm how these improvements are integrated into the project approach. The appraisal will confirm whether these improvements are either:
• Protected in place
• Replaced in like kind
• Removed and compensation provided

RIGHT OF WAY ACQUISITION NEGOTIATION SERVICES
Epic is responsible for the entire acquisition process of the 6 required parcels impacted by the Van Buren Widening project. Property acquisition services include negotiating and obtaining Temporary Construction Easements ("TCEs") and partial acquisitions.

Property acquisition requires that we negotiate with property owners or appointed representatives for the purchase of property rights in good faith, as follows:

• Offer Package Preparation
• Meet & Present Written Purchase Offers In-Person, if possible
• Good Faith Negotiation, Regular Contact and Maintain Diary Entries
• Recommendations, Counter-Offers, and Purchase Agreement Amendments
• Fair Settlement

Epic will perform the right of way acquisition services in close coordination with the City and in accordance with the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Title 49 CFR Part 24), as amended, and the URA regulations effective February 2005. Epic's acquisition personnel have a working knowledge of Chapter 13 of the Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual ("LAPM"), the Caltrans Right of Way Manual, the California Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Guidelines (Title 25, California Code of Regulations) and state Government Code 7367.2 et seq.

ESCROW/CLOSING SERVICES
Once Epic has obtained the property owner and City’s signature on acquisition agreement(s) we will open escrow and coordinate escrow requirements with property owner. Epic will help ensure that the property can be conveyed to the City without any unacceptable liens, Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CCRs) or other encumbrances. We will coordinate payment between the Grantor, City and the Escrow Company. Epic will obtain the City’s signature on Certificates of Acceptance and all other documentation necessary to convey title. At the close of the transaction, we will obtain the final title policy, review closing statements and submit closing files to the City for approval and close of escrow.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT
It is Epic’s privileged responsibility to represent the City of Jurupa Valley in the most professional and respectful manner. Epic’s Project Manager, Kari Anvick, SR/WA, will work closely with the City and its consultants to review project assignments and establish lines of communication, procedures and protocols, and will work to keep the team on track to reach goals. To manage ongoing right of way project tasks and budget, Kari and her team will:

• Develop a detailed project schedule, staffing requirements and team roster. We will maintain the schedule, project files and provide progress reports following an extensive Quality Management Plan (QMP) that serves as the backbone for every project.
• Provide the City with a roster of contact information, responsibilities and schedule of activities.
• Manage any meetings with City and its consultants through scheduling, agenda and minutes.
• Coordinate with all stakeholders, including any state oversight agencies as directed by the City.
• Oversee all activities performed under the right of way contract, which includes developing and maintaining a quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) plan, with a dedicated QA/QC manager’s oversight.
Project Management Methodology
It is Epic’s responsibility to represent the City in a professional manner. Project Manager, Kari Anvick, SR/WA, will work closely with City and its partners to manage the entire right of way scope and schedule of a given contract task order. Epic’s primary objective in quality, budget and schedule control is to avoid unpleasant surprises! To ensure the project moves as efficiently and smoothly as possible, Epic implements the following policies on all projects:

- Determine the reporting structure, key milestones and deadlines, frequency and format of status reporting, frequency of future meetings, and budget objectives.
- Create a schedule which reflects all key deadlines and ensures individual steps can be completed to meet key deadlines.
- Meet periodically throughout the project to verify the schedule and ensure target dates are feasible.
- Generate a project budget to reflect all anticipated costs. Every endeavor is made to meet the project’s financial goals. If unanticipated events occur, Epic will work with the City to determine the most effective and least costly solution.
- Define a tracking and monitoring process that will ensure that the status of each file is known and communicated.
- Deploy Epic’s standard right of way tracking database that will serve as the depository for all information. At the end of each week (or in a time frame agreed upon at the kick-off meeting), provide a status report by individual file.
- Hold status meetings on a regular basis with key stakeholders to review project issues, project schedules, evaluate project resource requirements and discuss project performance to ensure effectiveness.
- A Quality Control Assurance specialist reviews each file before it is submitted to a client to ensure compliance with the applicable funding source.
- Epic will work closely with the City to ensure expedient and cost-efficient resolution of any problems.

Optional Services (currently out of scope)
Epic can provide these optional services, if needed. These services are currently assumed to be out of scope for this project, but can be provided by Epic if needed. Fees would be determined at the time of request to perform.

- Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments
- Appraisal Reviews: At this time the project has no state or federal funding, therefore appraisal reviews and are not required. This service can be provided if the funding changes.
- Right of Entry Permits
- Eminent Domain coordination
- Utility Relocation Coordination
- Caltrans Right of Way Certification: At this time the project has no state or federal funding, therefore right of way certification is not required. This service can be provided if the funding changes.

Describe how the consultant proposes to interact with the City to ensure the services are provided and performed to the City’s satisfaction
As a service provider specializing in on-call contracts, we are adept at handling variable schedule and contract demands. We will work closely with the City throughout the entire right of way process. While we provide turn-key services that fully manages the process, we are available to meet any specific process, forms, reporting or meeting cadences the City may require.

Provide a detailed time frame and phases of the work
For a detailed project schedule by phase of work, please refer to the “Schedule” section 10 of this proposal.
10. Schedule

The Epic project team is dedicated to managing, tracking and adjusting right of way milestones as project considerations mature. Early, collaborative planning, schedule maintenance and quick recovery processes are equally important to meeting ever-changing designs and construction schedules. Epic project Managers and QA/QC specialists closely to track delivery milestones. As each right of way function is accomplished, the schedule is updated and integrated into a weekly status report. We can accommodate any start date for the City. The dates may be adjusted to fit the City’s and its engineers’ project goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Task</th>
<th>Duration (Calendar Days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notice to Proceed</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Planning</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kick-off Meeting &amp; Planning</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Preliminary Title Reports (&quot;PTRs&quot;)</td>
<td>15 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review PTRs</td>
<td>10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal/Acquisition Services</td>
<td>168 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Notice of Decision to Appraise letters</td>
<td>10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform Appraisals</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Review and Approve Just Compensation</td>
<td>1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Written Offer/Negotiations</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escrow Coordination</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open/Close Escrow</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condemnation Support (if necessary)</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine Properties to be Condemmed</td>
<td>12 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of Intent to Adopt to develop RON</td>
<td>21 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution of Necessity Hearing and Filing (Attorney)</td>
<td>45 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filling</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of Possession (90 occupied, 60 non-occupied)</td>
<td>90 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Order of Condemnation Served</td>
<td>10 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT B
PAYMENT RATES AND SCHEDULE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Right of Way Services:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Total per Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title Services: Order and Review Preliminary Title Reports (Assumes 6 reports)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Prep for Offer Packages (Assumes 6 Property Owners)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitions &amp; Negotiations (Assumes 6 Property Owners)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escrow Services Coordination (Assumes 6 Property Owners)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management (Meetings, File maintenance, File close-out, Status reports, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage/Overnight Packages</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line Data services</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Title Reports - assumes 6 @ $600 each</td>
<td>$3,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal Reports - assumes 4 appraisal waivers and 2 reports</td>
<td>$6,250.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ODC's</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,500.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL ROW SERVICES         | **$42,885.00** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional Right of Way Services:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPTIONAL Rights of Entry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Assumes 5 Property Owners)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 21, 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. 2019-16, 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.
2019-13 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 21, 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 21, 2019 the following work needs to be undertaken to complete the repair and replacement of the Limonite Avenue Road Damage:

- Closeout of emergency repairs.

The City Manager entered into the following agreement(s) on behalf of the City to repair and replace the Limonite Avenue Road Damage:

1. City of Jurupa Valley Agreement for Minor Construction and Maintenance Services, dated March 14, 2019 (with Gentry Brothers, Inc.) in the total amount of $29,657.48 for emergency culvert repair along Limonite Avenue.

As of March 14, 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:

- $10,000 from HR Green for construction management and inspection services.

OTHER INFORMATION

Previous Actions:

- March 7, 2019 – the City Council adopted Resolution 2019-14 continuing emergency repairs for Limonite Avenue.

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 $50,000. The City Manager will
seek reimbursement from State and Federal emergency funds and any parties responsible for the damage, as appropriate.
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1. Resolution No. 2019-16
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-16

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 21st 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. 2019-16 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 21st 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 21st day of March, 2019.

________________________________
Victoria Wasko, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 21, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER

BY: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM 15.A

CONSIDERATION OF GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NO. 19002 TO AMEND THE 2017 GENERAL PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT TO REFLECT CHANGES REQUESTED BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (HCD); INITIATION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE GENERAL PLAN MAP AND ZONING MAP TO IMPLEMENT THE HOUSING ELEMENT; AND RECEIVE THE GENERAL PLAN ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL

RECOMMENDATION

That the City Council approve General Plan Amendment No. 19002 to amend the 2017 General Plan Housing Element to reflect changes requested by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), initiate amendments to the General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map implement the 2017 General Plan Housing Element, and receive the General Plan Annual Progress Report.

BACKGROUND

State law requires cities and counties to update their General Plan Housing Elements every 5-8 years to address housing issues including how they will plan for their share of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). The current HCD housing needs cycle is the 5th Cycle which includes the period between October 2013 and October 2021. Municipalities were required to update their housing elements early within the time period to indicate how they can meet their housing needs within this timeline. However, the City of Jurupa Valley was unable to embark on its General Plan and Housing Element immediately following incorporation due to financial constraints, including the loss of Vehicle License Fee revenues. However, the City received two extensions from the State acknowledging the financial constraints, and the General Plan was initiated by the City Council in August of 2014 and adopted on September 7, 2017.

The Jurupa Valley Housing Element was prepared by knowledgeable staff in
conjunction with Veronica Tam & Associates, one of the premier housing consultants in the State. In addition, staff was in regular contact with HCD throughout the plan preparation process, ensuring that the State was aware of housing conditions in the City and generally supportive of the approaches being proposed to meet the City’s housing needs. The Housing Element contains two major sections, the Housing Element itself and the Housing Site Inventory and Analysis (Attachments 3 and 4). The Site Inventory and Analysis is a detailed description of existing and potential housing resources in the City and forms the basis for the policies and programs in the Housing Element.

The Housing Element includes all of the components required by state law including an analysis of population and household characteristics and needs, an inventory of land, and an analysis of governmental and non-governmental constraints to providing adequate housing. The Element also includes an analysis of how the City can meet its fair share of RHNA. RHNA is the state-mandated process to identify the total number of housing units (by affordability level) that each jurisdiction must accommodate in its Housing Element. Jurisdictions don’t have to build the housing, rather, they must ensure they have designated enough land at adequate densities to accommodate their housing allocation. The City’s 5th Cycle RHNA allocation is outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Jurupa Valley RHNA (2013-2021)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Housing Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Extremely Low Income (0-30% AMI)  
2 Very Low Income (31-50% AMI)  
3 Low Income (51-80% AMI)  
4 Moderate Income (81-120% AMI)  
5 Above Moderate Income (>120% AMI)

On November 26, 2017, staff submitted the newly-adopted Housing Element to HCD for a mandatory certification review. This is a required step for all jurisdictions following adoption of a Housing Element and allows HCD to determine whether the element is in compliance with State housing element law. During the subsequent year, staff was in communication with HCD providing information and clarification related to their review. On date, October 25, 2018, HCD sent the City a letter (Attachment 5) indicating their conditional approval of the Housing Element if certain minor amendments are made. The City Council initiated GPA No. 19002 on November 15, 2018 to address proposed changes to the Housing Element and staff gave the Planning Commission an overview of the issues during a Study Session on January 23, 2019. On February 27, 2019, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing and adopted Resolution No. 2019-02-27-01 recommending that the City Council approve GPA No. 19002 and initiate amendments to the General Plan Map and Zoning Map to implement the Housing Element. If the Council approves the proposed changes, staff will then send the amended Housing Element to HCD and anticipates a determination of conformance in
April of this year.

It should be noted that there has been recent correspondence from HCD regarding the City’s conformance with Housing Element law that has raised confusion and concern. In December of 2018, HCD sent the City of Jurupa Valley (and about 40 other cities) a letter stating the City was in noncompliance regarding the Housing Element because it had not received the adopted revised Element. In addition, on February 19, 2019, Mayor Berkson and other City Mayors without adopted housing elements were invited to a meeting with Governor Newsom to discuss barriers to housing. These actions surprised staff, inasmuch as there had not been sufficient time to complete the process following receipt of HCD’s October 25th letter of conditional approval. Subsequent communications with agency staff confirmed that HCD is aware that the City is in the process of adopting the final amendments and is satisfied with the schedule for submitting a compliant Housing Element to HCD.

**ANALYSIS**

This report addresses three items related to the 2017 General Plan Housing Element. The first item involves consideration of the amendments to the Housing Element requested by HCD that staff believes will result in a determination of conformance with state law. The second item involves a recommendation to initiate amendments to the General Plan Map and Zoning Map to identify additional sites to meet the City’s RHNA requirements. Finally, staff is in the process of preparing a General Plan Annual Progress Report to document the City’s progress in implementing its General Plan and if complete by March 21st, will present the report for review and public comment at the hearing. These items are discussed below.

1. **Amendments to the 2017 General Plan Housing Element to Reflect Changes Requested by HCD**

The paragraphs below outline the changes requested by HCD that staff believes are minor in nature and consistent with the City’s housing goals and objectives as stated in the 2017 General Plan. The changes are reflected in strikeout/underline format in Attachments 3 and 4 and are described in detail below.

   a. **Revise Table 5.33 to more accurately reflect Jurupa Valley’s progress in meeting the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).**

   Table 5.33 of the Housing Element outlines how many units could be built under the 2017 General Plan that would satisfy the City’s RHNA requirements. HCD requested that the City add additional detail to Table 5.33 to add known projects not reflected in the adopted Housing Element and provide additional detail about the development potential on other land in the City. The additional added projects include the 26 Veteran’s apartments that are being built by Habitat for Humanity, as well as those that could be built under the Rio Vista Specific Plan. HCD also asked for a more detailed breakdown of potential units that could be built in the City through new construction and reuse and/or intensification. This was based
on the Housing Site Inventory and Analysis previously mentioned and contained in Attachment 2. Revised Table 5.33 is included below.

**Table 5.33 Progress in Meeting RHNA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Capacity</th>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely/Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Units Built Since 1/1/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely/Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lennar Harvest Village</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Redesignation of Country Village Senior Apartments to HHDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely/Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Habitat for Humanity Veteran Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely/Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotals                      | 0                  | 204 | 0        | 722            | 926   |

4. Development Potential in Specific Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Extremely/Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Corridor Specific Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Meadows Ranch SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Vista SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>1,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Knolls SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotals                     | 0                  | 0   | 1,225    | 2,826          | 4,051 |

5. Development Potential on Vacant and Underutilized Parcels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Extremely/Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranch Residential (EDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Neighborhood (LDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Rural Community – Low Density Residential” (RC-LDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential (HDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Density Residential (VHDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Density Residential (HHDR)²</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotals                     | 424                | 229 | 870      | 2,587          | 4,110 |

**Total RHNA Credits (Built + Potential)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely/Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>6,135</td>
<td>9,087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RHNA Surplus/[Deficit]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely/Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>5,414</td>
<td>7,375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


²Assumes 65% of potential HHDR units on vacant or underutilized parcels (653) applied to “Very Low/Extremely Low” housing need, with the remaining potential HHDR units allocated to meet “Low Income” need.

Table 5.33 includes a number of assumptions about the income levels of different residential categories. Staff can provide additional information on
these assumptions at the hearing if desired by the City Council. However, it is important to note that HCD assumes that the highest density category will accommodate the majority of extremely low and very low income housing. In most jurisdictions, HDC maintains a minimum threshold of 30 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) as accommodating the lowest income levels. However, due to the low density and rural nature of the City, as well as its lower land costs and relative affordability compared with other jurisdictions in California, staff asked HCD to consider a 25 du/ac density (the City’s maximum density in the Highest Density Residential zone, or HHDR) to count for the lowest income categories. After extensive discussions with the State, HCD agreed with this request.

b. **Reduce the number of acres needed to be rezoned to the Highest Density Residential land use designation (HHDR) to meet regional housing needs for Extremely Low/Very Low Income housing.**

Based on the analysis of development potential in the City, the adopted Housing Element identified the need to rezone an additional 37 acres of land to HHDR. This was the amount of land needed at the highest residential density (HHDR) of 25 du/ac to generate units at the lowest income categories and ensure that the City meets its entire 5th Cycle RHNA allocation. The Housing Element also includes Program (HE 1.1.1) requiring the City to “amend the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and Map to designate at least 37 acres for residential use at HHDR density (up to 25 du/acre) to help meet Lower Income RHNA needs”.

The adopted 2017 Housing Element assumed that residential land within the City, including land designated HHDR, would develop at 80% of the maximum density and the RHNA numbers were based on that assumption. However, based on further conversations with HCD, they agreed that the City can assume the maximum residential density for the HHDR designation which in turn reduced the additional amount of HHDR land needed from 37 to 16 acres and the proposed amendment to the Housing Element revises that figure in several places. As outlined in Section 2 below, in addition to reducing the number of additional acres from 37 to 16, staff and the Planning Commission are recommending that the City Council initiate amendments to the General Plan Map and Zoning Map to identify additional high density residential sites.

c. **List specific parcels in the Adequate Sites Inventory.**

In conjunction with the refined analysis of development potential outlined above, HCD requested that the Housing Site Inventory and Analysis include more detailed information about specific parcels. These changes are reflected in strike-out/underline format in Attachment 2.

d. **Modify Housing Element Program 2.1.9 to address the removal of governmental constraints.**
HCD believes that governmental constraints are a significant impediment to the provision of housing. These constraints may include building codes, land use controls, growth management measures, development fees, processing and permit procedures, and site improvement costs. This is particularly the case in the highest density categories which the State assumes will provide the bulk of the lowest income housing. As such, HCD requests that the City strengthen Housing Element Program 2.1.9 by adding the text shown in underline format below. This will require the City to undertake an evaluation of zones that allow multi-family residential development (i.e. R-3, R-6, PUD and SP), and potentially propose changes to streamline the requirements and/or the development process.

**Program HE 2.1.9 Remove Government Constraints.** Evaluate the zoning ordinance, subdivision requirements, and other City regulations to remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing, where appropriate and legally possible. Evaluate and revise as appropriate the city's density requirements for the Highest Density Residential land use designation (HHDR) to address constraints for housing development including impacts on feasibility of proposals.

e. **Other minor changes.**

Staff identified additional minor changes to the Housing Element and Housing Site Inventory and Analysis that will be corrected in the revised document. These include additional clarifying language and changes related to formatting, references and typos.

2. **Initiation of Amendments to the General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map to Implement the 2017 General Plan Housing Element**

As outlined in Section 1.b above, the Housing Element includes a program (HE 1.1.1) requiring the City to redesignate and rezone 16 acres of land to the highest residential density (HHDR) to provide adequate acreage for lower income housing and ensure the City meets its RHNA allocation. Table 7 in the Housing Site Inventory and Analysis (Attachment 4), identifies a number of sites for potential redesignation to higher density residential designations. Staff and the Planning Commission have reanalyzed the sites in the Housing Site Inventory and identified 55 sites, totaling 196.2 acres, for potential redesignation and rezone to HHDR (Attachments 7 and 8). These sites include those that staff and the Planning Commission believe may be suited for higher density development but require additional analysis and consideration. In order to fulfill Housing Element Program 1.1.1, staff requests that the City Council initiate a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change to allow staff and the Planning Commission to more fully evaluate each of the sites and bring forward a recommendation to redesignate and rezone a minimum of 16 acres to HHDR.

3. **General Plan Annual Progress Report**

California Public Resources Code Section 65400 requires that after a legislative body, such as the City Council, has adopted general plan, the planning agency shall submit a
General Plan Annual Progress Report to the legislative body, the State Office of Planning and Research, and HCD by April 1st of each year. To date, the City of Jurupa Valley has not prepared an annual report as the City’s first General Plan was adopted in September of 2017 and the City has been in close contact with HCD since that time discussing final changes to the Housing Element. Now that the Housing Element is close to being certified as compliant by the State, staff is in the process of preparing the necessary documentation for the General Plan Annual Report. The required components of the Annual Report include:

1. The status of the General Plan and progress in its implementation
2. The City’s progress in meeting its share of regional housing needs and local efforts to remove governmental constraints
3. Data about housing production in the City for the past year including the number of housing development applications received and the number of housing units approved and disapproved
4. The degree to which the General Plan complies with the State’s General Plan Guidelines
5. A listing of sites rezoned to accommodate that portion of the City’s RHNA that was not accommodated on sites identified in the Housing Element

Some of the housing related data to be included in the report must be categorized by sales or rental price in order to establish affordability. This, and other similar types of data, have not been tracked and thus are not readily available. Staff has been researching and coordinating with other agencies to develop the required housing data for the past several months. It is not certain if this information will be available in time to include the Annual Progress Report with the March 21, 2019 agenda packet.

In order to satisfy the requirement to meet an April 1, 2019 deadline for Council review and approval, the item has been included here inasmuch as the final regular Council meeting prior to April 1st is March 21st. The report will be made available to the Council and the public as soon as possible. In the event the Council wishes to extend the time for its review and public comment, the item can be continued to a subsequent meeting.

4. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

On September 7, 2017, the Jurupa Valley City Council adopted Resolution No. 2017-14 certifying the 2017 General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) (SCH No. 2016021025) and adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations. GPA No. 19002 has been evaluated against the 2017 FEIR to ensure the changes requested by HCD do not create new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously analyzed impacts.

The City’s CEQA Administrator finds that that the analyses and conclusions in FEIR adopted by the City Council on September 7, 2017 remain valid and that the proposed minor modifications to the Housing Element do not create new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously analyzed impacts and that the project currently under review is “within the scope” of the earlier FEIR. The CEQA
Administrator has thus prepared a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination (PEDR) which documents the applicability of the 2017 FEIR to GPA No. 19002 (Attachment 6).

CONCLUSION
Staff recommends that the City Council:

1. Approve GPA No. 19002 to reflect changes requested by HCD.
2. Initiate amendments to the General Plan Map and Zoning Map to implement the Housing Element.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
Costs associated with this project are part of the Planning Department FY18/19 budget allocation.

ALTERNATIVES
1. Defer action, continue the public hearing and direct staff to provide additional information.
2. Refer the item to the Planning Commission for further study and recommendation and provide direction as needed.
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RESOLUTION NO. 2019-17

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 19002 TO AMEND THE 2017 GENERAL PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT TO REFLECT CHANGES REQUESTED BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, AND DETERMINING NO FURTHER CEQA REVIEW REQUIRED

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

Section 1. Project. The City has initiated General Plan Amendment No. 19002 to amend the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan Housing Element to reflect changes requested by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (“HCD”) the (“Project”).

Section 2. General Plan Amendment

(a) Section 9.30.010.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that any amendment to any part of the Jurupa Valley General Plan, shall be adopted in accordance with the provisions of Section 65300 et seq. of the Government Code, as now written or hereafter amended, and Chapter 9.30 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. No mandatory element of the General Plan may be amended more frequently than four (4) times during any calendar year, unless otherwise allowed by Government Code Section 65358. Subject to that limitation, an amendment may be adopted at any time, as determined by the City Council. Each amendment may include more than one change to the General Plan.

(b) Section 9.30.010.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the initiation of proceedings for the amendment of any part of the Jurupa Valley General Plan shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 9.30 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(c) Section 9.30.040.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the initiation of proceedings for any amendment pursuant to Section 9.30.040 requires an order of the City Council, adopted by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the entire membership of the City Council. The City Council may adopt an order initiating amendment proceedings at any time. The adoption of an order by the City Council initiating amendment proceedings does not require a public hearing and does not imply any such amendment will be approved.

(d) Section 9.30.040.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that either the Planning Director or the Planning Commission may recommend that the City Council adopt an order initiating proceedings for an amendment pursuant to Section 9.30.040. All such recommendations must be in writing and submitted to the City Clerk for placement on the City Council agenda as a matter not requiring a public hearing.
On November 15, 2018, upon recommendation by the Planning Director, the City Council ordered the initiation of proceedings for the General Plan Amendment No. 19002 by an affirmative vote of 5-0 of the City Council.

Section 9.30.040.E. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after adoption of an order of the City Council initiating proceedings for an amendment pursuant to Section 9.30.004, the amendment shall be processed, heard and decided in accordance with Sections 9.30.010 and 9.30.100 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

Section 9.30.100(1) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that proposals to amend the Jurupa Valley General Plan, or any part or element thereof, shall be heard by the Planning Commission during a public hearing on the matter. Notice of the public hearing shall be given pursuant to Section 9.05.040 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. If the proposed amendment to the General Plan would affect the permitted uses or intensity of uses of real property, notice of the public hearing shall also be given pursuant to Section 9.05.050 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. Further, Government Code Section 65353 provides that when a city has a planning commission authorized by local ordinance or resolution to review and recommend action on a proposed general plan, the commission shall hold at least one public hearing before approving a recommendation on the adoption of a general plan.

Section 9.30.100(2) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after closing the public hearing, the Planning Commission shall make a recommendation for approval or disapproval within a reasonable time, by resolution, including therein its findings, and transmit it to the City Council with a copy mailed to the applicant. A recommendation for approval shall be made by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the total membership of the Planning Commission. If the Planning Commission cannot reach a decision within a reasonable time after closing the hearing, that fact shall be reported to the City Council and shall be deemed a recommendation to deny the proposal. Further, Government Code Section 65354 provides that the planning commission shall make a written recommendation on the adoption of a general plan, that a recommendation for approval shall be made by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the total membership of the commission, and that the planning commission shall send its recommendation to the legislative body.

Section 9.30.100(3) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that upon receipt of a recommendation of the Planning Commission on amendment of the General Plan, the City Clerk shall set the matter for public hearing before the City Council at the earliest convenient day and shall give notice of public hearing in the same manner as notice was given of the hearing before the Planning Commission.

Section 9.30.100(4) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after closing the public hearing, the City Council shall render its decision within a reasonable time. A decision to amend the General Plan, or any part or element thereof, shall be made by resolution, which resolution shall be adopted by the affirmative vote of not less than the majority of the total membership of the City Council. The City Council may approve, modify or disapprove the recommendation of the Planning Commission; provided, however, that any substantial modification of the Planning Commission’s recommendation not previously considered by the Commission must first be referred to the Commission for its recommendation.
(k) Section 9.30.100(5) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that a proposal to amend any part or element of the General Plan may not be approved by the City Council until all procedures required by the Jurupa Valley CEQA implementing procedures to approve a matter have been completed.

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

(a) The Project 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 27, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the Project, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing. At the conclusion of the Planning Commission hearing and after due consideration of the testimony, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2019-02-27-01, recommending that the City Council approve General Plan Amendment No. 19002 to amend the 2017 General Plan Housing Element to reflect changes requested by the California Department of Housing and Community Development, initiate amendments to the General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map to implement the 2017 General Plan Housing Element, and determine that no further CEQA review is required.

(c) On March 21, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the Project, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing.

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

Section 4. **California Environmental Quality Act.** The City Council 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 General Plan Amendment No. 19002. City staff has also reviewed the Initial Study and the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) prepared for the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan (SCH #2016021025) and certified by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on September 7, 2017, 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 the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan. All potential environmental impacts
associated with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and General Plan Amendment No. 19002 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted for the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan, and the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR will reduce certain impacts to a level that is less than significant.

(b) The City Council 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 the Project 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 the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan; and

2) All potential environmental impacts associated with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and General Plan Amendment No. 19002 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan, 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 the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan, and all other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City Council’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 General Plan Amendment No. 19002. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find and determine that General Plan Amendment No. 19002 should be adopted because:

(a) The City submitted a copy of the Housing Element of the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan to HCD for a mandatory consistency review and HCD has indicated that it will certify the Housing Element if the proposed amendments are made;

(b) The Housing Element, including the proposed amendments, will guide the City’s decision-making and development processes regarding housing through 2021;

(c) The proposed amendments to the Housing Element are consistent with the City’s history, future goals, and long-term objectives;

(d) The proposed Housing Element, as amended, will be consistent with the City’s goals and objectives that support the provision of a variety of housing choices for all income levels in the City; and
(e) The proposed amendments to the Housing Element are consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan.

Section 6. Approval of General Plan Amendment No. 19002. Based on the foregoing, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby approves General Plan Amendment No. 19002 to amend the 2017 General Plan Housing Element to reflect changes requested by HCD.

Section 7. Certification. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 21st 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. 2019-17 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 21st 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 21st day of March, 2019.

___________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
EXHIBIT “A”
Previous Environmental Document
Review Determination

City of Jurupa Valley
General Plan Amendment (GPA) No. 19002

Applicant & Lead Agency
City of Jurupa Valley
8390 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
Contact: Mary P. Wright, General Plan Program Manager
(951) 332-6464
mwright@jurupavalley.org

February 19, 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 for the 2017 General Plan, SCH #2016021025, certified by the Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2017-14 on September 7, 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.

The City of Jurupa Valley comprises 45 square miles located in Western Riverside County. The City is bordered by the San Bernardino and the cities of Fontana and Colton on the north, the City of Riverside to the south and east, and the I-15 freeway and the City of Eastvale on the west. (See Exhibit 1). The 2017 General Plan and Housing Element covers the entirety of the City of Jurupa Valley.

Exhibit 1 – Map of Jurupa Valley
Project Description.

Approved Project

On September 7, 2017, the City of Jurupa Valley adopted the 2017 General Plan, including the seven elements required by State law as well as three optional elements. The Housing Element is one of the required elements and outlines how the City will accommodate housing for all income groups. The Element includes a Housing Needs Assessment which quantifies projected housing needs based on the City's share of the 'Regional Housing Needs allocation' (RHNA). It also includes a summary of resources and constraints including an analysis of population and household characteristics and needs, an inventory of land and an analysis of governmental and non-governmental constraints to providing adequate housing. The Element includes a number of policies and programs specifically designed to meet housing needs for all income levels, including affordable and market rate housing. It was prepared to meet the State's 5th Cycle Housing Element Update Planning Period from October 15, 2013 to October 15, 2021.

Proposed Project

Following adoption of the 2017 General Plan, staff submitted the Housing Element to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for a mandatory certification review. This is a required step for all jurisdictions following adoption of a Housing Element and allows HCD to determine whether the element is in compliance with State housing element law. On October 25, 2018, HCD sent the City a letter indicating they will find the Housing Element in compliance with state housing law if certain minor amendments discussed with staff are approved by the City Council. Proposed GPA No. 19002 is an amendment to the 2017 General Plan Housing Element to make the changes requested by HCD. If approved by the City Council, the revised Housing Element will be transmitted to HCD for final approval.

GPA No. 19002 includes the following changes to the 2017 General Plan Housing Element:

1. Revisions to Table 5.33 to more accurately reflect Jurupa Valley's progress in meeting the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).
2. A reduction in the number of acres needed to be rezoned to the Highest Density Residential land use designation (HHDR) to meet regional housing needs for Extremely Low/Very Low income housing.
3. A listing of specific parcels in the Adequate Sites Inventory.
4. Modifications to Housing Element Program 2.1.9 to address the removal of governmental constraints.
5. Other minor changes.

2.0 USE OF PREVIOUS EIR

The 2017 General Plan EIR was certified by the Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2017-14 on September 7, 2017. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) allows a previously adopted 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 2017 General Plan 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 Sections 4.1 through 4.17 of 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]

February 19, 2019

[City of Jurupa Valley]

[Agency]

[Date]
4.0 ANALYSIS

The analysis in Sections 4.1 through 4.17 of this document has been prepared to determine if the changes proposed by the Proposed Project are within the scope of the analysis contained in the 2017 General Plan EIR and to ensure the proposed changes do not create new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously analyzed impacts as compared to those identified previously.

4.1 Aesthetics

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined the Approved Project would have a less than significant impact on visual character, scenic resources, and light and glare, and no mitigation measures related to aesthetics were required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to aesthetics.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

The 2017 General Plan determined that the Approved Project would have no impact on the loss of forest land, zoning for forest land and the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. However, the Approved Project would have a significant impact on the conversion of agricultural land, the loss of Prime Farmland, and the cumulative loss of agriculture in the region. As there are no mitigation measures available for these impacts, they remained a significant, unmitigated impact. A Statement of Overriding Considerations prepared for the project indicated that the benefits of developing the City in accordance with the 2017 General Plan would outweigh impacts related to agriculture and farmland.

Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan 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 2017 General Plan EIR. Thus, although the impact to agricultural resources remains a significant, unmitigated impact, no new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.3 Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that General Plan goals, policies and programs will provide sufficient protection for air quality impacts of future development on nearby sensitive receptors, would protect from adverse odors and would be consistent with the overall goals and intent of the AQMP. Therefore, impacts related to those issues were determined to be less than significant and no mitigation was deemed to be necessary.
The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that the Approved Project will help reduce programmatic air quality impacts from future land uses (i.e., air pollutants generated by new development) but will not be able to reduce impacts from future development to less than significant levels when compared to SCAQMD daily thresholds. Future development projects may exceed SCAQMD daily thresholds even with project-specific mitigation, so this long-term impact remains significant and no additional feasible mitigation is available at a programmatic level. A Statement of Overriding Considerations prepared for the project indicated that the benefits of developing the City in accordance with the 2017 General Plan would outweigh impacts related to air quality.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan 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 2017 General Plan EIR. Thus, although the impact to air quality remains a significant, unmitigated impact, no new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.4 Biological Resources

The 2017 General Plan determined that implementation of the General Plan would have no impact related to local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Furthermore, the General Plan would have a less than significant impact on habitat modifications, impacts to threatened habitat and species, and other biological considerations. As impacts would be less than significant, no mitigation related to biological resources was required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to biological resources.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.5 Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that the General Plan contains adequate goals, policies and programs to ensure that build-out under the General Plan would not adversely affect archaeological resources, tribal cultural resources or human remains. In addition, mitigation measures were incorporated into the 2017 General Plan EIR to ensure that impacts related to potential historic and paleontological resources would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not change the assessment of cultural and tribal cultural resource impacts in the 2017 General Plan EIR. In addition, mitigation measures related to historic and paleontological resources would remain in effect and no additional mitigation measures are needed.
4.6 Geology and Soils

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that the Approved Project could have a significant impact related to geology and soils. However, with the incorporation of mitigation measures involving site specific geotechnical investigations for individual projects, impacts related to geology and soils would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not change the assessment of geology and soils impacts in the 2017 General Plan EIR. In addition, mitigation measures related to geology and soils would remain in effect and no additional mitigation measures are needed.

4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions and climate change were less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Mitigation Measure 4.7.5.2A requires that the City prepare and adopt a Climate Action Plan (CAP) specifically for the City of Jurupa Valley, including a 2030 reduction target and local emission inventory. With the incorporation of Mitigation Measure 4.7.5.2A, impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions and climate change would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to greenhouse gas emissions and climate change.

4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that the Approved Project would not have a potentially significant impact related to hazards and hazardous materials and no mitigation would be required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to hazards and hazardous materials.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that impacts related to hydrology and water quality were less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Mitigation Measure 4.9.5.6A requires that non-residential development projects be required to mechanically sweep their parking areas once every two weeks to minimize the amount of particulate matter entering surface and groundwater resources.
The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to hydrology and water quality.

4.10 Land Use and Planning

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that impacts related to land use and planning were less than significant and no mitigation measures were required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to land use and planning.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.11 Mineral Resources

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that impacts related to mineral resources were less than significant and no mitigation measures were required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to mineral resources.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.12 Noise

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that the Approved Project will not be able to reduce impacts related to long-term noise levels in exceedance of City standards or traffic related noise levels along several major roadways. A Statement of Overriding Considerations prepared for the project indicated that the benefits of developing the City in accordance with the 2017 General Plan would outweigh impacts related to noise.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan 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 2017 General Plan EIR. Thus, although the impact to noise remains a significant, unmitigated impact, no new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.13 Population and Housing

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that impacts related to population and housing was less than significant and no mitigation measures were required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to population and housing.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.14 Public Services

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that impacts related to public services was less than significant and no mitigation measures were required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to public services.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.15 Recreation and Parks

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that impacts related to recreation and parks were less than significant and no mitigation measures were required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to recreation and parks.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.16 Transportation and Traffic

The 2017 General Plan determined that the Approved Project would have a significant unmitigable impact related to roadway and cumulative levels of service. A Statement of Overriding Considerations prepared for the project indicated that the benefits of developing the City in accordance with the 2017 General Plan would outweigh impacts related to transportation and traffic.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan 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 2017 General Plan EIR. Thus, although the impact to transportation and traffic remains a significant, unmitigated impact, no new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.17 Utilities and Service Systems

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that impacts related to utilities and service systems were less than significant and no mitigation measures were required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to utilities and service systems.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Conclusion

Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan 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 2017 General Plan EIR.
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-02-27-01

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY APPROVE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 19002 TO AMEND THE 2017 GENERAL PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT TO REFLECT CHANGES REQUESTED BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND INITIATE AMENDMENTS TO THE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE MAP AND ZONING MAP TO IMPLEMENT THE 2017 GENERAL PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT, AND DETERMINING NO FURTHER CEQA REVIEW REQUIRED

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

Section 1. Project. The City has initiated General Plan Amendment No. 19002 to amend the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan Housing Element to reflect changes requested by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (“HCD”) the (“Project”). Planning Department staff is also recommending the initiation of implementation actions for affordable housing items in the Housing Element.

Section 2. General Plan Amendment.

(a) The City has initiated General Plan Amendment No. 19002 to amend the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan Housing Element to reflect changes requested by HCD.

(b) Section 9.30.010.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that any amendment to any part of the Jurupa Valley General Plan, shall be adopted in accordance with the provisions of Section 65300 et seq. of the Government Code, as now written or hereafter amended, and Chapter 9.30 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. No mandatory element of the General Plan may be amended more frequently than four (4) times during any calendar year, unless otherwise allowed by Government Code Section 65358. Subject to that limitation, an amendment may be adopted at any time, as determined by the City Council. Each amendment may include more than one change to the General Plan.

(c) Section 9.30.010.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the initiation of proceedings for the amendment of any part of the Jurupa Valley General Plan shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 9.30 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(d) Section 9.30.040.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the initiation of proceedings for any amendment pursuant to Section 9.30.040 requires an order of the City Council, adopted by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the entire
membership of the City Council. The City Council may adopt an order initiating amendment proceedings at any time. The adoption of an order by the City Council initiating amendment proceedings does not require a public hearing and does not imply any such amendment will be approved.

(e) Section 9.30.040.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that either the Planning Director or the Planning Commission may recommend that the City Council adopt an order initiating proceedings for an amendment pursuant to Section 9.30.040. All such recommendations must be in writing and submitted to the City Clerk for placement on the City Council agenda as a matter not requiring a public hearing.

(f) On November 15, 2018, upon recommendation by the Planning Director, the City Council ordered the initiation of proceedings for the General Plan Amendment No. 19002 by an affirmative vote of 5-0 of the City Council.

(g) Section 9.30.040.E. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after adoption of an order of the City Council initiating proceedings for an amendment pursuant to Section 9.30.004, the amendment shall be processed, heard and decided in accordance with Sections 9.30.010 and 9.30.100 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(h) Section 9.30.100(1) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that proposals to amend the Jurupa Valley General Plan, or any part or element thereof, shall be heard by the Planning Commission during a public hearing on the matter. Notice of the public hearing shall be given pursuant to Section 9.05.040 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. If the proposed amendment to the General Plan would affect the permitted uses or intensity of uses of real property, notice of the public hearing shall also be given pursuant to Section 9.05.050 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. Further, Government Code Section 65353 provides that when a city has a planning commission authorized by local ordinance or resolution to review and recommend action on a proposed general plan, the commission shall hold at least one public hearing before approving a recommendation on the adoption of a general plan.

(i) Section 9.30.100(2) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after closing the public hearing, the Planning Commission shall make a recommendation for approval or disapproval within a reasonable time, by resolution, including therein its findings, and transmit it to the City Council with a copy mailed to the applicant. A recommendation for approval shall be made by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the total membership of the Planning Commission. If the Planning Commission cannot reach a decision within a reasonable time after closing the hearing, that fact shall be reported to the City Council and shall be deemed a recommendation to deny the proposal. Further, Government Code Section 65354 provides that the planning commission shall make a written recommendation on the adoption of a general plan, that a recommendation for approval shall be made by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the total membership of the commission, and that the planning commission shall send its recommendation to the legislative body.

Section 3. Initiation of General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map Amendments.
The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council initiate amendments to the City’s Official General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map to implement actions for affordable housing items in the Housing Element.

1) The 2017 Housing Element includes Program HE 1.1.1 requiring the City to “amend the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and Map to designate at least 37 acres for residential use at HHDR density (up to 25 du/acre) to help meet Lower Income RHNA needs”.

2) General Plan Amendment No. 19002, if adopted, will modify Housing Element Program HE 1.1.1 to reduce the amount of land needed to be re-designated and re-zoned highest density residential (“HHDR”) from thirty-seven (37) to sixteen (16) acres.

3) The Housing Element Site Inventory and Analysis identifies several sites for potential re-designation and re-zoning to meet the requirement set forth in Program HE 1.1.1.

(b) Section 9.30.010.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that any amendment to any part of the Jurupa Valley General Plan, shall be adopted in accordance with the provisions of Section 65300 et seq. of the Government Code, as now written or hereafter amended, and Chapter 9.30 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. No mandatory element of the General Plan may be amended more frequently than four (4) times during any calendar year, unless otherwise allowed by Government Code Section 65358. Subject to that limitation, an amendment may be adopted at any time, as determined by the City Council. Each amendment may include more than one change to the General Plan.

(c) Section 9.30.010.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the initiation of proceedings for the amendment of any part of the Jurupa Valley General Plan shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 9.30 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(d) Section 9.30.040.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the initiation of proceedings for any amendment pursuant to Section 9.30.040 requires an order of the City Council, adopted by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the entire membership of the City Council. The City Council may adopt an order initiating amendment proceedings at any time. The adoption of an order by the City Council initiating amendment proceedings does not require a public hearing and does not imply any such amendment will be approved.

(e) Section 9.30.040.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that either the Planning Director or the Planning Commission may recommend that the City Council adopt an order initiating proceedings for an amendment pursuant to Section 9.30.040. All such recommendations must be in writing and submitted to the City Clerk for placement on the City Council agenda as a matter not requiring a public hearing.

Section 4. Procedural Findings. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that:
(a) The Project was processed including, but not limited to, a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

(b) On February 27, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the Project, 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 5. California Environmental Quality Act. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby recommends that the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley make the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Project:

(a) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the City’s local CEQA Guidelines, City staff has considered the potential environmental impacts of General Plan Amendment No. 19002. City staff has also reviewed the Initial Study and the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) prepared for the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan (SCH #2016021025) and certified by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on September 7, 2017, 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 the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan. All potential environmental impacts associated with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and General Plan Amendment No. 19002 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted for the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan, and the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR will reduce certain impacts to a level that is less than significant.

(b) The City Council 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 the Project 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 the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan; and
2) All potential environmental impacts associated with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and General Plan Amendment No. 19002 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan, 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 the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan, and all other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City Council’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 6. **Findings for Recommendation of Approval of General Plan Amendment No. 19002.** The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby recommend that the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley find and determine that General Plan Amendment No. 19002 should be adopted because:

(a) The City submitted a copy of the Housing Element of the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan to HCD for a mandatory consistency review and HCD has indicated that it will certify the Housing Element if the proposed amendments are made;

(b) The Housing Element, including the proposed amendments, will guide the City’s decision-making and development processes regarding housing through 2021;

(c) The proposed amendments to the Housing Element are consistent with the City’s history, future goals, and long-term objectives;

(d) The proposed Housing Element, as amended, will be consistent with the City’s goals and objectives that support the provision of a variety of housing choices for all income levels in the City; and

(e) The proposed amendments to the Housing Element are consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan.

Section 7. **Findings for Recommendation of Initiation of General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map Amendments.** No findings are required under the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code to recommend the initiation of General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map amendments.

Section 8. **Recommendation of Approval of General Plan Amendment No. 19002 and of Initiation of General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map Amendments.** Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby recommends that the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley:

(a) Approve General Plan Amendment No. 19002 to amend the 2017 General Plan Housing Element to reflect changes requested by HCD; and
(b) Initiate amendments to the General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map to identify sites in the Housing Element Site Inventory to implement Program HE 1.1.1. in the Housing Element, as described in Section 3(a) of this Resolution.

Section 9. 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 27th 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. 2019-02-27-01 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 27th 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, AICP
PLANNING DIRECTOR
5 – HOUSING ELEMENT

A. INTRODUCTION

This Housing Element identifies the housing needs and goals, policies, and programs for Jurupa Valley, and promotes expanded housing opportunities, community safety, prosperity, and quality of life for all, consistent with Jurupa Valley’s adopted Community Values Statement, included in Appendix 8.0.

This Housing Element was prepared to establish a strategy to meet this young City’s housing needs for all income levels, including affordable and market-rate housing. This Housing Element was prepared to meet the State of California’s 5th Cycle Housing Element Update Planning Period from October 15, 2013 to October 15, 2021. The primary issues addressed include: 1) the provision of a decent housing in a healthy environment for all income levels, 2) affordable housing for special needs populations, 3) implementation of housing programs, 4) rehabilitation and preservation of existing affordable housing, and 5) removal of blight. Housing is a key part of the City’s overall economic development efforts to improve and expand its housing stock, improve property values, diversify the employment base, and improve the quality of life for all residents.

This update is part of a larger effort to prepare Jurupa Valley’s inaugural General Plan. The City intends to update this element no
later than October 2021, or as required by law. All elements must remain consistent when revisions to the General Plan are complete. To ensure consistency, elements to be updated will be made consistent with the Housing Element, and any needed changes will be made to this document. In addition, as portions of the 2017 General Plan are amended following adoption, the City will periodically review all the elements to ensure that internal consistency is maintained. Housing Elements are to be reviewed and updated every 7 years, or as otherwise required under state law.

**Primary Goals**

HE 1: Encourage and where possible, assist in the development of quality housing to meet the City’s share of the region’s housing needs for all income levels and for special needs populations.

HE 2: Conserve and improve the housing stock, particularly housing affordable to lower income and special needs households.

HE 3: Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons.

HE 4: Maintain and enhance residential neighborhoods and remove blight.

HE 5: Reduce residential energy and water use.

**Policy and Program Sections**

1. Introduction
2. What’s New in This Housing Element
3. Background
4. Housing Action Plan
5. Quantified Housing Objectives
6. Housing Element Goals, Policies, and Programs
7. Community Profile
8. Housing Inventory and Market Conditions
9. Existing Housing Needs
10. Housing Constraints

**Attachments Appendices**

A Housing Sites Inventory and Analysis
B Public Meetings Input
C General Plan Advisory Committee Report
B. WHAT’S NEW IN THIS HOUSING ELEMENT?

The following key findings and policy recommendations address comments received from the General Plan Advisory Body (GPAC), residents and property owners, and City decision-makers:

Continuance of the Inclusionary Housing Program

Since the last Housing Element update, housing costs in western Riverside County have risen dramatically. Inclusionary housing is a policy ensuring that a portion of new housing units are reserved for working persons of modest means who already live in or wish to move to the community, such as teachers, police and fire personnel, health care workers, sales clerks, and administrative support staff. Jurupa Valley intends to work with Riverside County to continue and update an existing Inclusionary Housing Program (IHP) previously administered by the County of Riverside.

The IHP will help ensure that a portion of new housing units are affordable to working-class residents with incomes up to 80% of the area-wide median income (AMI), which is about $65,000 per year in Riverside County in 2017. This program requires that 1 out of every 25 new units (4%) be reserved for households at the 50% AMI income level. Projects of six or more units are required to participate in the program. These affordable units must be provided on-site, off-site, or through the payment of an in-lieu fee. These fees are combined with other sources of funds, such as Low Income Tax Credit funding, and are used to assist in providing additional affordable housing opportunities in the City. The program is not expected to significantly affect market rate housing projects and will, at the same time, allow the City to address its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).

Emphasis on Incentives and Grants Rather than Regulations

Generally, incentives are preferable to regulations as the means to facilitate the production of housing for all income levels. Although state law requires cities to regulate development in many respects, this Housing Element emphasizes incentives to encourage the production of lower-cost housing. Among these possible incentives are modifications to development standards, reduced development fees, expedited permit processing and direct financial assistance from in-lieu IHP fees, non-profit housing developers, and state or federal grants.
Neighborhood Improvements and Removal of Blight

Jurupa Valley includes nine distinct communities with varied settings, housing types, and housing needs. Some neighborhoods in the older communities of Rubidoux, Mira Loma, Belltown, and Glen Avon consist mostly of pre-1980s houses, many with deferred maintenance and code compliance issues; a lack of storm water drainage and other public improvements; and localized blighted areas caused by accumulated trash, illegal dumping, and graffiti. These conditions can discourage reinvestment in these areas, lower property values, and detract from neighborhoods’ safety and appearance. It is a primary goal of this young city to reverse urban blight and improve residential neighborhood quality and pride through code enforcement, public and private capital investment, and heightened awareness and attention to community needs.

Reduce Homelessness

In the 2015 Point-In-Time Count conducted by Riverside County, 168 unsheltered, homeless individuals were documented in the City of Jurupa Valley. After the City of Riverside, this is the second highest number of homeless persons among incorporated and unincorporated areas in Riverside County. Most of the homeless persons are residing in and near the Santa Ana River Basin, which runs along the City’s east and south boundaries. As described in Appendix 13.0, the causes of homelessness are varied and complex, and not readily resolved. In addition to complying with SB 2 regarding suitable zoning for a homeless shelter (the City has already set aside a zone that allows homeless shelters without discretionary review), the Housing Element includes a program calling for the City to actively work with neighboring jurisdictions to achieve regional cooperation to reduce homelessness.

Increased Emphasis on Energy-Efficient Development

In the years since the last Housing Element update, energy costs have risen dramatically, and it has become clear that we must take steps as a society to make more efficient use of our natural resources. While local governments are limited in the impact they can have in this area, there are some significant steps cities can take to support this goal. The Housing Element contains new policies encouraging sustainable design and resource conservation in both new construction and remodeling projects.
C. BACKGROUND

The Housing Element of the General Plan is only one facet of a City’s planning program. The California Government Code requires that General Plans contain an integrated, consistent set of goals and policies. This Housing Element helps shape and is influenced by policies contained in the other nine Elements of this General Plan; particularly the Land Use Element, which establishes the location, type, intensity, and distribution of land uses throughout the City, and by the Mobility Element, which establishes policies for the movement of people, goods, and services throughout the City.

State Housing Element Requirements

State law requires the preparation of a Housing Element as part of a jurisdiction’s General Plan (California Government Code §65302(c)). It is the primary planning guide for local jurisdictions to identify and prioritize housing needs and to determine ways to meet these needs best while balancing community objectives and resources. The 2017 Housing Element consists of ten sections, including: 1) Introduction, 2) Housing Inventory and Market Conditions, 3) Housing Needs, 4) Housing Constraints, and 5) Housing Action Plan. Attachment A in this Housing Element contains background details regarding the City’s inventory of sites for housing development.

The California State Housing Law (California Health and Safety Code, Division 13, Part 1.5) and guidelines adopted by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), were used in the preparation of the element (California Government Code §65585). Periodic review of the element is required to evaluate 1) the appropriateness of its goals, objectives, and policies in contributing to the attainment of the state housing goals, 2) its effectiveness in attaining the City’s housing goals and objectives and 3) the progress of its implementation (California Government Code §65588).

The preparation of the Housing Element is regulated by Title 7, Chapter 3, Article 10.6, §65580 through §65589.8 of the California Government Code. The law governing the contents of Housing Elements is among the most detailed of all elements of the General Plan. According to Section 65583 of the Government Code, “The Housing Element shall consist of an identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, financial resources, and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing. The housing element shall identify adequate sites for housing, including rental housing, factory-built housing, mobile homes, and emergency shelters, and shall make adequate provision for the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.”
Consistency with Other Elements of the General Plan

This Housing Element builds upon the other General Plan elements and is consistent with the policies and proposals set forth in them. By law, general plans must be internally consistent. Therefore, proposed amendments to any element must be evaluated against the other General Plan elements to ensure that no conflicts occur.

The Housing Element was last updated as part of the Riverside County General Plan in 2008. When the City of Jurupa Valley incorporated in 2011, the new City adopted the County’s General Plan, including the Housing Element. The 2017 Housing Element is the City’s first locally prepared housing element and is being developed as part of its new 2017 General Plan.

Housing must be viewed in a context that includes more than the availability of adequate shelter. External factors affecting the adequacy of housing include the quality of public services, aesthetics and visual characteristics, and proximity to related land uses. For example, the location of housing often determines the extent of school, park, library, police, fire, and other services associated with housing.

Housing Element Organization

The Housing Element is divided into ten sections. The first two sections provide an overview of the contents, scope, and purpose of the Housing Element. The third and fourth sections summarize the City’s Action Plan to address housing needs and issues and lay out the City’s housing construction objectives. The fifth and sixth sections contain the City’s housing goals and policies and the programs to implement these goals and policies. The seventh and eighth sections contain the Community profile and the Housing Inventory and Profile, which provides an overview of population, employment, and housing characteristics in Jurupa Valley. The ninth and tenth sections describe the City’s housing needs, opportunities, and constraints.

In addition, this element addresses the mandatory housing element sections required under state law, as summarized below.

- An assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints related to meeting these needs.
- An analysis and program for preserving assisted housing developments.
- A statement of community goals, quantified objectives, and policies relative to the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing.
A program that sets forth a 5-year schedule of actions that the City is undertaking, or intends to undertake, in implementing the policies set forth in the Housing Element.

Public Participation
Public participation was an essential part of the preparation of the Housing Element update. The update process provided residents and other interested parties numerous opportunities for review and comment. During preparation of this element, public participation and input was actively encouraged in a number of ways. The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) was particularly valuable in developing housing policies and programs, particularly with regard to identifying community values, housing needs and priorities. For example, GPAC identified the City’s diverse housing stock as one of Jurupa Valley’s greatest assets. Members cited the City’s mix of new and established residential neighborhoods, its mix of housing types and costs, and the mix of semi-rural, large-lot residential areas with conventional suburban neighborhoods as positive housing assets. Primary housing needs were identified as: 1) affordable housing, particularly for seniors and first-time homebuyers; 2) quality multi-family housing, including apartments and condominiums; and 3) large lot homes suitable for equestrian/animal keeping. In terms of multi-family housing, most Committee members felt it should: 4) be located close to jobs, commercial centers, and major thoroughfares, and 5) include high-quality patio or garden homes near parks. In terms of meeting special housing needs, Committee members generally supported: 6) more senior housing, including independent living and assisted living centers; 7) housing for homeless persons; and 8) safe housing for single heads of households and children. Committee members also identified several areas where mixed-use housing might be appropriate, including: 9) along Mission Boulevard; 10) in old town Rubidoux and Glen Avon; 11) near retail centers; and 12) near the Metrolink Station and freeway access areas. This input formed the basis of Policies 1.2, 1.6, 1.8, 2.2, 2.7, and Programs 1.1.5, 1.1.13, 1.1.15, 2.1.1, 2.1.3. and 4.1.2, among others.

The outreach effort included:
- Early in the update process, the City held eight public workshops to solicit community ideas, concerns, and perspectives on planning issues in Jurupa Valley, including housing. Workshops were held throughout the City at various times to reach a wide audience, and a broad cross section of residents was represented. A summary of the input received is included in Attachment 5B.
- The City Council appointed an ad hoc General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) to work with staff and consultants in...
developing the 2017 General Plan. During that 1-year-long effort, the 31-member Committee reviewed a wide range of general plan issues, including housing—during its monthly public meetings. The Final Report of GPAC’s findings and recommendations is included as Attachment 5C.

- The Planning Commission conducted a study session to review existing policies in the 2011 Housing Element and identified those that should remain, should be modified, or were no longer relevant to the City and should be deleted.
- On February 18, 2016, the City Council and the Planning Commission held a joint study session on the Housing Element. The public meeting included an introduction to the Housing Element and key housing issues in Jurupa Valley. Minutes from the meeting are included as Attachment 5B.
- A public workshop on the City’s housing conditions, issues, and needs was held on March 10, 2016. Over 150 housing agencies, advocates, non-profits, business and real estate groups, and interested citizens received direct mail notice. A summary of topics discussed and input received is included as Attachment 5B.
- The Planning Commission and City Council held over 40 advertised public meetings on the Draft 2017 General Plan, during which land use, housing, and/or community needs and concerns were discussed.

Announcements of all Housing Element committee meetings and public hearing notices were published in the local newspaper in advance of each meeting, typically in Spanish and English, as well as posting the notices on the City’s website. The draft Housing Element was made available for review at City Hall, and posted on the City’s website. The document was also circulated to housing advocates and nonprofit organizations representing the interests of lower-income persons and special needs groups. After receiving comments on the draft Housing Element from the California Department of Housing and Community Development a proposed final Housing Element was prepared and made available for public review prior to adoption by the City Council.

**Evaluation of the Previous Housing Element**

Per California Government Code §65588, “Each local government shall review its housing element as frequently as appropriate to evaluate all of the following: (1) The appropriateness of the housing goals, objectives, and policies in contributing to the attainment of the state housing goal; (2) The effectiveness of the housing element in attainment of the community’s housing goals and objectives; And
The City of Jurupa Valley incorporated on July 1, 2011 and adopted the County of Riverside Housing Element at that time. As a recently incorporated city, Jurupa Valley did not adopt a new 4th Cycle housing element after incorporation, and received a time extension to complete its first locally prepared General Plan and Housing Element. Consequently, the City has not completed a review of the previous housing element.

D. HOUSING ACTION PLAN

An important component of the Housing Element is the City’s description of what it hopes to achieve during the current planning period. This is accomplished with a statement of goals, policies, actions, and quantified objectives on the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing to help meet the housing needs of all residents. The legislative requirements for what must be included in the Action Plan are as follows:

- Improvement and conservation of housing, including affordable housing stock [§65583(b) and §65583(c)(4)];
- Production of housing as set forth in the goals and quantified objectives [§65583(b)];
- Assist in the development of housing to meet the needs of very low, low and moderate income households [§65583(c)(2)];
- Address, and where possible, remove governmental constraints [§65583(c)(3)];
- Adequate sites for housing [§65583(c)(1)];
- Adequate provision of housing for existing and projected needs, including regional share, for all economic segments of the community [§65583(c)];
- Promotion of equal housing opportunities for all persons [§65583 (c)(6)];
- Preserve assisted housing at risk of converting to non-low income uses [§65583(c)(6)].

This section of the Housing Element presents the City’s Housing Action Plan for the period 2014-2021. The objectives and actions described in Table 5.1 below reflect the assessment of the City’s housing needs and summarize Housing Element programs, responsible parties, and anticipated time frames for their implementation. Time frames are intended to be achieved unless determined by the City Council to be infeasible due to budget or staffing constraints.
### Table 5.1: Housing Action Plan Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal HE 1:</strong> Encourage and where possible, assist in the development of quality housing to meet the City's share of the region's housing needs for all income levels and for special needs populations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and Map designate sufficient land at appropriate densities and in appropriate locations to accommodate the City's fair share of regional housing needs.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.1. <strong>General Plan and Zoning Amendments.</strong> Amend General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and Map to designate at least 16.67 acres for residential use at HHDH density (up to 25 du/acre) to help meet Lower Income RHNA needs. The Land Use Map will be amended concurrently with the 2017 General Plan. Zoning Ordinance amendments shall be initiated within 1 year of adopting the new General Plan.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Concurrent with Zoning Ordinance update for consistency with 2017 General Plan or within 18 months of General Plan adoption, whichever comes first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide incentives to encourage development of Opportunity Sites and adaptive reuse of properties in all Residential Zones, with emphasis on Medium-High, High, Very High, and Highest Density Residential zones.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.2. <strong>Housing Authority Coordination.</strong> Coordinate with the Riverside County Housing Authority to pursue grant funding and other incentives to promote and assist the non-profit and/or private production of housing affordable to lower income households. Utilize public financing tools when available, including revenue bonds, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME, and Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program funds.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing, 2017-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage construction of multi-family housing affordable to moderate and lower income households.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.3. <strong>Tax Exempt Bonds.</strong> Consider using tax-exempt revenue bonds to help finance new multi-family construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve mobile homes and encourage their maintenance and improvement as affordable housing for seniors, disabled persons and lower income households, and to maintain and enhance neighborhood quality and safety.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.4. <strong>Mobile Homeowner Assistance.</strong> As resources allow, use federal and state grant funds, when available, to assist seniors, veterans and other lower income households purchase and/or improve mobile homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage and assist the feasibility of private development of affordable housing for lower income households and special needs groups.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.5. <strong>Affordable Housing Incentives.</strong> Consider establishing incentives for developers of new housing that is affordable to lower income households and special needs groups, such as: fast track/priority application and permit processing, density bonuses and/or fee waivers, assist affordable housing developers with right-of-way acquisition, off-site infrastructure improvements and other development costs, and assist in securing federal or state housing financing resources. Incentives should be considered for new housing developments of 100 or more units in which at least 15% of total units are sold or rented at prices affordable to households with incomes below 80% of the Riverside County Area Median Income (AMI).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concurrent with Zoning Ordinance update for consistency with 2017 General Plan or within 18 months of General Plan adoption, whichever comes first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain consistency with state law and encourage production of smaller, affordable housing where appropriate.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.6. <strong>Density Provisions.</strong> Update the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and General Plan density provisions to ensure consistency with state law, including minimum density requirements and density bonuses, as required by state law, to encourage production of smaller, affordable housing, particularly in Town Centers and in higher density, mixed-use and other areas where appropriate and compatible with adjacent development.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Concurrent with Zoning Ordinance update for consistency with 2017 General Plan or within 18 months of General Plan adoption, whichever comes first. CDBG and HOME funds coordination is annual and ongoing. *Ongoing, 2017-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage and assist the feasibility of private development of affordable housing for lower income households and special needs groups.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.7. <strong>City Development Fees.</strong> Develop a sliding scale Fee Assistance program where the amount and type of City development fees may be waived by the City Council based on the number of affordable units proposed (i.e., as the number of affordable units increases, the amount of fee waiver increases).</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Ongoing, 2017-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize grant funding to assist in the development of affordable housing and to improve neighborhoods.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.8. <strong>CDBG and HOME Funds.</strong> When available, use CDBG; HOME and other grant or housing trust funds to write down costs of acquiring sites and to offset infrastructure and construction costs for residential developments in which at least 15% of total units are sold or rented at prices affordable to households with incomes below 80% of the Riverside County Area Median Income (AMI).</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Ongoing, 2017-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage and assist the feasibility of private development of affordable housing for lower income households and special needs groups.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.9. <strong>Site Identification.</strong> Work with public, private and non-profit housing entities to identify candidate sites for new construction of rental housing for seniors and other special housing needs, and take all actions necessary to expedite processing and approval of such projects.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Ongoing, 2017-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist developers, decision makers and the public in identifying housing opportunities.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.10. <strong>Residential Incentive Zone (R-6).</strong> Update and continue to encourage development of affordable housing in the R-6 zone, and other multi-family residential zones, where appropriate. Utilize incentives for development as established in Ordinance 348, or in the 2017 General Plan and subsequent Zoning Ordinance amendments.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Ongoing, 2017-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist developers, decision-makers and the public in identifying housing opportunities.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.11. <strong>Updated Land Use Inventory and Map.</strong> Establish and maintain a Land Use Inventory and a map that provide a mechanism to monitor a) acreage and location by General Plan designation, b) vacant and underutilized land, and c) build-out of approved projects utilizing the City’s GIS system and supported by mapping. Maintain the Land Use Inventory on a regular basis, as frequently as budget allows.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Ongoing, 2017-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HE 1.1.12. <strong>Candidate Sites.</strong> Encourage developers to identify vacant and underutilized properties as candidate sites for affordable or mixed market rate/affordable housing development and identify them in the Land Use Inventory.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Ongoing, 2017-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a shelter to help meet local needs for safe housing for homeless adults and children.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.13. Homeless Shelter. In cooperation with non-profit organizations, adjacent cities, and with Riverside County, encourage the development of a homeless shelter to meet Jurupa Valley’s and adjacent communities’ homeless shelter needs. Consider tax incentives and other financial incentives to encourage homeless shelter development.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Concurrent with Zoning Ordinance update for consistency with 2017 General Plan or within 18 months of Housing Element certification, whichever comes first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address the broad range of needs of homeless persons.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.14. Homelessness Strategy. Until a permanent shelter or shelters can be established, the City shall work with Riverside County and local housing agencies to help prepare a homelessness strategy to address immediate needs dealing with safety, health and sanitation, environmental health, temporary housing, and access to homeless services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide government incentives to promote creative, private- and public sector housing products, particularly for lower income households.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.15. Creative Housing Solutions. Provide incentives to encourage development of a range of creative and affordable housing types to accommodate homeless persons, seniors, disabled persons, and other low and extremely low-income populations, such as single room occupancy dwellings (SROs), pre-fabricated housing, so-called “tiny houses,” and other emerging housing products. Potential incentives include priority permit processing, fee waivers or deferrals, flexible development standards, supporting or assisting with funding applications, and coordinating with housing developers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concurrent with Zoning Ordinance update for consistency with 2017 General Plan or within 18 months of General Plan adoption, whichever comes first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage and coordinate activities of non-profit housing providers in Jurupa Valley.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.16. Coordination with Non-Profit Housing Providers. Continue to work with non-profit organizations, such as National Community Renaissance, Mary Erickson Housing, and Habitat for Humanity, in the production of affordable and self-help housing for moderate and lower income households.</td>
<td></td>
<td>City will consult with non-profit housing providers at least annually and on an on-going basis as part of its annual HOME and CDBG outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage and assist the feasibility of developing high-quality housing that meets a wide range of housing needs, tenure and budgets.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.17. Flexible Standards. Continue to provide for flexibility in the design of residential development through the processing of planned unit developments (PUDs), area and specific plans, and town center plans, and through the application of Zoning Ordinance provisions allowing flexible lot sizes and development standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing, 2017-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comply with new state law and to provide housing that meets the needs and budgets for small households, such as single parent families, adult children, seniors.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.18. Accessory or Second Dwelling Units. Update the Municipal Code to allow “Accessory Dwelling Units” in compliance with state law within 1 year of Housing Element adoption.</td>
<td>Concurrent with Zoning Ordinance update for consistency with 2017 General Plan, no later than within 1 years of Housing Element certification, or within 18 months of General Plan adoption, whichever comes first.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve mobile homes and encourage their maintenance and improvement as affordable housing, and allow for the construction or expansion of high-quality mobile home parks.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.19. Mobile and Manufactured Homes. Continue to allow mobile homes, modular and manufactured homes in single-family residential zones “by right,” and mobile home parks subject to a CUP, and encourage construction of new mobile home parks and manufactured housing to increase the supply of affordable dwelling units, where appropriate.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Ongoing, 2017-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage and assist the feasibility of developing high-quality housing that meets a wide range of housing needs, tenure and budgets.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.20. Mixed Housing Types and Densities. Encourage residential development proposals to provide a range of housing types and densities for all income levels, including market rate housing, using creative planning concepts such as traditional neighborhood design, planned unit developments, area and specific plans, and mixed-use development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote accessible housing that meets the needs of disabled persons and other persons with special needs.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.21. Accessible Housing for Disabled Persons. Encourage single- and multi-family housing developers to designate accessible and/or adaptable units already required by law to be affordable to persons with disabilities or persons with special needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote accessible housing that meets the needs of disabled persons and other persons with special needs.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.22. Universal Design. Encourage “universal design” features in new dwellings, such as level entries, wider paths of travel, larger bathrooms, and lower kitchen countertops to accommodate persons with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote accessible housing that meets the needs of disabled persons and other persons with special needs.</td>
<td>HE 1.1.23. Affordable Housing for Disabled Persons. Encourage, and as budget allows, help support programs providing increased opportunities for disabled persons in affordable residential units rehabilitated or constructed through City or County programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL HE 2: Conserve and improve the housing stock, particularly housing affordable to lower income and special housing needs households.</strong></td>
<td><strong>HE 2.1.1. Infrastructure.</strong> As budget allows, City shall include sufficient resources for adequate maintenance of public facilities such as streets, sidewalks, and drainage in the City's capital improvement program and encourage community services districts to do likewise.</td>
<td>Engineering and Public Works Department; Community Services Districts</td>
<td>Ongoing, 2017-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and improve the overall quality, safety and appearance of Jurupa Valley's housing stock.</td>
<td><strong>HE 2.1.2. Adaptive Housing Strategies.</strong> Support creative strategies for the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of residential, commercial, and industrial structures for housing, if appropriate.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserve housing resources, particularly for historic resources and to provide cost- and resource-efficient, high quality affordable housing.</td>
<td><strong>HE 2.1.3. Code Enforcement.</strong> Ensure that housing is maintained through code enforcement activities. Continue to administer the Code Enforcement Program to eliminate unsafe, illegal, and substandard conditions in residential neighborhoods and residential properties.</td>
<td>Building and Code Enforcement Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect public health, safety and neighborhood quality for all persons; administer codes in a fair, consistent and community-responsive manner.</td>
<td><strong>HE 2.1.4. Affordable Mobile Homes Conservation.</strong> Conserve affordable mobile home housing stock and help bring such housing up to code through mobile home loan and improvement grants funded by CDBG and other funds, as available.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Ongoing, 2017-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve mobile homes and encourage their maintenance and improvement as affordable housing for seniors, disabled persons and lower income households, and to maintain and enhance neighborhood quality and safety.</td>
<td><strong>HE 2.1.5. Bilingual Outreach.</strong> As resources allow, provide bilingual outreach materials and activities to educate and inform the community about available housing rehabilitation programs and resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer all persons and equal opportunity to participate in planning and housing decisions that affect them.</td>
<td><strong>HE 2.1.6. Monitor Assisted Units.</strong> Help ensure that affordable housing assisted with public funds remains affordable for the required time through maintenance of an inventory of assisted units which is monitored for expiration of assisted housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve publicly assisted affordable housing that is at risk of being converted to market-rate and losing its affordability provisions.</td>
<td><strong>HE 2.1.7. Preserve At-Risk Housing Units.</strong> Preserve grant-assisted, bond-financed, density bonus or other types of affordable units at risk of conversion to market rate during the planning period by 1) purchase the units using state, federal or local financing and/or subsidies, 2) assist with low or no interest loans for rehabilitation, as budget allows, 3) support bond refinancing, and 4) refer the project sponsor to other federal or local sources of below-market financing. City shall also ensure compliance with state noticing and tenant education requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve affordable housing as required by the funding agency or source of funds providing assistance to the project.</td>
<td><strong>HE 2.1.8 Affordability Covenants.</strong> As a condition of project approval, require new affordable housing projects to remain affordable for a specific time, consistent with and as required by the funding program(s) in which they participate, through covenants with the project proponent, Housing Authority or other housing agency.</td>
<td>Planning Department, assisted by Building and Engineering Departments</td>
<td>Annually, starting the second year within 2 years following 2017 General Plan Update adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove or mitigate governmental constraints to housing such as outdated, unnecessary, conflicting and excessive requirements.</td>
<td><strong>HE 2.1.9 Remove Government Constraints.</strong> Evaluate the zoning ordinance, subdivision requirements, and other City regulations to remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing, where appropriate and legally possible. Evaluate and revise as appropriate the City’s density requirements for the Highest Density Residential land use designation (HHDR) to address constraints for housing development including impacts on feasibility of proposals.</td>
<td>Planning Department, assisted by Building and Engineering Departments</td>
<td>Annually, starting the second year within 2 years following 2017 General Plan Update adoption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL HE 3: Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons.**

<p>| Help ensure that all persons are treated fairly and have access to housing which meets their needs and budget. | <strong>HE 3.1.1. Fair Housing Council.</strong> Utilize the services of the Fair Housing Council of Riverside County to implement a number of programs, including: 1) audits of lending institutions and rental establishments, 2) education and training of City staff, and 3) fair housing outreach and education regarding fair housing laws and resources. | Planning Department | Ongoing, 2017-2021 |
| Help ensure that all persons are treated fairly and have access to housing which meets their needs and budget. | <strong>HE 3.1.2. Education and Outreach.</strong> Continue to use the services of the Fair Housing Council to provide education and outreach services to the public in both Spanish and English (also see HE 3.1.1 above). | Planning Department | Ongoing, 2017-2021 |
| Preserve existing public housing. | <strong>HE 3.1.3. Public Housing and Rental Assistance.</strong> Encourage Riverside County to continue to maintain 300+ public housing units and continue to assist very low-income recipients in Jurupa Valley with Section 8 rental assistance vouchers. | Planning Department | Ongoing, 2017-2021 |
| Explore innovative financing strategies to assist first time homebuyers. | <strong>HE 3.1.4. First-Time Homebuyers Assistance.</strong> Explore the feasibility of developing a new First Time Home Buyer Down Payment Assistance Program, utilizing tax-exempt mortgage revenue bonds to finance mortgages and down payment assistance for single-family homes for very low and low income first time homebuyers. | Planning Department | Ongoing, 2017-2021 |
| Explore innovative financing strategies to assist first time homebuyers. | <strong>HE 3.1.5. Lease/Purchase Home Ownership Program.</strong> Encourage the Housing Authority to continue the Lease/Purchase Home Ownership Assistance Program, which assists potential homeowners in leasing a property while moving towards ownership at the end of 3 years. | Planning Department | Ongoing, 2017-2021 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodate new market rate housing to diversify the housing stock,</td>
<td>HE 3.1.6. <strong>Housing Variety.</strong> Facilitate new market rate residential projects that provide a variety of housing types and densities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase property values, increase median income and create the elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for prosperity for all households.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide safe pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle linkages between</td>
<td>HE 3.1.7. <strong>Neighborhood Connectivity.</strong> Require new residential neighborhoods to interconnect with existing neighborhoods to provide for social interaction, assure pedestrian-friendly connectivity, and minimize vehicle trips.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighborhoods; promote walkability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure new multi-family housing meets the same high quality standards for</td>
<td>HE 3.1.8. <strong>Multi-Family Dwellings Standards.</strong> Establish standards for multiple-family dwellings that will achieve comparable recreation and open space opportunities, protection from sources of noise and degraded air quality, adequate access to public services and facilities and parking that apply to single-family housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality and environmental health that other housing types must meet for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all income levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure fair treatment of all persons in securing safe housing and to</td>
<td>HE 3.1.9. <strong>Amend the Zoning Ordinance.</strong> Amend the Zoning Ordinance to expand housing opportunities, as required by state and federal law, including but not limited to: amending the definition of “Family,” removing the minimum distance requirement between emergency shelters, permitting multi-family development without discretionary land use approval, providing reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities, and encouraging development of a variety of housing for all income levels, such as manufactured housing, rental housing, mobile homes, single-room occupancy housing, employee housing and transitional and supportive housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concurrent with Zoning Ordinance update for consistency with 2017 General Plan or within 1 year of <strong>Housing Element certification</strong>, <strong>General Plan adoption</strong>, whichever comes first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promote equal housing opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL HE 4: Maintain and enhance residential neighborhoods and remove blight.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the quality of life in all residential areas and promote residents’</td>
<td>HE 4.1.1. <strong>Neighborhood Participation.</strong> Implement varied strategies to ensure residents are aware of and able to participate in planning decisions affecting their neighborhoods early in the planning process, such as neighborhood meetings, City Council member visits, and town hall meetings.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Ongoing, 2017-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active involvement in and support for neighborhood pride and improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 4.1.2. <strong>Neighborhood Needs.</strong> Identify specific neighborhood needs,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems, trends, and opportunities for improvements. Work directly with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighborhood groups and individuals to address concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 4.1.3. <strong>Neighborhood Improvements.</strong> As budget allows, help fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighborhood improvements, such as street paving or repairs, sidewalks,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedestrian and equestrian trails, crosswalks, parkways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a pro-active code enforcement program to identify housing in need of repair and make owners aware of resources for financial assistance</td>
<td><strong>HE 4.1.4. Neighborhood Pride.</strong> Working with Riverside County, CSDs and non-profit housing entities, develop and promote a Neighborhood Pride Program including cooperative projects with Code Enforcement staff, and Public Works projects in target areas, as funding allows.</td>
<td>Planning Code Enforcement Public Works</td>
<td>Within 18 months of Housing Element certification Ongoing, 2017-2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL HE 5: Reduce residential energy and water use.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HE 5.1.1. Incentives.</strong> Consider establishing incentives for energy conservation above and beyond the requirements of Title 24, such as priority permit processing or reduced permit fees on a sliding scale Fee Assistance Program, as budget allows.</td>
<td>Building, Planning and Engineering</td>
<td>Ongoing, 2017-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HE 5.1.2. Energy Programs for Lower Income Households.</strong> Encourage and participate in Riverside County’s and utility providers’ programs to reduce maintenance and energy costs for households with low incomes, and increase efforts to inform the public about available cost-saving, energy conservation programs.</td>
<td>Engineering Department, assisted by Planning and Building Departments.</td>
<td>Ongoing, 2017-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HE 5.1.3. Energy Conservation Grants.</strong> Pursue grant funds for energy rehab costs and consumer education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HE 5.1.4. City Requests for Proposals.</strong> City RFPs, contracts, and bidding procedures capital projects and programs shall incorporate energy conservation and sustainability measures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HE 5.1.5. City Facilities.</strong> Utilize energy/water saving measures in City-owned buildings and facilities, including landscaping, to meet industry sustainable design standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HE 5.1.6. Sustainable Design.</strong> Adopt sustainable design policies, standards and codes that result in attractive, energy efficient, neighborhoods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Quantified Housing Objectives

The City’s quantified objectives for new construction, rehabilitation and conservation are presented in Table 5.2. It is the City’s overarching objective to ensure that all residents have decent, safe, sanitary, and affordable housing, regardless of income, and that their neighborhoods are protected from conditions that lead to blight. This element’s goals, policies, and programs are the City’s primary tools to help meet housing and neighborhood quality needs and to achieve the City’s Quantified Objectives – 2014-2021 (Table 5.2 below).

Table 5.2: Quantified Objectives – 2014-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Ex. Low</th>
<th>V. Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Construction*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Quantified objective for new construction is for the period 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021 per the RHNA

F. Housing Element Goals, Policies, and Programs

The condition, availability, and cost of Jurupa Valley’s housing stock are of vital importance to its residents and employers, and the City’s economy as a whole. The primary housing goals are meeting housing needs for all income groups, including market rate housing needs, housing conservation and improvement, equal housing opportunity, neighborhood improvement and removal of blight, energy conservation, and housing policy implementation. Policies and programs for each goal are described below.

Goals

HE 1 Encourage and, where possible, assist in the development of quality housing to meet the City’s share of the region’s housing needs for all income levels and for special needs populations.

HE 2 Conserve and improve the housing stock, particularly housing affordable to lower income and special housing needs households.

HE 3 Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons.

HE 4 Maintain and enhance residential neighborhoods and remove blight.

HE 5 Reduce residential energy and water use.
Policies and Programs
HE 1 – Encourage Development of Quality Housing That Meets the City’s Affordable Housing Needs

Policies

HE 1.1 Regional Housing Needs Allocation. Changes to the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance and Map shall provide and/or maintain sufficient land at appropriate densities to meet the City’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation for the 2014-2021 Planning Period.

HE 1.2 Affordable Housing. To encourage affordable residential development on sites zoned to allow multi-family residential uses and identified in the vacant land inventory, the City will adopt development incentives and standards to encourage lot consolidation, and to allow residential development at a density of up to 25 dwelling units per acre in the Highest Density Residential (HHDR) designation, where appropriate.

HE 1.3 Preservation of Affordable Housing. All residential development projects that receive City financial incentives shall be required to remain affordable, in compliance with the specific requirements of the program in which they participate.

HE 1.4 Availability of Suitable Sites. Ensure the availability of suitable sites for the development of affordable housing to meet the needs of all household income levels, including special needs populations.

HE 1.5 Housing for Mentally Disabled. Encourage the development of additional housing for the mentally disabled.

HE 1.6 Housing for Homeless Persons. In cooperation with other cities and/or the County of Riverside, assist in the development of emergency, transitional, and permanent supportive housing for homeless persons and families.

HE 1.7 Self-Help Housing. City will promote self-help housing programs (e.g., Habitat for Humanity) and, as budget allows, provide financial assistance.

HE 1.8 Innovative Housing. Encourage innovative housing, site plan design, and construction techniques to promote new affordable housing, improve energy efficiency, and reduce housing costs.
HE 1.9 **Starter Housing.** Consider allowing construction of high quality “starter housing” (single-family units up to 1,600 square feet) on smaller lots in Medium-High Density and High Density zones, and consider providing incentives such as flexible development standards, permit fast tracking, and City fee reductions.

### Programs

**HE 1.1.1 General Plan and Zoning Amendments.** Amend General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and Map to designate at least 16.37 acres for residential use at HHDR density (up to 25 du/acre) to help meet Lower Income RHNA needs. The Land Use Map will be amended concurrently with the 2017 General Plan. Zoning Ordinance amendments shall be initiated within 1 year of adopting the new General Plan.

**HE 1.1.2 Housing Authority Coordination.** Coordinate with the Riverside County Housing Authority to pursue grant funding and other incentives to promote and assist the non-profit and/or private production of housing affordable to lower income households. Utilize public financing tools when available, including revenue bonds, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME, and Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program funds.

**HE 1.1.3 Tax Exempt Bonds.** Consider using tax-exempt revenue bonds to help finance new multi-family construction.

**HE 1.1.4 Mobile Homeowner Assistance.** As resources allow, use federal and state grant funds, when available, to assist seniors, veterans and other lower income households purchase and/or improve mobile homes.

**HE 1.1.5 Affordable Housing Incentives.** Consider establishing incentives for developers of new housing that is affordable to lower income households and special needs groups, such as: fast track/priority application and permit processing, density bonuses and/or fee waivers, assist affordable housing developers with right-of-way acquisition, off-site infrastructure improvements and other development costs, and assist in securing federal or state housing financing resources. Incentives should be considered for new housing developments of 100 or more units in which at least 15% of total units are sold or rented at prices affordable to households with incomes below 80% of the Riverside County Area Median Income (AMI).
HE 1.1.6 **Density Provisions.** Update the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and General Plan density provisions to ensure consistency with state law, including minimum density requirements and density bonuses, as required by state law, to encourage production of smaller, affordable housing, particularly in Town Centers and in higher density, mixed-use and other areas where appropriate and compatible with adjacent development.

HE 1.1.7 **City Development Fees.** Develop a sliding scale Fee Assistance program where the amount and type of City development fees may be waived by the City Council based on the number of affordable units proposed (i.e., as the number of affordable units increases, the amount of fee waiver increases).

HE 1.1.8 **CDBG and HOME Funds.** When available, use CDBG; HOME and other grant or housing trust funds to write down costs of acquiring sites and to offset infrastructure and construction costs for residential developments in which at least 15% of total units are sold or rented at prices affordable to households with incomes below 80% of the Riverside County Area Median Income (AMI).

HE 1.1.9 **Site Identification.** Work with public, private and non-profit housing entities to identify candidate sites for new construction of rental housing for seniors and other special housing needs, and take all actions necessary to expedite processing and approval of such projects.

HE 1.1.10 **Residential Incentive Zone (R-6).** Update and continue to encourage development of affordable housing in the R-6 zone, and other multi-family residential zones, where appropriate. Utilize incentives for development as established in Ordinance 348, or in the 2017 General Plan and subsequent Zoning Ordinance amendments.

HE 1.1.11 **Updated Land Use Inventory and Map.** Establish and maintain a Land Use Inventory and a map that provide a mechanism to monitor a) acreage and location by General Plan designation, b) vacant and underutilized land, and c) build-out of approved projects utilizing the City’s GIS system and supported by mapping. Maintain the Land Use Inventory on a regular basis, as frequently as budget allows.

HE 1.1.12 **Candidate Sites.** Encourage developers to identify vacant and underutilized properties as candidate sites for affordable or mixed market rate/affordable housing development and identify them in the Land Use Inventory.
HE 1.1.13 **Homeless Shelter.** In cooperation with non-profit organizations, adjacent cities, and with Riverside County, encourage the development of a homeless shelter to meet Jurupa Valley’s and adjacent communities’ homeless shelter needs. Consider tax incentives and other financial incentives to encourage homeless shelter development.

HE 1.1.14 **Homelessness Strategy.** Until a permanent shelter or shelters can be established, the City shall work with Riverside County and local housing agencies to help prepare a homelessness strategy to address immediate needs dealing with safety, health and sanitation, environmental health, temporary housing, and access to homeless services.

HE 1.1.15 **Creative Housing Solutions.** Provide incentives to encourage development of a range of creative and affordable housing types to accommodate homeless persons, seniors, disabled persons, and other low and extremely low-income populations, such as single room occupancy dwellings (SROs), pre-fabricated housing, so-called “tiny houses,” and other emerging housing products. Potential incentives include priority permit processing, fee waivers or deferrals, flexible development standards, supporting or assisting with funding applications, and coordinating with housing developers.

HE 1.1.16 **Coordination with Non-Profit Housing Providers.** Continue to work with non-profit organizations, such as National Community Renaissance, Mary Erickson Housing, and Habitat for Humanity, in the production of affordable and self-help housing for moderate and lower income households.

HE 1.1.17 **Flexible Standards.** Continue to provide for flexibility in the design of residential development through the processing of planned unit developments (PUDs), area and specific plans, and town center plans, and through the application of Zoning Ordinance provisions allowing flexible lot sizes and development standards.

HE 1.1.18 **Accessory or Second Dwelling Units.** Update the Municipal Code to allow “Accessory Dwelling Units” in compliance with state law within 1 year of Housing Element adoption.

HE 1.1.19 **Mobile and Manufactured Homes.** Continue to allow mobile homes, modular and manufactured homes in single-family residential zones “by right,” and mobile home parks subject to a CUP, and encourage
construction of new mobile home parks and manufactured housing to increase the supply of affordable dwelling units, where appropriate.

**HE 1.1.20 Mixed Housing Types and Densities.** Encourage residential development proposals to provide a range of housing types and densities for all income levels, including market rate housing, using creative planning concepts such as traditional neighborhood design, planned unit developments, area and specific plans, and mixed-use development.

**HE 1.1.21 Accessible Housing for Disabled Persons.** Encourage single- and multi-family housing developers to designate accessible and/or adaptable units already required by law to be affordable to persons with disabilities or persons with special needs.

**HE 1.1.22 Universal Design.** Encourage “universal design” features in new dwellings, such as level entries, wider paths of travel, larger bathrooms, and lower kitchen countertops to accommodate persons with disabilities.

**HE 1.1.23 Affordable Housing for Disabled Persons.** Encourage, and as budget allows, help support programs providing increased opportunities for disabled persons in affordable residential units rehabilitated or constructed through City or County programs.

**HE 2 – Conserve and Improve the Housing Stock, Particularly Housing Affordable to Lower Income and Special Housing Needs Households**

**Policies**

**HE 2.1 Retain Housing.** Where feasible and appropriate, older, sound housing should be retained, rehabilitated, and maintained as a significant part of the City’s affordable housing stock, rather than demolishing it. Demolition of non-historic housing may be permitted where conservation of existing housing would preclude the achievement of other housing objectives or adopted City goals.

**HE 2.2 Removal of Affordable Housing.** Discourage the removal or replacement of sound housing that is affordable to extremely low, very-low, low- and moderate income households, and avoid discretionary approvals or other municipal actions that remove or adversely impact such housing unless: 1) it can be demonstrated that rehabilitation of lower-cost units at risk of replacement
is financially or physically infeasible, or 2) an equivalent number of new units comparable or better in affordability and amenities to those being replaced is provided, or 3) the project will remove substandard, blighted, or unsafe housing.

**HE 2.3 Public Housing.** Encourage the Riverside County Housing Authority to pursue federal and state funds to modernize public housing affordable to very low and low-income households.

**HE 2.4 Tax-Exempt Bonds.** Consider using tax-exempt private activity bonds for the financing of multi-family housing rehabilitation.

**HE 2.5 Historic Residential Properties.** Consider adopting incentives for the preservation of historic residential structures, such as the Mills Act Program, which provides property tax relief for rehabilitation of historic properties, as well as grants for the identification of historic structures.

**HE 2.6 Housing Rehabilitation Funding.** Pursue all available federal, state, and local funds to assist housing rehabilitation.

**HE 2.7 Neighborhood Quality.** The condition and quality of residential neighborhoods is a key measure of a community’s housing health. The City will consider and promote the safety, appearance, and quality of residential neighborhoods by preserving the fabric, amenities, spacing (i.e., building heights and setbacks), and overall character and quality of life in established neighborhoods.

**HE 2.8 At-Risk Housing Preservation.** Work with Riverside County Housing Authority and other housing agencies to preserve the affordability of assisted housing and other affordable housing resources at risk of conversion to market rate housing utilizing federal, state, and local financing and subsidies, as City resources allow.

**Programs**

**HE 2.1.1 Infrastructure.** As budget allows, City shall include sufficient resources for adequate maintenance of public facilities such as streets, sidewalks, and drainage in the City’s capital improvement program and encourage community services districts to do likewise.

**HE 2.1.2 Adaptive Housing Strategies.** Support creative strategies for the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of residential,
commercial, and industrial structures for housing, if appropriate.

HE 2.1.3 **Code Enforcement.** Ensure that housing is maintained through code enforcement activities. Continue to administer the Code Enforcement Program to eliminate unsafe, illegal, and substandard conditions in residential neighborhoods and residential properties.

HE 2.1.4 **Affordable Mobile Homes Conservation.** Conserve affordable mobile home housing stock and help bring such housing up to code through mobile home loan and improvement grants funded by CDBG and other funds, as available.

HE 2.1.5 **Bilingual Outreach.** As resources allow, provide bilingual outreach materials and activities to educate and inform the community about available housing rehabilitation programs and resources.

HE 2.1.6 **Monitor Assisted Units.** Help ensure that affordable housing assisted with public funds remains affordable for the required time through maintenance of an inventory of assisted units which is monitored for expiration of assisted housing.

HE 2.1.7 **Preserve At-Risk Housing Units.** Preserve grant-assisted, bond-financed, density bonus or other types of affordable units at risk of conversion to market rate during the planning period by 1) working with the Riverside County Housing Authority or other nonprofit housing entities to 1) purchase the units using state, federal or local financing and/or subsidies, 2) assist with low or no interest loans for rehabilitation, as budget allows, 3) support bond refinancing, and 4) refer the project sponsor to other federal or local sources of below-market financing. City shall also ensure compliance with state noticing and tenant education requirements.

HE 2.1.8 **Affordability Covenants.** As a condition of project approval, require new affordable housing projects to remain affordable for a specific time, consistent with and as required by the funding program(s) in which they participate, through covenants with the project proponent, Housing Authority or other housing agency.

HE 2.1.9 **Remove Government Constraints.** Evaluate the zoning ordinance, subdivision requirements, and other City regulations to remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing, where appropriate and legally possible. Evaluate and revise as appropriate the city’s density requirements for the Highest Density Residential land use designation (HHDR) to address constraints for
housing development including impacts on feasibility of proposals.

**HE 3 – Promote Equal Housing Opportunities for All Persons**

**Policies**

**HE 3.1**  
**Fair Housing Program.** Continue to support fair housing laws and organizations that provide fair housing information and enforcement.

**HE 3.2**  
**Housing Information.** Provide referrals to low-income households and households with special housing needs on how to obtain housing counseling, financing, and other housing information.

**HE 3.3**  
**Housing Opportunities for Seniors, Disabled Persons and Veterans.** Encourage and, as budget allows, help support programs and activities that promote affordable housing opportunities for seniors, disabled persons, and veterans.

**Programs**

**HE 3.1.1**  
**Fair Housing Council.** Utilize the services of the Fair Housing Council of Riverside County to implement a number of programs, including: 1) audits of lending institutions and rental establishments, 2) education and training of City staff, and 3) fair housing outreach and education regarding fair housing laws and resources.

**HE 3.1.2**  
**Education and Outreach.** Continue to use the services of the Fair Housing Council to provide education and outreach services to the public in both Spanish and English (also see HE 3.1.1 above).

**HE 3.1.3**  
**Public Housing and Rental Assistance.** Encourage Riverside County to continue to maintain 300+ public housing units and continue to assist very low-income recipients in Jurupa Valley with Section 8 rental assistance vouchers.

**HE 3.1.4**  
**First-Time Homebuyers Assistance.** Explore the feasibility of developing a new First Time Home Buyer Down Payment Assistance Program, utilizing tax-exempt mortgage revenue bonds to finance mortgages and down payment assistance for single-family homes for very low and low income first time homebuyers.

**HE 3.1.5**  
**Lease/Purchase Home Ownership Program.** Encourage the Housing Authority to continue the Lease/Purchase Home Ownership Assistance Program, which assists potential homeowners in leasing a property while moving towards ownership at the end of 3 years.
HE 3.1.6 **Housing Variety.** Facilitate new market rate residential projects that provide a variety of housing types and densities.

HE 3.1.7 **Neighborhood Connectivity.** Require new residential neighborhoods to interconnect with existing neighborhoods to provide for social interaction, assure pedestrian-friendly connectivity and minimize vehicle trips.

HE 3.1.8 **Multi-Family Dwellings Standards.** Establish standards for multiple-family dwellings that will achieve comparable recreation and open space opportunities, protection from sources of noise and degraded air quality, adequate access to public services and facilities and parking that apply to single-family housing.

HE 3.1.9 **Amend the Zoning Ordinance.** Amend the Zoning Ordinance to expand housing opportunities, as required by state and federal law, including but not limited to: amending the definition of “Family” to comply with state and federal law, removing the minimum distance requirement between emergency shelters, permitting multi-family development without discretionary land use approval, providing reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities, and encouraging development of a variety of housing for all income levels, such as manufactured housing, rental housing, mobile homes, single-room occupancy housing, employee housing and transitional and supportive housing.

HE 4 – Maintain and Enhance Residential Neighborhoods and Remove Blight

**Policies**

HE 4.1 **Removal of Blight.** As part of development approvals, City budget and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) program and other municipal actions, give high priority to removing and reversing the effects of blight, particularly in residential neighborhoods and highly visible locations along major street and highway corridors. Within established neighborhoods, new residential development shall be of a character, scale, and quality that preserve the neighborhood character and maintain the quality of life for existing and future residents.

HE 4.2 **Design Compatibility.** Higher density housing should maintain high quality standards for unit design, privacy, security, on-site amenities, and public and private open space. Such standards should be flexible enough to allow innovative and affordable design solutions and shall be designed to enhance prevailing neighborhood architectural and site character.
HE 4.3 **Neighborhood Integration.** New neighborhoods should be an integral part of an existing neighborhood or should establish pedestrian, bicycle, and, where appropriate, equestrian linkages that provide direct, convenient, and safe access to adjacent neighborhoods, schools, parks and shopping.

**Programs**

HE 4.1.1 **Neighborhood Participation.** Implement varied strategies to ensure residents are aware of and able to participate in planning decisions affecting their neighborhoods early in the planning process, such as neighborhood meetings, City Council member visits, and town hall meetings.

HE 4.1.2 **Neighborhood Needs.** Identify specific neighborhood needs, problems, trends, and opportunities for improvements. Work directly with neighborhood groups and individuals to address concerns.

HE 4.1.3 **Neighborhood Improvements.** As budget allows, help fund neighborhood improvements, such as street paving or repairs, sidewalks, pedestrian and equestrian trails, crosswalks, parkways, street trees and other public facilities to improve aesthetics, safety, and accessibility.

HE 4.1.4 **Neighborhood Pride.** Working with Riverside County, CSDs and non-profit housing entities, develop and promote a Neighborhood Pride Program including cooperative projects with Code Enforcement staff, and Public Works projects in target areas, as funding allows.

**HE 5 – Reduce Residential Energy and Water Use**

**Policies**

HE 5.1 **New Construction.** Encourage the development of dwellings with energy-efficient designs, utilizing passive and active solar features and energy-saving features that exceed minimum requirements in state law.

HE 5.2 **Sustainable Design.** Residential developments should promote sustainability in their design, placement, and use. Sustainability can be promoted through a variety of housing strategies, including the following:

1. Maximize use of renewable, recycled-content and recycled materials, and minimize use of building materials that require high levels of energy to produce or that cause significant, adverse environmental impacts.
2. Incorporate renewable energy features into new homes, including passive solar design, solar hot water, solar power, and natural ventilation and cooling.
3. Minimize thermal island effects through reduction of heat-absorbing pavement and increased tree shading.
4. Avoid building materials that may contribute to health problems through the release of gases or glass fibers into indoor air.
5. Design dwellings for quiet, indoors and out, including appropriate noise mitigation for residential uses near noise sources such as highways, major streets, railroad tracks, and industrial uses.
6. Design dwellings to be economical to live in due to reduced energy or resource use, ease of maintenance, floor area, or durability of materials.
7. Help inform residents, staff, and builders of the advantages and methods of sustainable design, and thereby develop consumer demand for sustainable housing.
8. Consider adopting a sustainable development rating system, such as the LEED® or Green Globes program.

**HE 5.3 Site and Neighborhood Design.** Residential site, subdivision, and neighborhood designs should consider sustainability. Some ways to do this include:

1. Design subdivisions to maximize solar access for each dwelling and site.
2. Design sites so residents have usable outdoor space with access to sun and shade.
3. Streets and access ways should minimize pavement devoted to vehicular use.
4. Use multi-purpose neighborhood “pocket parks”/retention basins to purify street runoff prior to its entering creeks. Retention basins shall be designed to be visually attractive as well as functional. Fenced-off retention basins should be avoided.
5. Encourage cluster developments with dwellings grouped around significantly sized, shared open space in return for City approval of smaller individual lots.
6. Treat public streets as landscaped parkways, using continuous plantings at least 6 feet wide and, where feasible, median planters to enhance, define, and buffer residential neighborhoods of all densities from the effects of vehicle traffic.
Programs

HE 5.1.1 Incentives. Consider establishing incentives for energy conservation above and beyond the requirements of Title 24, such as priority permit processing or reduced permit fees on a sliding scale Fee Assistance Program, as budget allows.

HE 5.1.2 Energy Programs for Lower Income Households. Encourage and participate in Riverside County’s and utility providers’ programs to reduce maintenance and energy costs for households with low incomes, and increase efforts to inform the public about available cost-saving, energy conservation programs.

HE 5.1.3 Energy Conservation Grants. Pursue grant funds for energy rehab costs and consumer education.

HE 5.1.4 City Requests for Proposals. City RFPs, contracts, and bidding procedures capital projects and programs shall incorporate energy conservation and sustainability measures.

HE 5.1.5 City Facilities. Utilize energy/water saving measures in City-owned buildings and facilities, including landscaping, to meet industry sustainable design standards.

HE 5.1.6 Sustainable Design. Adopt sustainable design policies, standards and codes that result in attractive, energy efficient, neighborhoods.

G. Community Profile

This section analyzes demographic and housing characteristics that influence the demand for and availability of housing in the City of Jurupa Valley. These analyses form a foundation for community-based housing programs.

Data and Methodology

The 2013-2021 Housing Element is the first Housing Element prepared for the City of Jurupa Valley since its incorporation. Preparation of this Housing Element requires the assemblage and presentation of relevant demographic and housing data for Jurupa Valley as an individual jurisdiction. The following key data sources were used to complete this Housing Element. Sources of specific information are identified in the text, tables, and figures.

- Census data (2000-2010) and American Community Surveys
- California Department of Finance (2015)
• U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Data, 2008-2012

The City of Jurupa Valley was incorporated on July 1, 2011, after the 2010 Census had been conducted. As such, the City of Jurupa Valley was not identified as a city in the decennial censuses. While the City was not recognized as an incorporated city in the decennial census, demographic and housing data for Jurupa Valley is extracted from the decennial censuses (2000 and 2010 U.S. Census) by retrieving the data for the block groups and census tracts that generally describe the boundaries of the City of Jurupa Valley. See Appendix 3.0 for the 2000 and 2010 Census Tracts and Block Groups, and 2009-2013 American Community Survey Census Tracts and Block Groups.

Another method of compiling decennial census data for the City of Jurupa Valley is using data for the Census Designated Places (CDPs) that comprise the City of Jurupa Valley. Six CDPs generally form the boundaries of Jurupa Valley, Crestmore Heights, Glen Avon, Mira Loma, Pedley, Rubidoux, and Sunnyslope.

Since the 2010 Census, the Bureau of Census has been conducting sample surveys, known as the American Community Surveys (ACS), on specific demographic and housing variables. ACSs are conducted every 1, 3, or 5 years, depending on the specific variables in question and the population size of the community. Some ACSs do contain data for the City of Jurupa Valley as an incorporated city. Therefore, by necessity, this report draws from multiple ACS data sets that depend upon the availability of data for the City. The ACS data gives us an opportunity to analyze demographic and housing data in the City as recent as 2012. When data is not available at the city-level, this report applies the same method used above for retrieving data from the decennial censuses, and extracts data at the block-group or tract-level.

Population Trends and Characteristics
Housing needs are influenced by population and employment trends. This section provides a summary of the changes to the population size, age, and racial/ethnic composition of the City of Jurupa Valley since 2000.

Historical, Existing, and Forecast Growth
The City of Jurupa Valley is a recently incorporated city in Riverside County. The City covers a 44-square-mile area and encompasses the neighborhoods of Jurupa Hills, Mira Loma, Glen Avon, Pedley, Indian Hills, Belltown, Sunnyslope, Crestmore Heights, and Rubidoux.
Jurupa Valley is located in a region that, since 1990, has experienced robust population growth. According to the U.S. Census, Riverside County had a population of just over 2.1 million persons in 2010. Overall, the County has experienced steady population growth over the last two decades, with the total number of residents increasing by 87% since 1990. Table 5.3 compares the population of Riverside County with neighboring counties.

**Table 5.3: Regional Population Trends (1990-2010)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>1,170,413</td>
<td>1,545,387</td>
<td>2,189,641</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>1,418,380</td>
<td>1,709,434</td>
<td>2,035,210</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>109,303</td>
<td>142,361</td>
<td>174,528</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bureau of the Census, 1990-2010

According to the U.S. Census, Jurupa Valley experienced a 16% population increase between 2000 and 2010. During the same period, Riverside County’s population increased by more than 40% (Table 5.4). Compared with other larger CDPs (more than 10,000 in population in 2010), growth in Jurupa Valley was also considered moderate.

**Table 5.4: Population Growth in Unincorporated Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley</td>
<td>80,596</td>
<td>93,817</td>
<td>95,679</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Valley CDP</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23,067</td>
<td>24,746</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temescal Valley CDP</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>22,535</td>
<td>23,397</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead Valley CDP</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18,510</td>
<td>18,751</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hemet CDP</td>
<td>14,823</td>
<td>17,418</td>
<td>17,684</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valle Vista CDP</td>
<td>10,488</td>
<td>14,578</td>
<td>15,131</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcrest CPD</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>14,347</td>
<td>16,559</td>
<td>446.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Sobrante CPD</td>
<td>4,803</td>
<td>12,723</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>164.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Gardens CPD</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>11,570</td>
<td>11,151</td>
<td>389.2</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland Village CPD</td>
<td>2,185</td>
<td>11,541</td>
<td>11,393</td>
<td>428.2</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>1,545,387</td>
<td>2,189,641</td>
<td>2,204,724</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Jurupa Valley: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level; ACS 2009-2013 data aggregated at census tract level.
2 Data for Census Designated Places (CDPs) aggregated at the CDP level.
3 “–” = data not available
Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000 and 2010 (DP1); American Community Survey 2009-2013 (B01003)

In 2010, the population of Jurupa Valley accounted for 4% of Riverside County’s population. As indicated in Figure 5-5. SCAG forecasts steady population growth for Jurupa Valley during the next 20 years with a projected population of approximately 126,000 persons by 2035, as shown in Figure 5-5.
Age Composition

To estimate the age profile of Jurupa Valley residents, census tract level data from the 2000 and 2010 Census was used. Table 5.5 presents the median age for those Census Designated Places (CDPs) within the City of Jurupa Valley. Between 2000 and 2010, the Jurupa Valley population experienced growth in all age groups, but overall, the City’s population is getting older. The “prime working” population, residents between the ages of 25 and 54 years, remains the largest age group in the City. The “school age” population, those between the ages of 5 and 17 years, makes up the next largest segment of the City’s residents. The percentage of residents over age 45 increased during the previous decade, while the City’s younger population decreased proportionally. The State of California, Riverside County, and most CDPs comprising the City of Jurupa Valley saw slight increases in median age from 2000 to 2010, as shown in Table 5.6.

Table 5.5: Median Age by Community, County, and State (2000-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestmore Heights CDP</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Avon CDP</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Loma CDP</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedley CDP</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubidoux CDP</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyslope CDP</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6: Age Distribution (2000-2010), Percent of Total Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>2000 City of Jurupa Valley</th>
<th>2000 Riverside County</th>
<th>2010 City of Jurupa Valley</th>
<th>2010 Riverside County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4 years</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 17 years</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 24 years</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 44 years</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54 years</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64 years</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Jurupa Valley: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level.
2 Riverside County: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the County level.
Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000 and 2010 (DP1).

Ethnicity/Cultural Identity

In terms of ethnicity and cultural identity, most Jurupa Valley residents are Hispanic. As of 2010, 67% of Jurupa Valley residents were of Hispanic origin (Table 5.7). Between 2000 and 2010, the Non-Hispanic White population of Jurupa Valley declined by almost 16%, while persons of Hispanic origin increased by 18%. The Black/African American population represented the third largest ethnic group in the City (3% in 2010).

Table 5.7: Racial and Ethnic Composition (2000-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>2000 City of Jurupa Valley</th>
<th>2000 Riverside County</th>
<th>2010 City of Jurupa Valley</th>
<th>2010 Riverside County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>33,684</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>788,831</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>3,577</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>92,403</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>39,416</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>559,575</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>10,135</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Island</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>58,483</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2,425</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>33,355</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>80,596</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,543,387</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Jurupa Valley: 2000 Census data aggregated at the block group level; 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level.
2 Riverside County: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the County level.
Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000 (P004) and 2010 (DP1)

Employment Trends

Housing needs are influenced by employment trends. Significant employment opportunities within the City can lead to growth in demand for housing in proximity to jobs. The quality (including job security, and stability) and/or pay of available employment can determine the need for various housing types and prices.

As shown in Table 5.8, between 2009 and 2013, over 16% of Jurupa Valley’s residents were employed in educational, health, and social services industries. About 14% were employed in retail trade; 13% in manufacturing; 10% in construction; 9% in arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services; and 9% in professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste
management services. There is no data to show that these percentages are based on job sectors within the City of Jurupa Valley.

### Table 5.8: Employment by Industry (2009-2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Jurupa Valley*</th>
<th></th>
<th>Riverside County</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting, and Mining</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>13,722</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3,813</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>72,017</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>5,040</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>81,173</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>2,066</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>29,676</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>5,311</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>114,208</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing, and Utilities</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>47,094</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>14,384</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate, and Rental &amp; Leasing</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>47,236</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, Management, Administrative, and Waste Management Svcs</td>
<td>3,391</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>87,990</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational, Health and Social Services</td>
<td>6,214</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>181,003</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, Recreation, Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>96,865</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services (except Public Administration)</td>
<td>2,047</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>45,696</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>45,696</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>38,198</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>877,030</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data indicates the occupations held by Jurupa Valley/Riverside County residents; the location of the related workplace is not indicated by this data.

*Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the census tract level.

Source: American Community Survey, 2009-2013 (DP03).

Table 5.9 shows Jurupa Valley’s labor force, which increased from 45,200 in 2000 to 45,900 in 2014. According to the California Employment Development Department (EDD), the unemployment rate in Jurupa Valley has steadily declined since 2010. In 2014, the City’s unemployment rate was recorded at 10.7%, higher than the County’s unemployment rate of 8.1%.

### Table 5.9: Labor Force Trends in the City, County and State (2010-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Persons in Labor Force</th>
<th>Employed Persons</th>
<th>Unemployed Persons</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate, % of Labor Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jurupa Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>45,200</td>
<td>37,200</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>45,200</td>
<td>37,600</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>45,500</td>
<td>38,700</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>45,600</td>
<td>39,800</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>45,900</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>976,200</td>
<td>841,100</td>
<td>135,200</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>978,200</td>
<td>849,400</td>
<td>128,800</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>989,100</td>
<td>873,900</td>
<td>115,200</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>998,600</td>
<td>899,800</td>
<td>98,800</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,010,700</td>
<td>927,300</td>
<td>83,400</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>18,336,300</td>
<td>16,091,900</td>
<td>2,244,300</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>18,419,500</td>
<td>16,260,100</td>
<td>2,159,400</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>18,554,800</td>
<td>16,630,100</td>
<td>1,924,700</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>18,671,600</td>
<td>17,002,900</td>
<td>1,668,700</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>18,811,400</td>
<td>17,397,100</td>
<td>1,414,300</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Household Characteristics

This section describes Jurupa Valley’s household characteristics. The Census Bureau defines a household as all persons living in a single housing unit, whether or not they are related. One person living alone is considered a household, as is a group of unrelated people living in a single housing unit.

Household Growth

In 2010, the Census reported 24,787 households in Jurupa Valley, an 11% increase from 2000, as shown in Table 5.10. According to the Census, however, the number of households in Jurupa Valley is growing at a significantly slower pace than Riverside County, but at a rate similar to the State of California overall. Between 2000 and 2010, the number of households in Riverside County increased by 36%, more than triple the rate of increase in Jurupa Valley (11%) and almost four times the rate in California (9%). During the same period, the number of dwelling units in the City grew by almost 11%, as shown in Table 5.10.

Table 5.10: Total Households and Household Growth (2000-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley¹</td>
<td>22,411</td>
<td>24,787</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County²</td>
<td>506,218</td>
<td>686,260</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>11,502,870</td>
<td>12,577,498</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Jurupa Valley: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the block group level.
2 Riverside County: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the County level.
Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000 and 2010 (H16)

Household Characteristics and Size

As shown in Table 5.11, the majority of households in Jurupa Valley in 2010 were family households (81%), at a higher proportion than the County as a whole (74%). About 41% of all households in the City were families with children and more than 23% of households had at least one elderly member (65+ years). About 6% of all households were made up of an elderly person living alone.
### Table 5.11: Household Characteristics, Percent of Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>City of Jurupa Valley</th>
<th>Riverside County</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with Children</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Families with Children</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Headed Families with Children</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Headed Families with Children</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family Households</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Living Alone</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Elderly (65+ years)</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Household Type
- **Families**: 80.5%
- **Families with Children**: 41.2%
- **Married Families with Children**: 30.3%
- **Male Headed Families with Children**: 4.2%
- **Female Headed Families with Children**: 6.9%
- **Non-Family Households**: 19.5%
- **Senior Living Alone**: 6.2%
- **Households with Elderly (65+ years)**: 23.2%

#### Household Size
- **Large Households (5+)**: 33.0%
- **Large Households - Owners**: 22.0%
- **Large Households - Renters**: 11.0%

2. Riverside County: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the County level.

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000 and 2010 (DP1, H16, QTH2)

The average household size for each Census Designated Place (CDP) within Jurupa Valley is listed below in Table 5.12. In 2010, all of these CDPs had a larger average household size than Riverside County (3.14 persons per household) and the state (2.90 persons per household).

### Table 5.12: Average Household Size by CDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Household Size, Number of Persons Per Household</th>
<th>Owner Households</th>
<th>Renter Households</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crestmore Heights CDP*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Avon CDP</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Loma CDP</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedley CDP</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubidoux CDP</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyslope CDP</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Riverside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2000 Census data not available
Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000 and 2010 (DP1)

### Tenure

Tenure refers to whether housing is rented or owned. Housing tenure is, in turn related to household income, composition (household size and relationships), and age of the householder. Communities need to have an adequate supply of units available both for rent and for sale to accommodate a range of households with varying incomes, family sizes, composition (individuals living together and their relationships to one another), and life styles.

Approximately 67% of Jurupa Valley households owned their homes, and 33% of households rented their homes in 2010. As shown in Table 5.13, the homeownership rate in Jurupa Valley was only slightly lower than in Riverside County but noticeably higher than in the State of California as a whole.
Table 5.13: Occupied Units by Tenure (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley¹</td>
<td>16,526</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>8,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County²</td>
<td>462,212</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>224,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>7,035,371</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>5,542,127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jurupa Valley: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the block group level. 
Riverside County: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the County level. 
Source: Bureau of the Census 2010 (H16-SF1)

As shown in Table 5.14 and Table 5.15 households of three or more persons made up the majority of households in 2000 and 2010, and the number of larger households increased between 2000 and 2010. Larger renter-households (with five or more persons) had the greatest relative increase between 2000 and 2010, while owner-occupied households with three to four persons had the greatest decrease. This trend may reflect that ownership housing has become increasingly unaffordable to larger households.

Table 5.14: Household Size Distribution (2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Total Households²</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Renter-Households</th>
<th>% of Total³</th>
<th>Owner-Households</th>
<th>% of Total²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Person</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Persons</td>
<td>5,073</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3,845</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 Persons</td>
<td>7,521</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5,576</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ Persons</td>
<td>6,335</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4,599</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,411</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6,499</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>15,912</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Person</td>
<td>132,494</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>51,493</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>81,001</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Persons</td>
<td>194,449</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>48,107</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>146,342</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 Persons</td>
<td>213,472</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>71,139</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>142,333</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ Persons</td>
<td>145,845</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>53,309</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>92,536</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686,260</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>224,048</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>462,212</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Person</td>
<td>2,929,442</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>1,588,527</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1,340,915</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Persons</td>
<td>3,653,802</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>1,384,739</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2,269,063</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 Persons</td>
<td>3,927,263</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>1,632,962</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2,294,301</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ Persons</td>
<td>2,066,991</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>935,899</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1,131,092</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,577,498</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5,542,127</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>7,035,371</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Jurupa Valley: 2000 Census data aggregated at the block group level. 
2 Represents Total Households 
3 Percent of Total Households 
Source: U.S. Census 2000 (H15-SF3)
Table 5.15: Household Size Distribution (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Jurupa Valley</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Riverside County</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>California</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Renter-Households</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Owner-Households</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Owner-Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Person</td>
<td>3,657</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1,786</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>104,557</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>41,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Persons</td>
<td>5,289</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3,844</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>153,900</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>36,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 Persons</td>
<td>7,666</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>5,356</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>154,827</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>49,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ Persons</td>
<td>8,175</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5,455</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>92,934</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>30,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,787</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,261</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,526</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>506,218</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>157,686</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Represents Total Households
3. Percent of Total Households
Source: U.S. Census 2010 (QTH2-SF1)

Household Income

Table 5.16 shows the median household incomes, according to the 2007-2011 ACS, for the CDPs generally comprising the City of Jurupa Valley. Median incomes in Jurupa Valley varied considerably by tenure. During this time, the median incomes for owner-occupied households in the CDPs were consistently nearly double those of renter-occupied households. According to 2000 Census and 2011 ACS data, in absolute terms and when inflation is factored in, the median incomes recorded in the different CDPs have risen since 2000).

About 47% of Jurupa Valley households are lower-income. Between 2009 and 2013, about one-third (31%) of Jurupa Valley households earned less than $35,000 and only 19% earned more than $100,000, as shown in Table 5.16 and Table 5.17, and in Figure 5-6.
### Table 5.16: Median Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Median Household Income, $</th>
<th>Median Household Income, $</th>
<th>Median Household Income, $</th>
<th>% Change 2000-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestmore Heights CDP</td>
<td>36,709</td>
<td>47,951</td>
<td>45,616</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49,395</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Avon CDP</td>
<td>48,941</td>
<td>63,930</td>
<td>66,635</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>50,364</td>
<td>65,789</td>
<td>70,880</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td>20,585</td>
<td>26,890</td>
<td>31,269</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Loma CDP</td>
<td>49,395</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>52,490</td>
<td>68,566</td>
<td>71,880</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td>31,994</td>
<td>41,793</td>
<td>52,118</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedley CDP</td>
<td>60,045</td>
<td>74,834</td>
<td>65,012</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>63,555</td>
<td>83,020</td>
<td>72,553</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td>38,750</td>
<td>50,618</td>
<td>43,433</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubidoux CDP</td>
<td>38,539</td>
<td>50,342</td>
<td>52,108</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>50,274</td>
<td>65,789</td>
<td>70,880</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td>21,573</td>
<td>26,890</td>
<td>31,269</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyslope CDP</td>
<td>47,390</td>
<td>61,771</td>
<td>75,788</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>51,378</td>
<td>67,113</td>
<td>75,788</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td>38,214</td>
<td>49,918</td>
<td>52,118</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>42,811</td>
<td>55,926</td>
<td>68,313</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>42,030</td>
<td>54,902</td>
<td>65,635</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>76,417</td>
<td>75,762</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>47,288</td>
<td>61,771</td>
<td>68,313</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,075</td>
<td>8,644</td>
<td>24,719</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 2007-2011 ACS data is the latest available for these CDPs.
2. Not adjusted for inflation
3. In 2011 inflation-adjusted dollars
4. "-" Data not available

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000 (HCT036 – SF4); American Community Survey (ACS), 2007-2011 (B25119)

The relatively high percentage of lower income persons residing in Jurupa Valley is one of several indicators showing a concentration of low-cost rental or sale housing in the City, particularly in several older neighborhoods in Mira Loma, Sunnyslope, Belltown, Glen Avon, and Rubidoux.

### Table 5.17: Household Income by Tenure (2009-2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Owner-Households</th>
<th>Renter-Households</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 to $9,999</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>1,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>1,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $19,999</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>1,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>2,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>3,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>3,397</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>4,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>3,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,000</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>2,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 or more</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,075</td>
<td>8,644</td>
<td>24,719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the census tract level.
Source: American Community Survey, 2009-2013 (B25118)
For the purposes of the Housing Element, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has established five income groups based on Area Median Income (AMI):

- Extremely Low Income: up to 30% of AMI
- Very Low Income: 31% to 50% of AMI
- Low Income: 51% to 80% of AMI
- Moderate Income: 81% to 120% AMI
- Above Moderate Income: >120% AMI

County Median Income as published by HCD must be used to establish income groups for the purpose of the Housing Element.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) periodically receives “custom tabulations” of Census data from the Census Bureau that are largely not available through standard Census products. The most recent estimates are derived from the 2008-2012 ACS. This dataset, known as the “CHAS” data (Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy), provides insight on the extent of housing problems experienced by lower-income households.
households. The Jurupa Valley CHAS data in this report was extracted at the census tract level (using the same census tracts as those used to aggregate Jurupa Valley data from the 2010 U.S. Census).

According to the CHAS data presented in Table 5.18, approximately 27% of Jurupa Valley households can be considered extremely low or very low income (50% or less of the AMI) and an additional 20% can be classified as low income (51% to 80% AMI). The majority of the City’s households (53%), however, were within the moderate and above moderate-income category (greater than 80% AMI). By comparison, about 58% of Riverside County households were moderate or above moderate-income households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>Extremely Low Income (0-30% of AMI)</th>
<th>Very Low Income (31-50%)</th>
<th>Low Income (51-80%)</th>
<th>Moderate/Above Income (80%+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley</td>
<td>24,738</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>676,620</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>12,466,330</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Jurupa Valley: 2008-2012 CHAS data aggregated at the census tract level.
2 Data presented in this table is based on special tabulations from sample Census data. The number of households in each category usually deviates from the 100% count due to the need to extrapolate sample data out to total households. Interpretations of this data should focus on the proportion of households rather than on precise numbers. Furthermore, because HUD programs do not cover households with incomes above 80% of the County AMI, CHAS data does not provide any breakdown of income groups above 80% AMI.

Sources: HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Data, 2008-2012.

H. HOUSING INVENTORY AND MARKET CONDITIONS

This section describes housing stock and market conditions in the City of Jurupa Valley.

Housing Growth

According to the 2000 and 2010 Census counts, only a small percentage of Riverside County’s over 500,000 new housing units were located within the City of Jurupa Valley. The number of housing units in Jurupa Valley, both existing and new, comprised just 3% of the County’s total existing housing stock in 2000 and 4% in 2010, as shown in Table 5.19.
Table 5.19: Housing Unit Growth (Nearby Cities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/County1,2</th>
<th># of Units 2000</th>
<th># of Units 2010</th>
<th># Units 20151</th>
<th>% Change 2000-2010</th>
<th>% Change 2010-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley</td>
<td>23,429</td>
<td>26,176</td>
<td>26,874</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno Valley</td>
<td>41,431</td>
<td>55,559</td>
<td>55,935</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perris</td>
<td>10,553</td>
<td>17,906</td>
<td>18,536</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemet</td>
<td>29,401</td>
<td>35,305</td>
<td>35,836</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>584,674</td>
<td>800,707</td>
<td>822,910</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>12,214,549</td>
<td>13,680,081</td>
<td>13,914,715</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Department of Finance estimates are corrected for demolition; therefore, housing growth in this table presents net increases in the housing stock; data available at city, county or state level for all jurisdictions (including Jurupa Valley).

Sources: Bureau of the Census 2000 (H001) and 2010 (QT-H1), State Department of Finance, Housing Estimates, May 2015.

Historically, housing growth in Jurupa Valley lagged behind the County and other neighboring jurisdictions, but experienced growth similar to the state as a whole. Between 2000 and 2010, Jurupa Valley’s housing stock increased at a significantly slower rate than the County’s and other nearby cities. However, housing growth in the region was severely impacted by the recent recession and, since 2010, the City’s housing stock has grown at rates similar to the rest of the County and at a higher rate compared to the state average.

According to the California Department of Finance, the housing stock in Jurupa Valley was estimated at 26,874 units as of January 1, 2015, representing a 3% increase from 2010; compared to the County’s 3% increase and the state’s 2% increase during the same interval. Among the most populous unincorporated areas (with population over 10,000 in 2010) in Riverside County, Jurupa Valley had moderate housing production rate between 2000 and 2013, as shown in Table 5.20.

Table 5.20: Housing Unit Growth (Unincorporated Areas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City1 Unincorporated Area2</th>
<th># of Units 2000</th>
<th># of Units 2010</th>
<th># Units 2013</th>
<th>% Change 2000-2010</th>
<th>% Change 2010-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley</td>
<td>23,429</td>
<td>26,176</td>
<td>26,668</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Valley CDP</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6,635</td>
<td>6,982</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temescal Valley CDP</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7,617</td>
<td>7,808</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead Valley CDP</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4,601</td>
<td>4,593</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hemet CDP</td>
<td>5,064</td>
<td>5,869</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valle Vista CDP</td>
<td>4,909</td>
<td>6,112</td>
<td>6,062</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcrest CPD</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>4,622</td>
<td>4,651</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Sobrante CPD</td>
<td>4,803</td>
<td>3,827</td>
<td>3,928</td>
<td>-20.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Gardens CPD</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>2,969</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland Village CPD</td>
<td>2,185</td>
<td>3,967</td>
<td>3,961</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>584,674</td>
<td>800,707</td>
<td>822,910</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1,2 = data not available
Jurupa Valley: 2000 Census data aggregated at the block group level and 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level; ACS 2009-2013 data aggregated at the block group level.
All data for Census Designated Places (CDPs) aggregated at the CDP level.
The minor negative growth rates are probably results of sampling errors.
Sources: Bureau of the Census 2000 (H001) and 2010 (QT-H1), American Community Survey, 2009-2013 (B25001).
Composition of Housing Stock

The composition of the City’s housing stock, specifically in regard to its available housing inventory by unit type, has remained fairly stable since 2000, which is to be expected given the City’s limited housing growth during this time. The California Department of Finance, which records building permit data submitted by local jurisdictions, estimates that single-family detached units comprise the vast majority of the City’s housing stock (77%) while multi-family units make up about 12% of the housing stock (Table 5.21). Countywide, in 2015, 68% of housing units were single-family detached units compared to 58% in the state. In Riverside County, multi-family units represented about 16% of the housing stock in 2015; compared to 31% in the state. Dwelling unit size and type significantly affect housing cost, density and character. In general, smaller, single-family housing and multi-family housing allow more cost-efficient construction and tend to be more affordable for lower income households.

Table 5.21: Housing Inventory by Unit Type (2000-2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>2009-2013</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family, detached</td>
<td>18,044</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>20,399</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>20,645</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family, attached</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>3,589</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>3,188</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3,237</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile homes</td>
<td>1,683</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (boats, RVs)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>24,551</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26,668</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26,874</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Jurupa Valley: 2000 Census data aggregated at the census tract level.
2 Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the block group level.
3 Jurupa Valley: 2015 DOF data available at the city level
Source: U.S. Census Bureau of the Census 2000, (DP-4); American Community Survey 2009-2013, (B25024); and State Department of Finance, Housing Estimates, May 2015.

As shown in Table 5.22, owner-occupied housing units were predominantly single-family detached, comprising 87% of all owner-occupied units. The majority of renter-occupied units were also single-family detached housing units (58%).

Table 5.22: Unit Type by Tenure (2009-2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied</th>
<th>Total Occupied Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family, detached</td>
<td>14,244</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>5,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family, attached</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family (2-4 units)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family (5+ units)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Homes</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Boats, RVs)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,292</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8,696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the block group level.
Source: American Community Survey 2009-2013, (B25032).
As shown in Table 5.15 (page 5-39), Jurupa Valley has a significant number of large households (i.e. households with five or more bedrooms). Approximately 28% of all Jurupa Valley are larger households, compared with about 21% in the County and 16% in the state. Between 2009 and 2013, about 34% of renter-occupied units were two-bedroom units, and about 30% were three-bedroom units, as shown in Table 5.23. Over 43% of owner-occupied units had three beds and 35% had four beds. Generally, housing units with three or more bedrooms are the most suited for large households, indicating that adequately sized rental units may be in limited supply in Jurupa Valley considering that the majority (57%) of the City's rental units have two bedrooms or fewer.

**Table 5.23: Unit Size by Tenure (2009-2013)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied</th>
<th>Total Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>%*</td>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio/1 bedroom</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedrooms</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>2,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedrooms</td>
<td>7,102</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>2,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bedrooms</td>
<td>5,643</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more bedrooms</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,292</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,696</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jurupa Valley, 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the block group level.
Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding
Source: American Community Survey, 2009-2013 (B25042).

**Vacancy Rates**

A certain number of vacant units are needed in the housing market to moderate the cost of housing and allow sufficient housing choice. Vacancy rates are generally higher among rental properties, as rental units have greater attrition than owner-occupied-units do. A healthy vacancy rate (one that permits sufficient choice and mobility among a variety of housing units) is considered to be 2% to 3% for ownership units and 5% to 6% for rental units. In 2000, the vacancy rate in Jurupa Valley was 4.3%, as shown in Table 5.24. By 2010, the overall vacancy rate for the City was determined to be 6.3%. This overall rate, however, includes housing units that were vacant due to foreclosures, seasonal occupancy, or other reasons. The actual vacancy rate (actual number of unoccupied dwelling units at any given time) for the City is likely to be lower than the listed rate. According to the 2010 Census, only about 59% of the City’s 1,650 vacant units were actually available for rent or sale, which reflects a relatively high number of seasonably occupied and possibly abandoned units.
Table 5.24: Household Occupancy Status (2000-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupancy Status</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>22,411</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>24,526</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Rent</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>23,429</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26,176</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jurupa Valley: 2000 Census data aggregated at the block group level and 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract.
Riverside County: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the County level.
Source: Bureau of the Census 2000 and 2010, (QT-H1);

Housing Conditions

Age of Housing Stock

The age of a housing unit is often an indicator of housing conditions. In general, housing that is 30 years or older may exhibit a need for repairs based on the useful life of materials. Housing more than 50 years old is considered aged and is more likely to exhibit a need for major repairs.

Jurupa Valley’s housing stock is older. Approximately 52% of the owner-occupied units in the City were built before 1980, and 20% were built before 1960. Of the City’s renter-occupied units, 61% were built before 1980, and 28% were built before 1960. Table 5.25 summarizes the age of the City’s housing stock by tenure. Based on housing age alone, a significant portion of Jurupa Valley’s housing stock could require rehabilitation in the upcoming decade.

Table 5.25: Tenure by Age of Housing Stock (Occupied Units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total Occupied Housing Units</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 or later</td>
<td>1,786</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2,962</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 - 1999</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 - 1989</td>
<td>4,295</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>5,801</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 - 1979</td>
<td>3,797</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>1,318</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>5,115</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 - 1969</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>2,942</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 - 1959</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3,568</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 - 1949</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 or earlier</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,292</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8,696</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24,988</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the block group level.
The data are from the American Community Survey and therefore, is based on a sample of units and extrapolated to represent the entire housing stock. This table is intended only to provide a general picture of age and tenure of the housing stock.
Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 2009-2013 (B25036).

Housing Conditions

Housing condition refers to the ability of various systems in a house to meet adopted building codes for health and safety, including plumbing, heating, electrical, and structural systems. Housing
conditions are considered substandard when one or more systems are found to be below the minimum standards required by Section 1001 of the Uniform Housing Code. Households living in substandard conditions are considered to be in need of housing assistance, even if they are not seeking alternative housing arrangements, due to the threat to residents’ health and safety that substandard housing poses.

In addition to structural deficiencies and standards, the lack of infrastructure and utilities often serves as an indicator for substandard conditions. According to the 2009-2013 ACS, 68 occupied units in Jurupa Valley (0.3% of all units) lacked complete plumbing facilities and 221 units lacked complete kitchen facilities (0.9% of all units), as shown in Table 5.26. This may be due to the fact that in Jurupa Valley, “substandard” dwellings such as tack rooms, storage or other outbuildings are often used illegally as guest quarters or as separate dwelling units. Under the City’s Zoning Code, guest quarters are not permitted to have kitchens.

One possible reason for the common use of substandard dwellings in the City is the relatively high number of lower income/large households and overcrowding in some residential areas. It should be noted that there might be some overlap in the number of substandard housing units, as some units may lack both complete plumbing and kitchen facilities. Similar to the County and the state, housing units lacking appropriate infrastructure and utilities comprise a very small proportion of the City’s housing stock.

Table 5.26: Number of Dwellings Lacking Plumbing or Complete Kitchen Facilities, 2009-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>Renter Occupied</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking plumbing facilities</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking complete kitchen facilities</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking plumbing facilities</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>2,962</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking complete kitchen facilities</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>4,390</td>
<td>6,273</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking plumbing facilities</td>
<td>20,916</td>
<td>43,006</td>
<td>63,922</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking complete kitchen facilities</td>
<td>26,676</td>
<td>124,714</td>
<td>151,390</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the census tract level.
2 Riverside County Housing Units: 683,144
3 California Housing Units: 12,542,460
Source: American Community Survey, 2009-2013 (B25049, B25053).

**Code Enforcement Activities**

The City of Jurupa Valley has established a Code Enforcement program to ensure a high quality of life throughout the communities and maintain property values. Code compliance in the City is a responsive program under which property inspections are done only
when inspection requests and complaints are received. Such a system may result in under-reporting of code compliance issues, particularly with regard to the rental housing stock. Often, tenants fear retaliation from the landlords and are therefore less willing to report an issue. Legal residency issues or language barriers may be another obstacle for reporting code compliance issues. According to the Code Enforcement staff, in January 2016 Jurupa Valley had 776 active code enforcement cases dealing with housing conditions and/or safety issues, and the City has closed 815 such cases since incorporation. Therefore, as a general estimate, less than 0.5% of the City's housing stock (or approximately 1,300 units) may be considered substandard in the City.

**Housing Costs and Affordability**

**Home Prices and Rents**

Realtor.com® was used to provide housing market data for Jurupa Valley. This information is sourced daily from listings and property data on the realtor.com website, which includes an up-to-date and accurate aggregation of real estate listings from approximately 800 regional listings from Multiple Listing Service (MLS). According to realtor.com, in November 2015, the average home listing price in Jurupa Valley was $379,000. The average selling price for homes in the City was slightly lower at $343,500. These figures are based on the City’s 24,412 property records and a realtor.com search of 510 listings of recently sold homes and 293 listings of homes available for sale.

Information on current rental rates in the City was obtained through a review of advertisements on Craigslist during October 2015. Available rental housing ranged from single-room studios to four- or more bedroom units. Most of the available units in the City were two-bedroom, three-bedroom, and four-bedroom units. Table 5.27 summarizes average rents by unit size. Overall, 81 units of varying sizes were listed as available for rent in October 2015 with an average rent of $1,517.

**Table 5.27: Average Rent by Unit Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Studio</th>
<th>1-Bedroom</th>
<th>2-Bedroom</th>
<th>3-Bedroom</th>
<th>4+ Bedroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>$808</td>
<td>$1,146</td>
<td>$1,203</td>
<td>$1,694</td>
<td>$1,943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Affordability Gap Analysis**

To determine overall housing affordability, the costs of homeownership and renting are compared to a household’s ability to pay these costs. Housing affordability is defined as spending no more than 30% to 35% of gross household income (depending on tenure and income level) on housing expenses. Table 5.28 summarizes affordable rents
and purchase prices by income category based on the 2015 HCD median income of $65,000 for Riverside County. General cost assumptions for utilities, taxes, and property insurance are shown. Affordable purchase price assumes a 4% interest rate with a 30-year fixed rate mortgage loan and a 10% down payment.

Given the need for a down payment and the high costs of homeownership, lower income households lacking sufficient savings or transferable equity must usually occupy rental housing. The affordability problem also persists in the rental market. The situation is exacerbated for large households and seniors with lower and moderate incomes given the limited supply of large units.

Table 5.28: Housing Affordability Matrix, Riverside County, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>Affordable Monthly Housing Costs</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>Taxes and Insurance</th>
<th>Maximum Affordable Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Sale</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (0-30% AMI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Person</td>
<td>$14,100</td>
<td>$353</td>
<td>$353</td>
<td>$181</td>
<td>$210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Person</td>
<td>$16,100</td>
<td>$403</td>
<td>$403</td>
<td>$192</td>
<td>$226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Person</td>
<td>$20,090</td>
<td>$502</td>
<td>$502</td>
<td>$221</td>
<td>$265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Person</td>
<td>$24,250</td>
<td>$606</td>
<td>$606</td>
<td>$249</td>
<td>$305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Person</td>
<td>$28,410</td>
<td>$710</td>
<td>$710</td>
<td>$277</td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30-50% AMI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Person</td>
<td>$23,450</td>
<td>$586</td>
<td>$586</td>
<td>$181</td>
<td>$210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Person</td>
<td>$26,800</td>
<td>$670</td>
<td>$670</td>
<td>$192</td>
<td>$226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Person</td>
<td>$30,150</td>
<td>$754</td>
<td>$754</td>
<td>$221</td>
<td>$265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Person</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>$838</td>
<td>$838</td>
<td>$249</td>
<td>$305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Person</td>
<td>$36,200</td>
<td>$905</td>
<td>$905</td>
<td>$277</td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (50-80% AMI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Person</td>
<td>$37,550</td>
<td>$683</td>
<td>$796</td>
<td>$181</td>
<td>$210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Person</td>
<td>$42,900</td>
<td>$780</td>
<td>$910</td>
<td>$192</td>
<td>$226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Person</td>
<td>$48,250</td>
<td>$878</td>
<td>$1,024</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>$265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Person</td>
<td>$53,600</td>
<td>$975</td>
<td>$1,138</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>$305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Person</td>
<td>$57,900</td>
<td>$1,053</td>
<td>$1,229</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income (80-100% AMI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Person</td>
<td>$45,500</td>
<td>$1,024</td>
<td>$1,194</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>$210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Person</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>$1,170</td>
<td>$1,365</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>$226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Person</td>
<td>$58,500</td>
<td>$1,316</td>
<td>$1,536</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>$265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Person</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$1,463</td>
<td>$1,706</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>$305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Person</td>
<td>$70,200</td>
<td>$1,580</td>
<td>$1,843</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Income (100-120% AMI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Person</td>
<td>$54,600</td>
<td>$1,251</td>
<td>$1,460</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>$210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Person</td>
<td>$62,400</td>
<td>$1,430</td>
<td>$1,668</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>$226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Person</td>
<td>$70,200</td>
<td>$1,609</td>
<td>$1,877</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>$265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Person</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
<td>$1,788</td>
<td>$2,085</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>$305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Person</td>
<td>$84,250</td>
<td>$1,931</td>
<td>$2,252</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Assumptions: 2015 HCD income limits; Health and Safety code definitions of affordable housing costs (between 30 and 35% of household income depending on tenure and income level); HUD utility allowances; 35% of monthly affordable cost for taxes and insurance; 10.0% down payment; and 4.0% interest rate for a 30-year fixed-rate mortgage loan. Taxes and insurance apply to owner costs only; renters do not usually pay taxes or insurance.

2 Riverside County: 4-person household median income = $65,000

Sources: State Department of Housing and Planning 2015 Income Limits; Housing Authority of the County of Riverside, Utility Allowances, 2015; Veronica Tam and Associates, 2015
Inventory of Sites for Housing Development

Section 65583(a)(3) of the *California Government Code* requires Housing Elements to contain an “inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant sites and sites having potential for redevelopment, and an analysis of the relationship of zoning and public facilities and services to these sites.” The City conducted a detailed inventory of potential housing sites as part of the 2017 General Plan process. The results of that study, including methodology, specific parcels, development constraints, and potential development capacity are discussed in Housing Element Attachment 5A.

That analysis indicated that the City had 943.942 acres of vacant or underutilized land suitable for residential development, with a development potential of 4,110.3,981 dwelling units. The inventory shows the City has adequate site capacity to accommodate the regional housing need for all income groups, except for the Very Low/Extremely Low Income level, as further discussed in Housing Element Attachment A (Vacant Land Analysis).

Residential Development Capacity

Nine of the City’s base General Plan land use designations allow residential development, plus four Overlay Districts. *Table 5.29*, below, describes the minimum and maximum residential density standards for each of these land use designations.

*Table 5.29: General Plan Residential Density Standards*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Minimum Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Maximum Density (du/ac)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Farm Residential (RR)</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranch Residential (EDR)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Neighborhood (VLDR)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Neighborhood (LDR and RC-LDR)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential (HDR)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Density Residential (VHDR)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Density Residential (HHDR)</td>
<td><em>25.0</em></td>
<td><em>25.0</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Overlay (CDO)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center Overlay (TCO)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Overlay (MUO)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan Overlay (SPO)</td>
<td><em>Unspecified</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Jurupa Valley, Draft 2017 General Plan.

du/ac = dwelling units per acre
Housing Element Attachment A uses the 2017 General Plan land use and zoning designations for each vacant parcel in the City to determine residential development capacity. The analysis showed that development of Opportunity Parcels and Partially Constrained Parcels is estimated to result in the construction of approximately 2,871 to 5,255 new dwelling units. Based on consideration of existing development patterns in the City and the constraints present on the Partially Constrained Parcels, it is assumed that only a percentage of the City’s maximum potential residential development capacity will actually be built. The Housing Inventory, Table 7 of Attachment A, projects that, due to physical constraints and land use/zoning standards, approximately 4,110 dwelling units will be built. The number of dwelling units built will depend largely on market demand. These estimates are approximate and do not consider density bonuses or other factors that could affect residential development yields.

Zoning to Encourage Housing for Lower-Income

Density is a critical factor in the development of affordable housing. Affordable housing tends to be developed at the highest density range available in a jurisdiction. In California’s current economic state in which public housing grants have diminished in the face of increasing need, and redevelopment funding is no longer available, reducing costs of the development of affordable housing has become even more critical. Overall, her density lowers the per unit land cost. Fortunately, compared with many other areas in Southern California, land costs in Riverside County and specifically, in Jurupa Valley, are significantly lower.

Pursuant to AB 2348 of 2004, the “default density” for most Riverside County jurisdictions, including Jurupa Valley, is 30 dwelling units per acre. The default density refers to the density at which lower-income housing development is presumed to be feasible, although state law allows jurisdictions to propose alternative densities that are sufficient to facilitate affordable housing based on local experience and circumstances.

Based on an analysis of multi-family developments in Riverside County, housing affordable to Moderate, Low and Very-Low income households is possible at default densities ranging from 20 to 40 dwelling units per acre due to the County’s still relatively low land and construction costs when compared with Orange, Los Angeles, and Ventura counties. Based on a Riverside County analysis of recent affordable, multi-family developments in western Riverside County (see Appendix B),

1 Memo of June 9, 2005 from California Department of Housing and Community Development on AB 2348 of 2004.
projects at densities ranging from 12 to 54 dwelling units per acre have been built in the County in recent years.

Over half of these projects have been successfully developed at densities of 25 dwelling units/acre or less. The recent history of actual affordable developments in Riverside County demonstrates that lower-income units are feasible in the City’s Highest Density Residential land use designation District (HHDR), which corresponds with the R-5 and R-6 Zone (Residential Incentive Zone).

These zones are intended to promote affordable multi-family housing development close to jobs, schools, public transit, and services. In combination with the HHDR General Plan designation, housing or mixed use developments with base densities of up to 25 dwelling units per acre are allowed in these zones. In addition, the City will apply density bonuses as allowed by state law, plus available flexible development standards, such as reduced parking requirement (one off-street space per unit required instead of the usual two spaces), streamlined permit processing, and other incentives to encourage affordable housing development. This zone is intended to promote affordable, multi-family housing development close to jobs, schools, and services by allowing a base residential density up to 25 dwelling units per acre, and includes zoning incentives such as flexible development standards, such as reduced parking requirement (one off-street space per unit required instead of the usual two spaces), streamlined permit processing, and other incentives.

### 1. Existing Housing Needs

This section provides an overview of existing housing needs in Jurupa Valley. It focuses on four types of housing need:

1. Housing need resulting from housing cost burden;
2. Housing need resulting from overcrowding;
3. Housing need resulting from population growth; and
4. Housing needs of special needs groups such as elderly persons, large households, persons with disabilities, female-headed households, homeless persons, and farm workers.

**Housing Cost Burden**

Housing cost burden is generally defined as households paying more than 30% of their gross income on housing-related expenses, including rent or mortgage payments and utilities. High housing costs can cause households to spend a disproportionate percentage of their income on housing. This may result in payment problems, deferred maintenance, or overcrowding.
This section uses data from the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) provided by HUD. The CHAS provides information related to households with housing problems, including cost burden, overcrowding, and/or without complete kitchen facilities and plumbing systems. The most recent estimates are derived from the 2008-2012 ACS and include a variety of housing need variables, further broken down by HUD-defined income limits and HUD-specified housing types. It should be noted that HUD-defined income limits differ slightly from the income limits established by the state, as shown in Table 5.30.

Table 5.30: Income Limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUD Income Limits</th>
<th>State HCD Income Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income (0-30% AMI)</td>
<td>Extremely Low Income (0-30% AMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (31-50% AMI)</td>
<td>Very Low (31-50% AMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (51-80% AMI)</td>
<td>Low Income (51-80% AMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate/Above Moderate Income (81%+ AMI)</td>
<td>Moderate Income (81-120% AMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above Moderate Income (&gt;120% AMI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Overcrowding

Dwelling units with more than 1.5 persons per room are considered overcrowded. Overcrowding increases health and safety concerns and stresses the condition of the housing stock and infrastructure. Overcrowding is strongly related to household size, particularly for large households and especially very large households and the availability of suitably sized housing. Overcrowding impacts owners and renters; however, renters are generally more significantly impacted. Some households may not be financially able to purchase adequately sized housing and may instead accept smaller housing or reside with other individuals or families in the same home in an effort to lower costs.

Household overcrowding reflects various living situations: 1) a family lives in a home that is too small; 2) a family chooses to house extended family members; or 3) unrelated individuals or families are “doubling up” to afford housing. However, cultural differences also contribute to the overcrowded conditions. Some cultures tend to have larger household sizes than others do, due to the preference of sharing living quarters with extended family members as a way of sharing living costs among family members. Overcrowding can strain physical facilities and the delivery of public services, reduce the quality of the physical environment, contribute to a shortage of parking, and accelerate the deterioration of homes and neighborhoods.

Approximately 11% of all households in Jurupa Valley were overcrowded, and 6% were severely overcrowded, according to the 2009-2013 ACS. As shown in Table 5.31, overcrowding is significantly
more common among the City’s renter-households than owner-households. By comparison, the incidence of overcrowding in Riverside County is much lower.

Table 5.31: Overcrowding by Tenure, Percent of Total Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overcrowded (1+ occupants per room)</th>
<th>Severely Overcrowded (1.5+ occupants per room)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley¹</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County²</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the block group level.
² Riverside County: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the County level.
Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 2009-2013 (B25014).

Projected Housing Needs – 2014-2021

The State of California determines the housing need for the counties that make up the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region. SCAG is responsible for allocating housing needs to each jurisdiction in its region. A local jurisdiction’s share of regional housing need is the number of additional housing units needed to accommodate the forecasted growth in the number of households, to replace expected demolitions and conversion of housing units to non-housing uses, and to achieve a future vacancy rate that allows for healthy functioning of the housing market. The allocation is divided into the four income categories addressed in the RHNA: Very Low, Low, Moderate, and Above Moderate. The allocation is further adjusted to avoid an over-concentration of lower income households in any one jurisdiction. Table 5.32 shows the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for the City of Jurupa Valley, as determined by SCAG. This RHNA covers a planning period of January 1, 2014 through October 31, 2021.

Table 5.32: Regional Housing Needs Allocation (2014-2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Construction Need²</th>
<th>Extremely Low Income¹</th>
<th>Very Low Income</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Moderate Income</th>
<th>Above-Moderate Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Housing Units²</td>
<td>1,712</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The City’s RHNA allocation for very low-income units is 409 units; this allocation is evenly split between extremely low and very low income groups.
² Jurupa Valley: SCAG RHNA available at the city level
Source: Regional Housing Needs Allocation, SCAG 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan

The City analyzed its ability to meet Regional Housing Needs in the 5th Housing Cycle allocation of housing need. The results of this analysis are summarized in Table 5.33. The table shows that the City’s land inventory, including projects approved and the potential development of vacant and underutilized parcels, exceeds the net remaining RHNA for this planning period in all income categories except for the Extremely Low/Very Low categories. In those categories, there is an unmet need of 438 dwelling units. To
accommodate the remaining need for Extremely Low and Very Low income housing, Programs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.9, 1.1.13, and 1.1.16 commit the City to designating 16.37 acres of HHDR land, working with the Riverside Housing Authority, housing non-profits, and housing developers to identify specific sites for developing housing suitable for extremely low and very-low income households, including seniors, disabled persons, veterans, farmworkers and the homeless.

A discussion of public facilities and infrastructure needed to serve future development is contained in Section J. Governmental Constraints, and also in Sections 9 through 12 of the Community Safety, Services and Facilities Element. There are currently no known public facility service limitations that would preclude the level of development described in the RHNA, although developers will be required to pay fees or construct public improvements prior to or concurrent with development.

Table 5.33: Progress in Meeting RHNA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Capacity</th>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely/Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA 6th Cycle RHNA (1/1/14-10/31)</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Units Built Since 1/1/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lennar Harvest Village</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Redesignation of Country Village Senior Apartments to HHDR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Habitat for Humanity Veteran Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Development Potential in Specific Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Corridor Specific Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Meadows Ranch SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Vista SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Knolls SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Development Potential on Vacant and Underutilized Parcels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranch Residential (EDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Neighborhood (LDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Rural Community – Low Density Residential” (RC-LDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential (HDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Density Residential (VHDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Density Residential (HHDR)</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RHNA Credits (Built + Potential)</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA Surplus/(Deficit)</td>
<td>15(199)</td>
<td>158-243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Approved in 2016; construction expected in 2017-2018. Cal Vet funded; for Low Income veterans and their families.
2 Assumes 65% of potential HHDR units on vacant or underutilized parcels (653) applied to “Very Low/Extremely Low” housing need, with the remaining potential HHDR units (214) allocated to meet “Low Income” need.
Redesignation/Rezoning of Sites to Meet RHNA

In the City of Jurupa, residential densities are determined by a parcel’s general plan land use designation. As provided in Program HE 1.1.1, the City will amend its General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map, as necessary, to redesignate sites to achieve a total of at least 16 acres of additional HHDR land with compatible zoning. If it is determined that redesignation and rezoning of any of the identified sites is not feasible, the City will identify another site or sites of comparable acreage for the development of housing affordable to lower-income households.

Special Needs Groups

Certain households, because of their special characteristics and needs, may require special accommodations and may have difficulty finding housing due to special needs. Special needs groups include seniors, persons with disabilities, families with children, single-parent households, large households, homeless persons and persons at-risk of homelessness, farm workers, and persons with HIV/AIDS.

Seniors

Seniors (persons age 65 and above) are gradually becoming a more substantial segment of a community’s population. Americans are living longer and having fuller lives than ever before in our history and are expected to continue to do so. Elderly persons are vulnerable to housing problems due to limited income, prevalence of physical or mental disabilities, limited mobility, and high health care costs. The elderly, particularly those with disabilities, may face increased difficulty in finding housing accommodations. A senior on a fixed income can face great difficulty finding safe and affordable housing. Subsidized housing and federal housing assistance programs are increasingly challenging to secure and often involve a long waiting list.

According to the 2010 Census, about 8% of all residents in Jurupa Valley were age 65 or older, 23% of the City’s households included at least one elderly member (Table 5.1, page 5-10) and 18% of households were headed by a senior resident. Between 2009 and 2013, a little over 11% of all seniors in Jurupa Valley were living in poverty. The 2009-2013 ACS also estimated that about 16% of Jurupa Valley’s elderly population had at least one disability and 25% had two or more disabilities, as shown in Table 5.34. This is comparable to the elderly population in the county (16%) and the state (15%) with one disability; and similar to the elderly population.
in the county (20%) and the state (22%) that report two or more disabilities.

**Table 5.34: Elderly with Disabilities Limiting Independent Living, 2000 and 2009-2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Status</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2009-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of People 65+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With one type of disability</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With two or more types of disability</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total with a disability</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Estimated data from 2009-2013 American Community Survey for illustrative purposes only
3. ACS 2009-2013, 65+ year olds: 7,593

Source: Bureau of the Census 2000 (PCT 26-SF3); ACS 2009-2013 (C18108).

**Table 5.35** summarizes the 2007-2011 ACS estimates of median household incomes for senior householders in the various CDPs comprising Jurupa Valley.

**Table 5.35: Median Income for Senior-Headed Households (2000 and 2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Householder Age</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007-20111,2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crestmore Heights CDP1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$71,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Avon CDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>$24,202</td>
<td>$23,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 years</td>
<td>$15,792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Loma CDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>$26,905</td>
<td>$43,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ years</td>
<td>$27,333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedley CDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>$32,143</td>
<td>$43,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ years</td>
<td>$26,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubidoux CDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>$30,326</td>
<td>$32,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ years</td>
<td>$23,555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyslope CDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>$29,732</td>
<td>$29,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ years</td>
<td>$25,480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>$33,532</td>
<td>$39,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ years</td>
<td>$26,054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>$41,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ years</td>
<td>$27,081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Estimated data from 2007-2011 American Community Survey for illustrative purposes only.
2. The ACS reports median income for households with a householder age 65+ years
3. 2000 Census data not available for the Crestmore Heights CDP.

Source: U.S. Census 2000 (P56-SF3); 2007-2011 ACS (B19049).
Generally, the median income for a senior household was about one-third of that for an average household (Table 5.16, page 5-40), except within Crestmore Heights, where the senior household median income was nearly double that of an average household in most of Jurupa Valley. Data from the County’s 2008-2012 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) supports the information presented below. According to CHAS, in Jurupa Valley 70% of elderly, renter-occupied households and 38% of elderly owner-occupied households suffered from housing cost burden (i.e., total housing costs exceeded 30% of total income). Similarly, in the County, 62% of elderly-renter-occupied households and 36% of elderly-owner-occupied households suffered from housing cost burden. Furthermore, the majority of elderly-headed households in both Jurupa Valley and Riverside County were homeowners. Many may need financial assistance in making necessary repairs or accessibility improvements.

### Table 5.36: Householders by Tenure and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Householder Age</th>
<th>2000 Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>2000 Renter-Occupied</th>
<th>2010 Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>2010 Renter-Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24 years</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>1,532</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-64 years</td>
<td>11,212</td>
<td>3,352</td>
<td>11,743</td>
<td>4,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 plus years</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,912</td>
<td>6,499</td>
<td>16,293</td>
<td>8,233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jurupa Valley: 2000 Census data aggregated at the block group level and 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level.
Source: Bureau of the Census 2000 and 2010 (QT-H2)

### Resources

The Riverside County Office on Aging is a planning and advocacy entity that serves as the official Area Agency on Aging (AAA) throughout Riverside County. It is charged to provide leadership in developing a system of care services for older persons and adults with disabilities in the County. Area Agencies on Aging (AAAs) are local aging programs that provide information and services on a range of assistance for older adults and those who care for them. Some of the programs and services provided by AAA include:

- Aging and Disability Resource Connection Program
- Care Coordination
- Caregiving
- Care Transitions Intervention (CTI)
- Community Outreach and Education
- Legal Assistance
- Transportation

Some senior programs in the City of Jurupa Valley have been offered in partnership with Jurupa Valley Adopt a Family program, a
community-based 501(c)(3) organization, and Healthy Jurupa Valley. Services and programs provided include assistance to senior households during the holiday seasons, and workshops catering to senior residents; recent workshop topics include returning to work after retirement. Through Healthy Jurupa Valley, seniors are also invited to attend senior health fairs. Additionally, the Jurupa Community Services District Recreation and Parks Department provides a Senior Mentoring Program that focuses on providing enrichment and/or general assistance to senior citizens, including assistance with everyday tasks and exposing seniors to new activities.

Seniors in Jurupa Valley may also benefit from programs offered through the County of Riverside Economic Development Agency (EDA). Through the Senior Home Repair Grant (SHRG) Program, EDA may be able to cover up to $6,000 of cost of repairs with no loan or payback requirement.

In terms of affordable housing resources, there are 357 affordable rental units in 4 rental properties throughout Jurupa Valley that are restricted for seniors, with renter qualifications not to exceed anywhere from 50% to 80% of median income. In addition to the senior housing developments listed in Table 5.37, seniors in the City are also served by 11 state-licensed residential care facilities for the elderly and 15 adult residential facilities with a combined capacity to serve 379 persons. In addition, Country Village Apartments provides 1,238 senior apartments, with rents affordable to low- and moderate income households.

**Table 5.37: Senior Housing Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Village Senior Apartments</td>
<td>8999 Mission Boulevard Riverside, CA 92509</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Village Apartments</td>
<td>10250 Country Club Drive Jurupa Valley, CA 91752</td>
<td>1,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Villas</td>
<td>5870 Mission Boulevard Riverside, CA 92509</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Palms</td>
<td>5875 Mission Boulevard Rubidoux, CA 92509</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Palms II</td>
<td>3702 La Rue Street Riverside, CA 92509</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Jurupa Valley, 2015
Persons with Disabilities

Federal laws define a person with a disability as “any person who has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities; has a record of such impairment; or is regarded as having such impairment.” In general, a physical or mental impairment includes hearing, mobility and visual impairments, chronic alcoholism, chronic mental illness, AIDS, AIDS Related Complex, and mental retardation that substantially limit one or more major life activities. Major life activities include walking, talking, and hearing, seeing, breathing, learning, performing manual tasks, and caring for oneself.

The U.S. Census Bureau classifies disabilities into the following categories:

- **Hearing difficulty**: Deaf or having serious difficulty hearing
- **Vision difficulty**: Blind or having serious difficulty seeing, even when wearing glasses
- **Cognitive difficulty**: Because of a physical, mental, or emotional problem, having difficulty remembering, concentrating, or making decisions
- **Ambulatory difficulty**: Having serious difficulty walking or climbing stairs
- **Self-care difficulty**: Having difficulty bathing or dressing
- **Independent living difficulty**: Because of a physical, mental, or emotional problem, having difficulty doing errands alone such as visiting a doctor’s office or shopping

According to the 2009-2013 ACS, approximately 11% of the Jurupa Valley population had one or more disabilities. Of the disabilities tallied during that time, as shown in Table 5.38, ambulatory and cognitive disabilities were the most prevalent. The City’s elderly population, in particular, seemed to be the most affected by disabilities with about 41% of Jurupa Valley seniors affected by at least one disability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability by Age and Type</th>
<th>5 to 17 years</th>
<th>18 to 64 years</th>
<th>65 years and over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Persons with a Disability</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Difficulty</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Difficulty</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Difficulty</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulatory Difficulty</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Care Difficulty</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Living Difficulty*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the census tract level.
*Tallied only for persons 18 years and over
Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 2009-2013, (S1810).
The City’s homeless population also appeared to be disproportionately affected by disabilities and health issues. The County of Riverside’s 2015 Point-in-Time Homeless Report found that 29% of Jurupa Valley’s homeless had a physical disability, 34% reported a mental illness, 48% had a substance abuse disorder, and 27% reported a chronic health condition. Among those persons who are marginally housed, dual diagnoses have been noted as a problem, i.e., cognitive difficulty connected to chemical dependency/addiction.

The elderly population is expected to grow substantially in the next 20 years. Since seniors have a much higher probability of being disabled, the housing and service needs for persons with disabilities should grow considerably commensurate with senior population growth. Special housing needs for persons with disabilities fall into two general categories: physical design to address mobility impairments; and in-home social, educational, and medical support to address developmental and mental impairments.

**Persons with Developmental Disabilities**

As defined by state law, “developmental disability” means a severe, chronic disability of an individual who:

- Is attributable to a mental or physical impairment or combination of mental and physical impairments;
- Is manifested before the individual attains age 18;
- Is likely to continue indefinitely;
- Results in substantial functional limitations in three or more of the following areas of major life activity: a) self-care; b) receptive and expressive language; c) learning; d) mobility; e) self-direction; f) capacity for independent living; or g) economic self-sufficiency; and
- Reflects the individual’s need for a combination and sequence of special, interdisciplinary, or generic services, individualized supports, or other forms of assistance that are of lifelong or extended duration and are individually planned and coordinated.

The Census does not record developmental disabilities. According to the U.S. Administration on Developmental Disabilities, an accepted estimate of the percentage of the population that can be defined as developmentally disabled is 1.5%. This equates to approximately 1,407 persons in the City of Jurupa Valley, based on the 2010 Census population.

The Inland Regional Center is a community-based, private nonprofit corporation funded by the State of California to serve people with developmental disabilities, as required by the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (aka Lanterman Act). The Lanterman Act is part of California law that sets out the rights and
responsibilities of persons with developmental disabilities. The Inland Regional Center is one of 21 regional centers throughout California and serves individuals and their families who reside within Riverside County. The Regional Center provides diagnoses and assessments of eligibility, and helps plan, access, coordinate, and monitor the services and supports that are needed because of a developmental disability. As of September 2015, the Regional Center had over 3,200 clients living in Jurupa Valley. Among these clients, approximately 74% are residing at home with other family members or guardians. Only about 5% are living independently, and another 12% are in community care facilities.

**Resources**

A number of non-profit agencies provide supportive services to persons with disabilities living in Jurupa Valley. ARC of Riverside County is a private, non-profit corporation serving adults with intellectual and other developmental disabilities. ARC operates six facilities in Western Riverside County providing services for those in need of full-time programming to ensure the development and maintenance of functional skills required for self-advocacy, community integration, and self-care. In addition, the Community Access Center (CAC), an independent living center located in the City of Riverside, has been providing services to people with disabilities in the County since 1995. CAC provides information, supportive services, and independent living skills training.

**Families with Children and Single-Parent Households**

According to the 2010 Census, approximately 41% of all households in Jurupa Valley have children under the age of 18, as shown in Table 5.13 (page 5-38). Single-parent households often require special consideration and assistance because of their greater need for affordable housing, as well as accessible daycare, health care, and other supportive services. Due to their generally lower income and higher living expenses such as daycare, single-parent households have limited opportunities for finding affordable, decent, and safe housing.

In 2010, approximately 2,705 single-parent households resided within Jurupa Valley, representing 11% of the City’s households. An estimated 62% (1,684 households) of these single-parent households with children under age 18 were headed by females, representing approximately 7% of all households in the City. Of particular concern are single-parent households with lower incomes. The 2011-2013 ACS shows that approximately 33% (727 households) of the City’s female-headed households with children had incomes below the poverty level. By comparison, about 13% of all households had incomes below the poverty level.
Resources
Limited household income constrains the ability of single-parent households to afford adequate housing, childcare, health care, and other necessities. Several agencies that serve Jurupa Valley residents offer various programs for families with children. The Jurupa Community Services District’s Parks and Recreation Department offers programs and recreational classes for the City’s youth, including health fairs, youth sports, special events, help with homework, and volunteer programs. Additional community and family resources are available through Healthy Jurupa Valley, as part of a national Healthy Cities movement to improve the health and quality of life for City residents. Healthy Jurupa Valley efforts are carried out through Action Teams, including the Jurupa Valley Family Resource Network, and include the organization of special community events such as the Healthy Jurupa Valley Extravaganza Health Fair that provides access to community services and children activities.

Single-parent households in Jurupa Valley can also benefit from general programs and services for lower- and moderate-income persons, including the Housing Authority of the County of Riverside Housing Choice Voucher and Public Housing programs, the County of Riverside Economic Development Agency’s (EDA) First Time Homebuyer and Home Repair Loan Program (HRLP) Programs, and various community and social services provided by non-profit organizations in the region such as the Food Bank.

Large Households

Large households are defined as those with five or more members. These households are usually families with two or more children or families with extended family members such as in-laws or grandparents. It can also include multiple families living in one housing unit to save on housing costs. Large households are a special needs group because the availability of adequately sized, affordable housing units is often limited. To save for necessities such as food, clothing, and medical care, lower- and moderate-income large households may reside in smaller units, resulting in overcrowding.

As indicated in Table 5.11 (page 5-37), in 2010, 33% of all households in Jurupa Valley had five or more members. The proportion of large households in Jurupa Valley was higher than in the County (21%). Generally, areas with higher proportions of large households also
tend to have a high proportion of family households and non-White populations, and have higher rates of overcrowding and higher cost burden. Cultural differences can also contribute to overcrowded conditions. Some cultures tend to have larger households or more open attitudes about intergenerational living, shared costs, and living arrangements, even in small housing units. In addition, recently arrived immigrants may stay with relatives on a temporary basis until they are established.

Table 5.39: Large Households by Tenure, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Persons in Unit</th>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>Renter Occupied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>3,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven or more</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>2,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Large Households</td>
<td>5,362</td>
<td>2,706</td>
<td>8,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>16,293</td>
<td>8,233</td>
<td>24,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total Households</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jurupa Valley: 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level.
Source: U.S. Census 2010 (QT-H2)

Resources

Large households in Jurupa Valley can benefit from general programs and services for lower-and moderate-income persons, including The Housing Authority of the County of Riverside Housing Choice Voucher and Public Housing programs, the County of Riverside Economic Development Agency’s (EDA) First Time Home Buyer (FTHB) and Home Repair Loan Program (HRLP) Programs, and various community and social services provided by non-profit organizations in the region.

Extremely Low Income Persons

In 2012, approximately 3,100 extremely low-income (ELI) households resided in the City, representing 12.5% of the total households. Most extremely low-income households are renters and experience a high incidence of housing problems, such as overpayment (defined as cost burden greater than 30% of income), overcrowding and substandard housing.

Projected Needs

To calculate the projected housing needs for its lowest income residents, the City assumed 50% of its very low-income RHNA housing need are extremely low-income households. As a result, based on the assigned very low income need of 409 units, the City has a projected need of 205 units for very low income households, and 204 units of extremely low income households. It is reasonable to assume that many of these households will be seeking rental housing and most likely be facing an overpayment, overcrowding or substandard housing conditions. Moreover, very low and extremely low-income households often face other challenges, such as mental
or other disabilities and special needs. To address the range of needs, the City will work with the Riverside County Housing Authority (RHA) and non-profit housing agencies to use public financing tools, CDBG and HOME funds to assist in the production of housing to meet Very Low and Extremely Low Income housing needs. The City will also consider assisting the RHA and non-profits and other entities to meet ELI housing needs through site identification assistance, development incentives, fee waivers, mobile homeowner assistance, and by encouraging innovative housing types, such as mobile home assistance, single-room occupancy (SRO) units (see Programs HE 1.1.2, 1.1.4, 1.1.5, 1.1.8, 1.1.15 and 1.1.16).

Homeless Persons

On January 4, 2012, final regulations went into effect to implement changes to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) definition of homelessness contained in the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act. The definition affects who is eligible for various HUD-funded homeless assistance programs. The new definition includes four broad categories of homelessness:

- People who are living in a place not meant for human habitation, in emergency shelter, in transitional housing, or who are exiting an institution where they temporarily resided.
- People who are losing their primary nighttime residence, which may include a motel or hotel or a doubled-up situation, within 14 days and lack resources or support networks to remain in housing.
- Families with children or unaccompanied youth who are unstably housed and likely to continue in that state.
- People who are fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence, have no other residence, and lack the resources or support networks to obtain other permanent housing.

This definition demonstrates the diversity of people experiencing homelessness. The numerous locations in which people experiencing homelessness can be found complicate efforts to accurately estimate their total population. For example, an individual living with friends on a temporary basis could be experiencing homelessness, but would be unlikely to be identified in a homeless count.

The most recent point-in-time count conducted in 2015 identified 168 unsheltered homeless individuals in the City of Jurupa Valley. This figure is three times higher than the 2013 estimate and makes up about 11% of the total homeless population for Riverside County, as shown in Table 5.40. The point-in-time count is a snapshot of how
many homeless people are on streets and in emergency and transitional shelters on any given day in Riverside County and Jurupa Valley, although numbers can vary significantly by season.

Table 5.40: Homeless Population in Jurupa Valley and Riverside County, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jurupa Valley</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td>Sheltered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Riverside County</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td>Sheltered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>1,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,888</td>
<td>2,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5,090</td>
<td>6,203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “–”: count not available.

Resources

The resources and services described in Table 5.41 serve low income and special needs populations in Jurupa Valley—not just the homeless. While some of the programs and services identified below are not located within the City’s boundaries, the services they provide are available to persons residing in Jurupa Valley.

Table 5.41: Homeless and Special Needs Housing Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Shelter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path of Life Ministries - Community Shelter Program</td>
<td>An emergency homeless shelter that serves adults by providing temporary housing along with assistance in obtaining important documents, job readiness, computer workshops, counseling, meals, hygiene supplies and various other forms of support. This program provides beds for up to 64 qualified single men and women.</td>
<td>2840 Hulen Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside, CA 92507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path of Life Ministries - Family Shelter Program</td>
<td>This program is offered to single parents with children, couples with children and single women, Support services focus on rapid re-housing, employment and increased income. It is a dormitory setting with 50 beds.</td>
<td>2530 Third Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside, CA 92507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path of Life Ministries - Emergency Cold Weather Shelter</td>
<td>The Path of Life Community Emergency Shelter provides an additional 72 beds from December to mid-April. These beds are provided on a night-by-night basis under the federal cold weather shelter initiative in cooperation with the County of Riverside.</td>
<td>6216 Brockton Avenue, #211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside, CA 92506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Kitchens</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary Chapel</td>
<td>Food assistance is provided on the 1st and 3rd Sunday of every month.</td>
<td>5383 Martin Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jurupa Valley, CA 95168-11082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Food Ministries</td>
<td>Provides food boxes for individuals and families on Thursdays.</td>
<td>5410 Beach Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside, CA 92509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manna Ministries</td>
<td>Food assistance is provided on the 1st and 3rd Sunday of every month.</td>
<td>4318 Pyrite Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jurupa Valley, CA 92509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubidoux Missionary Baptist Church</td>
<td>Groceries are provided to families and individuals on the 2nd and 4th Saturday of each month.</td>
<td>2890 Rubidoux Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jurupa Valley, CA 92509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubidoux Family Resource Center</td>
<td>Provides groceries and food, and also provides referrals to resources such as thrift stores and clothing.</td>
<td>5473 Mission Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rubidoux, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transitional Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Place</td>
<td>Jefferson Transitional Programs (JTP) is a non-profit 501c3 offering vocational, supported living, and educational programs for individuals with chronic mental illness and/or addictions.</td>
<td>3839 Brockton Avenue Riverside, CA 92501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe House Transitional Living</td>
<td>A 15-bed apartment complex in downtown Riverside. Services are available to older homeless youth ages 18-22 for up to 18 months. Five apartments are set aside for Permanent Supportive Housing for youth ages 18-24.</td>
<td>9685 Hayes Street Riverside, CA 92503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permanent Supportive Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path of Life Ministries</td>
<td>Provides immediate housing to chronically homeless individuals and some families, in scattered privately owned homes and apartments throughout Riverside County.</td>
<td>6216 Brockton Avenue, #211 Riverside, CA 92506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rental and Support Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path of Life Ministries</td>
<td><strong>Rapid-Rehousing Program:</strong> provides assistance for the most immediate housing possible for homeless families with children and provides temporary rental subsidies. <strong>Rental Assistance Program:</strong> when available, provides one-time rental assistance (up to $1000.00) to those exiting from homelessness or at risk of becoming homeless.</td>
<td>6216 Brockton Avenue, #211 Riverside, CA 92506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill AIDS Project</td>
<td>Provides housing assistance, including help in locating and paying for emergency, transitional, or permanent housing, funds for paying rent, mortgage, and utility assistance. Referrals are available to other government and private subsidized housing programs and the state’s homeless prevention program.</td>
<td>3576 Arlington Avenue, #206 Riverside, CA 92506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire Veterans Stand Down</td>
<td>Reunites homeless veterans with their families and communities through restorative resources and services. Some services provided include VA Claim assistance, legal clinics/seminars, transportation, food, blankets/sleeping bags, and care counseling.</td>
<td>6185 Magnolia Avenue, #338 Riverside, CA 92506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled American Veterans Charity</td>
<td>Provides free, professional assistance to veterans and their families in obtaining benefits and services.</td>
<td>4351 University Avenue Riverside, CA 92501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran Social Services</td>
<td>Some emergency services provided include food pantry, grocery packs, clothes, lunches, motel vouchers, eviction prevention, and rental assistance.</td>
<td>3772 Taft Street Riverside, CA 92503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Jurupa Valley, 2015

---

**Farm Workers**

As traditionally defined, farm workers are persons whose primary incomes are earned through permanent or seasonal agricultural labor. Permanent farm workers tend to work in fields or processing plants. During harvest periods when workloads increase, the need to supplement the permanent labor force is satisfied with seasonal workers. Often these seasonal workers are migrant workers, defined by the inability to return to their primary residence at the end of the workday. The agricultural workforce in Riverside County does many jobs, including weeding, thinning, planting, pruning, irrigation, tractor work, pesticide applications, harvesting, transportation to the cooler or market, and a variety of jobs at packing and processing facilities, as described in Table 5.42.
Jurupa Valley was once primarily a farming area, with dairies, orchards, row crops, and small farms. With urbanization, most agricultural uses have moved out of the City and therefore, agricultural employment within the City of Jurupa Valley is declining. According to the 2014 American Fact Finder, only about one-tenth of 1% of the City’s civilian workforce (or 390 persons) works in agriculture and related occupations. It follows that few farm workers live and work in the City. While only small, isolated pockets of commercial agricultural remain in the City, cities must also consider housing needs for farmworkers employed in outlying County areas.

It is difficult to estimate the number of farm workers residing in the County or City of Jurupa Valley. The 2012 USDA Census of Farmworkers reported 1,215 farms, employing 13,843 farmworkers in the County. Among these farms, 107 farms reported hiring 3,324 migrant workers. USDA data is only available at the county level. According to 2011-2013 ACS, there were 9,684 agricultural workers living in Riverside County (about 1% of the County’s total labor force).

Farm worker households tend to have high rates of poverty, live disproportionately in housing which is in the poorest condition, have very high rates of overcrowding, have low homeownership rates, and are predominantly members of minority groups. Some immigrant farm workers may have an inherent fear and mistrust of law enforcement and other government authorities based on their experience or perception of the government in their country of origin or on the rumors and experiences of other farm workers. These farm workers may be reluctant to report fair housing issues or violations or contact any other government official for assistance. Furthermore, most federally funded housing programs, including the Housing Choice Voucher program and other subsidy programs, exclude persons who are undocumented. This means that people who are sometimes most in need are unable to obtain housing assistance, and others are unable to find any housing and instead must resort to homeless shelters, to sleeping in their vehicles, or to homeless encampments.

### Table 5.42: Farm Worker Employment Profile, Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario Metropolitan Statistical Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Title</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Location Quotient</th>
<th>Mean Hourly Wage</th>
<th>Annual Mean Wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farming, Fishing, and Forestry Occupations</td>
<td>5,410</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>$10.30</td>
<td>$21,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Line Supervisors of Farming, Fishing, and Forestry Workers</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$19.78</td>
<td>$41,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Inspectors</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>$24.98</td>
<td>$51,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graders and Sorters, Agricultural Products</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>$8.90</td>
<td>$18,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Equipment Operators</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>$11.70</td>
<td>$24,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmworkers and Laborers, Crop, Nursery, and Greenhouse</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>$9.41</td>
<td>$19,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), the average annual full-time wage for farm workers and laborers in the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario MSA in May 2014 was $19,570. Within farming, fishing, and forestry occupations, first-line supervisors and agricultural inspectors earned the highest wages. Table 5.42 presents the location quotient for farming, fishing, and forestry occupations. The location quotient is the ratio of the area concentration of occupational employment to the national average concentration. A location quotient greater than one indicates the occupation has a higher share of employment than average, and a location quotient less than one indicates the occupation is less prevalent in the area than average. The location quotient for agricultural employment in Jurupa Valley shows there is a moderate to high concentration of all types of agricultural occupation in the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario MSA. In Jurupa Valley, an estimated 606 residents were employed in the farming, fishing, and forestry occupations, or 11% of the County’s population in these occupations.

Resources

A number of service providers in Riverside County provide assistance and services to farmworkers. The Family Resource Center Program at Mecca Family and Farm Workers Service Center (91-275 66th Avenue, Suite 100, Mecca, CA 92254) provides seven core service types: parenting skills, self-sufficiency, community action, child abuse prevention services, information and referral services, education and literacy, and life skills. There are also two farmworker housing projects located in Riverside County: Chapultepec Apartments (62-600 Lincoln St., Mecca, CA 92254; 31 units) and Las Mañanitas (91-200 Avenue 63 Mecca, CA 92254; 128 beds).

Publicly Assisted Housing

The availability and location of publicly assisted housing may be a fair housing concern. If such housing is concentrated in one area of a community or of a region, a household seeking affordable housing is limited to choices within the area. In addition, public/assisted housing and Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) assistance should be accessible to qualified households regardless of race/ethnicity, disability, or other protected class status.

Public Housing

The Housing Authority of the County of Riverside (HACR) owns and operates 38 conventional public housing units in Jurupa Valley and a total of 469 units in Riverside County. Eligible residents must be seniors or disabled, or have an annual gross income at or below 80% of the AMI. As of October 2015, 38 Jurupa Valley households were living in public housing units managed by the HACR, and there were 1,443 Jurupa Valley households on the waiting list for public housing.
However, HACR plans to convert the Public Housing units in Jurupa Valley to Project-Based Vouchers (PBV).

**Housing Choice Vouchers Program**

HACR administers the Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCV) for Jurupa Valley residents. As of October 2015, 359 Jurupa Valley households were receiving Housing Choice Vouchers. For the distribution of Voucher assistance within the City, HACR has established local preferences such as families who have lost HCVs due to funding cuts, working families, elderly or disabled, and veterans. As of October 2015, 381 households were on the waiting list for the HCV program.

As an extension of the HCV program, HACR assists eligible families who purchase a home by applying their existing HCV towards a monthly mortgage payment. Eligible families may qualify for a maximum period of 10 or 15 years (depending on the mortgage terms).

**Other Affordable Housing Developments**

Housing developments utilizing federal, state, and/or local programs, including state and local bond programs, Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), density bonus, or direct assistance programs, are often restricted for use as low-income housing and provide another source of affordable housing for a jurisdiction. *Table 5.43* summarizes housing developments in Jurupa Valley in which some or all of the units are designated as affordable for low to moderate-income households. Together these projects provide 382 units of affordable housing.

**Table 5.43: Non-Public Housing Affordable Units in Jurupa Valley**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Unit Size</th>
<th>Total Affordable Units</th>
<th>Total Project Units</th>
<th>Expiration of Affordability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Villas</td>
<td>5870 Mission Blvd. Riverside, CA 92509</td>
<td>LIHTC, Sec 202/811</td>
<td>53 – 1 BR 1 – 2 BR</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Palms</td>
<td>5875 Mission Blvd. Rubidoux, CA 92509</td>
<td>RDA, LIHTC, HOME</td>
<td>88 – 1 BR 20 – 2 BR 1 – 3 BR</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Palms II</td>
<td>3702 La Rue St. Riverside, CA 92509</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>73 – 1 BR 18 – 2 BR</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Village Senior Apartments</td>
<td>8989 Mission Blvd. Riverside, CA 92509</td>
<td>RDA, LIHTC, HOME</td>
<td>90 – 1 BR 12 – 2 BR</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for Humanity-CalVet Jurupa Valley Veterans Housing</td>
<td>At the end of Amarillo Street in Glen Avon area</td>
<td>CalVet Habitat, HACR</td>
<td>18 – 3 BR 8 – 4 BR</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>382</td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: These properties were developed prior to the incorporation of Jurupa Valley. Therefore, records on these properties do not use Jurupa Valley as the location but these properties are located in Jurupa Valley.

Abbreviations: HOME: HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HUD); CDBG: Planning Block Grant (HUD); RDA: City Redevelopment Agency; LIHTC: Low Income Housing Tax Credit; HTF: Housing Trust Fund; MHSA: Mental Health Services Act

Source: Southern California Association of Governments, 2015.
Units at Risk of Converting to Market-Rate Housing

Projects at Risk

State law requires that the City identify, analyze, and propose programs to preserve existing multi-family rental units that are eligible to convert to non-low-income housing uses due to termination of subsidy contract, mortgage prepayment, or expiring use restrictions during the next 10 years. Thus, this at-risk housing analysis covers a 10-year period from October 15, 2013 to October 15, 2023 (10 years from the statutory deadline of the Housing Element). Consistent with state law, this section identifies publicly assisted housing units in Jurupa Valley, analyzes their potential to convert to market rate housing uses, and analyzes the cost to preserve or replace those units.

Within the at-risk analysis period, only one project is considered to be at-risk of converting to market-rate housing—54-unit Mission Villas senior housing, funded with Section 202 financing and Section 8 project-based rent subsidies. The Section 8 contract for Mission Villas is due to expire on January 31, 2018. However, HUD has prioritized funding for Section 8 renewals for senior housing projects (Section 202), and therefore, this project is at low risk of converting to market-rate housing. There are several public agencies and private non-profits in the West Riverside County area with the capacity to acquire and manage at-risk units or develop new affordable units. In 2017, these include:

1. **Housing Authority of the County of Riverside**  
   Address: 5555 Arlington Avenue, Riverside, CA 92504  
   Phone: (951) 351-0700

2. **Fair Housing Council of Riverside County, Inc.**  
   3933 Mission Inn Avenue, Riverside, CA 92501  
   Phone: (951) 682-6581

3. **Southern California Association of Non-Profit Housing**  
   501 Shatto Place, Suite 403, Los Angeles, CA 90020  
   Phone: (213) 480-1249

4. **National Community Renaissance**  
   9421 Haven Avenue, Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730  
   Phone: (909) 483-2444

5. **Habitat for Humanity Riverside**  
   2180 Iowa Avenue, Riverside, CA 92507  
   Phone: (951) 787-6754

6. **Path of Life Ministries**  
   1240 Palmyrita Avenue, Suite A, Riverside, CA 92507  
   Mail: PO Box 1445, Riverside CA  
   Phone: (951) 786-9048
Preservation and Replacement Options

To preserve the existing affordable housing stock, the City must either preserve the existing assisted units or facilitate the development of new units. Depending on the circumstances of the at-risk projects, different options may be used to preserve or replace the units. Preservation options typically include: 1) transfer of project to nonprofit ownership; 2) provision of rental assistance to tenants; and 3) purchase of affordability covenants. For example, CDBG and HOME funds may be used to acquire and rehabilitate the affordable units in exchange for an extended affordability covenant on the assisted units. In terms of replacement, the most direct option is the development of new assisted multi-family housing units. These options are described below. Due to the City’s significant financial constraints, all options would require a collaborative effort between the City and the Riverside County Housing Authority or nonprofit housing agency to pursue.

1. Transfer of Ownership

Transferring ownership of an at-risk project to a nonprofit housing provider is generally one of the least costly ways to ensure that the at-risk units remain affordable for the long term. Transferring property ownership to a nonprofit organization would secure low-income restrictions, and the project would become potentially eligible for a greater range of governmental assistance. Mission Villas is a Section 202 senior housing project, which is nonprofit-owned. Therefore, transferring ownership to another nonprofit is not a necessary preservation option.

2. Rental Assistance

*Table 5.44* shows rental subsidies required for a typical 25 unit below-market apartment project in Jurupa Valley in 2015. Rental subsidies can be used to maintain affordability of the 54 at-risk affordable units at Mission Villas. All 54 units are one-bedroom assisted living units for seniors. Should the Section 8 contract not be renewed, other funding sources could be used to structure the rent subsidies to reflect the Section 8 program. According to HUD records, the units at Mission Villas are renting at $676 monthly, significantly below Fair Market Rents for comparable units. Should these units convert to market rate, the tenants should expect to pay at least $908 per month, resulting in an affordability gap of $232. As indicated in *Table 5.44*, the total cost of subsidizing the rents of all 54 at-risk units is estimated at $12,528 per month or $150,336 annually. Providing this level of subsidies for at least 55 years would require over $17 million, assuming an annual inflation rate of 2.5% over 55 years. The feasibility of this alternative is highly dependent upon the availability of reliable funding sources necessary to make
rent subsidies and the willingness of property owners to participate in the program.

Table 5.44: Rental Subsidies Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Size</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Fair Market Rent</th>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Contract Rent</th>
<th>Monthly Subsidy per Unit</th>
<th>Total Monthly Subsidy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-bedroom</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$908</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$676</td>
<td>$232</td>
<td>$12,528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Fair Market Rent (FMR) is determined by HUD, 2015.
2. 2015 contract rent for unit at Mission Villas per HUD records.

3. **Purchase of Affordability Covenants**

Another option to preserve the affordability of the at-risk project is to work with Riverside County’s Housing Authority or nonprofit housing agencies and developers to provide incentives to the property owner to maintain the project as affordable housing. Incentives could include writing down the interest rate on the remaining loan balance, providing a lump-sum payment, and/or supplementing the rents to market levels. The feasibility of this option depends on whether the complex has a high level of debt-to-equity ratio. By providing lump sum financial incentives or ongoing subsidies in rents or reduced mortgage interest rates to the owner, the City can ensure that some or all of the units remain affordable. Funding available for purchase of affordability covenants is also limited. Typically, HUD funds cannot be used for this purpose.

4. **Construction of Replacement Units**

The construction of new low-income housing units is a means of replacing the at-risk units if they are converted to market-rate units and is eligible for HUD funds. The cost of developing housing depends upon a variety of factors, including density, size of the units (i.e., square footage and number of bedrooms), location, land costs, and type of construction. Assuming an average construction cost of approximately $150,000 per unit, it would cost over $8.1 million (excluding land costs) to construct 54 new assisted units. Including land costs, the total cost to develop replacement units would be higher.

5. **Cost Comparisons**

The above analysis attempts to estimate the cost of preserving the at-risk units under various options. These cost estimates are general estimates and are intended to demonstrate only the relative magnitude of funding required. Actual costs of preservation would depend on the individual circumstances of the at-risk property and market conditions at the time.

The transferring of ownership of the at-risk units to a nonprofit housing organization is not an effective option, since Mission Villas
is already nonprofit-owned. The annual costs of providing rental subsidies to preserve the 54 assisted units are relatively low ($150,336); however, long-term provision of rental subsidies for at least 55 years would cost over $17 million. New construction of 54 replacement units has highest upfront costs ($8 million, excluding land costs) but the new units would typically be subject to long-term affordability restrictions and high housing quality standards. In evaluating the various options, the City or the responsible housing agency must consider the available funding sources and the willingness of property owners to participate in preservation, among other factors. With the dissolution of redevelopment in California and as a “young” city, Jurupa Valley has virtually no financial capacity to support affordable housing development. The City is struggling to maintain economic stability given the loss of state pass-thru and tax increment funds.

### J. Housing Constraints

#### Governmental Constraints

Governmental constraints are policies, standards, requirements, and actions imposed by the government that affect the development and provision of housing. These constraints may include building codes, land use controls, growth management measures, development fees, processing and permit procedures, and site improvement costs. State and federal agencies play a role in the imposition of governmental constraints; however, these agencies are beyond the influence of local government and are therefore not addressed in this analysis.

#### Land Use Element

The Land Use Element of a General Plan designates the general distribution, location, and extent of uses for land planned for housing, business, industry, open space, and public or community facilities. As it applies to housing, the Land Use Element establishes a range of residential land use categories, specifies densities (typically expressed as dwelling units per acre), and suggests the types and locations of housing appropriate in a community. Residential development is implemented through the zoning districts, use classifications, development regulations, and design standards specified in the jurisdiction’s zoning code.

The City of Jurupa Valley adopted the County of Riverside General Plan upon the City’s incorporation in 2011. In 2016, the City began preparing its first General Plan. The Plan is considered “interim” in recognition of the fact that it is a focused General Plan update intended to meet community needs until the City’s budget allows a
more extensive update. A series of eight public workshops on community planning issues and needs were held in January and February of 2015, and the City Council appointed a 31-member General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) that developed a Community Values Statement and identified Community Assets, Issues and Needs during public meetings held between January and December of 2015, and adoption of the General Plan is anticipated in early 2017.

The 2017 General Plan Land Use Element includes designating certain sites for medium, high, and highest density as a part of this process. Several such sites are shown on the 2011 Land Use Element as industrial and are located within existing residential neighborhoods. These changes to the Land Use Element facilitate residential development by removing the need for private developers to seek General Plan Amendments for several specific sites (Figure LUE-11), thus removing a potential barrier to housing production. Further, the City’s initiative serves as an incentive to attract new multiple-family dwelling projects.

Types of Residential Communities

The governmental factor that most directly influences the types and character of residential communities, as well as market conditions, is the allowable density range of residentially designated land. In general, higher densities allow developers to take advantage of economies of scale, reduce the per-unit cost of land and improvements, and reduce development costs associated with new housing construction. Reasonable density standards ensure the opportunity for higher-density residential uses to be developed within a community, increasing the feasibility of producing affordable housing, and offer a variety of housing options that meet the needs of the community.

Table 5.45 summarizes the City’s 2017 General Plan land use designations that will allow residential uses, as well as their permitted net densities (without density bonus). The 2017 General Plan provides a range of densities for single-family (up to 14 units per acre) and multi-family (14 to 25 units per acre) housing development to accommodate a wide range of housing options. Maximum allowed densities are established for all residential designations, and a minimum density is established for HHDR to help ensure that land zoned for residential multifamily use will be developed as efficiently as possible.
### Table 5.45: Jurupa Valley General Plan Residential Land Use Designations, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Minimum “Target”</th>
<th>Maximum Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Farm (Rural Residential - RR)</td>
<td>Single-family detached residences on large parcels of at least 5 acres.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 unit per 5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranch (Estate Density Residential - EDR)</td>
<td>Single-family detached residences on large parcels of at least 2 acres.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 unit per 2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Neighborhood (Very Low Density Residential - VLDR)</td>
<td>Single-family detached residences on large parcels of 1 to 2 acres.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 unit per 1 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Neighborhood (Low Density Residential (LDR))</td>
<td>Single-family detached residences on large parcels of ½ to 1 acre.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 unit per ½ acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR)</td>
<td>Single-family detached and attached residences with a density range of 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)</td>
<td>Single-family attached and detached residences with a density range of 5 to 8 dwelling units per acre.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential (HDR)</td>
<td>Single-family attached and detached residences, including townhouses, stacked flats, courtyard homes, patio homes, and zero lot line homes.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Density Residential (VHDR)</td>
<td>Single-family attached residences and all types of multi-family dwellings.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Density Residential (HHDR)</td>
<td>Multi-family dwellings, includes apartments and condominium.</td>
<td>25, 20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Overlay (MUO)</td>
<td>Allows a mix of residential, commercial, office and other compatible uses.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Town Center Overlay (TCO)</td>
<td>Applied to three historic core areas, namely Rubidoux, Pedley, and Glen Avon.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Draft 2016 Jurupa Valley General Plan.
The Zoning Code is the primary tool for implementing the General Plan Land Use and Housing elements. It is designed to protect and promote public health, safety and welfare, as well as to promote quality design and quality of life. The City of Jurupa Valley’s residential zoning districts control both the use and development standards of each residential site or parcel, thereby influencing the location, design, quality, and cost of housing.

**Residential Density and Affordable Housing**

State housing law requires jurisdictions to provide an analysis showing that land use designations or zones identified for the development of housing for lower income households are sufficient to encourage such development. The law provides two options for preparing the analysis: 1) describe market demand and trends, financial feasibility, and recent development experience; or 2) utilize default density standards deemed adequate to meet the lower income housing need. According to state law, the default density standard for the City of Jurupa Valley is 30 dwelling units per acre.

Based on an analysis of affordable housing development in the Western Riverside County region and on discussions with local affordable housing developers, as outlined in the following section, the City has determined that a base density of 25 du/a (allowed maximum density, not including any applicable including-density bonus) is appropriate to accommodate the City’s Lower Income housing need.

Program HE 1.1.1 commits the City to amending the Land Use Map of the General Plan to add at least 48 acres of HHDR-designated land with appropriate zoning to allow multi-family ownership and rental housing. The HHDR land use designation allows a base density of 25 dwelling units per acre, with additional density possible through state-mandated density bonuses.

Land costs in Jurupa Valley continue to be significantly lower than those of Orange and Los Angeles counties; hence, the number of units per acre necessary to allow an affordable housing development project to achieve economies of scale is smaller than that of many other Southern California cities. A survey of vacant properties for sale in Jurupa Valley on LandWatch.com showed seven properties available and suitable for residential development. Properties ranged in size from 1 to 17 acres and had an average land cost of $124,559 per acre. By comparison, vacant properties in inland Orange County on mostly smaller, infill sites range from $.5 million to well over $1 million per acre.

The City contacted three affordable housing developers within the Riverside/Jurupa Valley area: National Community Renaissance, Jamboree Housing Corporation, and Bridge Housing Corporation.
Based on those conversations, it was determined that densities of 25 dwelling units per acre are sufficient to accommodate affordable housing development within the City of Jurupa Valley. According to these developers, the primary determinant of affordability is land cost, followed by the type and cost of construction. They noted that there was a “pivot point” density at or near 25 dwelling units per acre. As density increased beyond this point, podium type development was typically required, significantly increasing the cost of construction. For this reason, these developers believed densities of 25 dwellings per acre or less were more feasible than higher densities in the Riverside/San Bernardino market. They also stressed the importance of project compatibility with surrounding uses in setting project density, because this related directly to the time and cost of development. Consequently, these non-profit developers indicated they would not exclude sites designated at 25 dwelling units per acre in their consideration of sites suitable to develop affordable housing.

Table 5.46: Inland Empire Affordable Housing Project Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Development Name¹</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Dwelling Units/Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley</td>
<td>Veterans’ Neighborhood²</td>
<td>North side of Mission Boulevard at Amarillo Street</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corona</td>
<td>C&amp;C Apartments²</td>
<td>8th Street at Rimpau Avenue</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corona</td>
<td>Corona Community Villas</td>
<td>2680 S. Main Street</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temecula</td>
<td>Madera Vista (2017)</td>
<td>44153 Margarita Road</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>Ivy at College Park (2014)</td>
<td>5950 Notre Dame Avenue</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>Ivy II at College Park (2017)</td>
<td>5950 Notre Dame Avenue</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highgrove (Riverside Co.)</td>
<td>Highgrove Blossom Apartments (2014)</td>
<td>550 Center Street</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Project completion dates in parentheses.
² Project has City approvals. Construction to begin in 2017.

Variety of Housing Opportunity

The Zoning Code provides for a range of housing types, including single-family, multi-family, second dwelling units, manufactured homes, mobile home parks, licensed community care facilities, employee housing for seasonal or migrant workers as necessary, assisted living facilities, emergency shelters, supportive housing, transitional housing, and single room occupancy (SRO) units. Table 5.47 summarizes the types of housing allowed by Jurupa Valley’s Zoning Code to ensure a variety of housing opportunities continues to be available.
Table 5.47: Jurupa Valley Permitted Uses by Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>One- Family Dwelling</th>
<th>Multiple Family Dwelling</th>
<th>Second Units</th>
<th>Congregate Care Facilities</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter</th>
<th>Transitional and Supportive Housing</th>
<th>Farm Worker Housing</th>
<th>Employee Housing</th>
<th>SRO</th>
<th>Manufactured Housing/ Mobile-home</th>
<th>Mobile-Home Park</th>
<th>Planned Residential Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-R/R-R-O</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1/R-1A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-T-R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-6</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>P#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-D</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>P#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = Permitted by Right; CUP = Conditional Use Permit Required; “NP” = Not Permitted; P* = Requires Site Development Permit; P# = Requires PC/CC review; PUD = Allowed with PUD; rezoning required.

Notes: 1. Transitional and Supportive housing subject to same requirements that apply to standard residential uses.
2. Employee housing for six of fewer persons is treated as a single-family structure and residential use.
Source: City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Code, 2016
**Single- and Multi-Family Uses**

One-family dwellings are permitted uses in most residential zones. Multi-family dwellings are permitted in the R-4 zone, as well as the R-2, R-3, and R-6 zones with the approval of a Site Development Permit. The Site Development Permit process is a discretionary review process that differs from conditional use permit review in that it is strictly concerned with design and the application of conditions to address traffic safety, parking, noise and other standards, not land use or compatibility. Conditions of approval may be imposed that must be met prior to or concurrent with project development. However, Site Development Permits are less costly and processed more quickly than conditional use permits. Site Development Permits for residential projects are typically acted upon by the Planning Director and generally do not require Planning Commission approval, except for special cases such as cellular sites and detached accessory structures.

**Accessory or Second Dwelling Units**

Second dwelling units are attached or detached dwelling units that provide complete independent living facilities for one or more persons, including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, cooking, and sanitation. Second dwelling units may be an alternative source of affordable housing for lower income households and seniors. These units typically rent for less than apartments of comparable size.

California law requires local jurisdictions to adopt ordinances that establish the conditions under which second dwelling units are permitted (*California Government Code*, §65852.2). A jurisdiction cannot adopt an ordinance that totally precludes the development of second dwelling units unless the ordinance contains findings acknowledging that allowing second dwelling units may limit housing opportunities of the region and result in adverse impacts on public health, safety, and welfare. In 2017, the City is developing an ordinance to amend its Accessory Dwelling Unit requirements to comply with state law.

An amendment to the state’s second unit law in 2003 requires local governments to use a ministerial, rather than discretionary process for approving second dwelling units and allows jurisdictions to count second dwelling units towards meeting their regional housing needs goals. A ministerial process is intended to reduce permit processing periods and development costs, because proposed second dwelling units that comply with local zoning regulations and standards can be approved without a public hearing.

Jurupa Valley permits second units on parcels that have at least 1 acre of usable land and that have a legal, single-family dwelling existing on the site, subject to additional development standards.
and the approval of a Second Unit Permit. Second Unit Permits are reviewed by the Planning Director and do not require discretionary review or a hearing.

**Manufactured Housing**

State law requires local governments to permit manufactured and mobile homes meeting federal safety and construction standards on a permanent foundation (and permanently connected to water and sewer utilities, where available), in all single-family residential zoning districts (§65852.3 of the *California Government Code*).

For purposes of permit issuance, Jurupa Valley permits mobile homes on a foundation system on all lots zoned to permit single-family dwellings. The installation of manufactured homes not on foundations is allowed whenever it is specifically provided for in the various zone classifications, and is subject to the requirements and standards set forth in those zones. A mobile home permitted in the R-R and R-A zones, however, is subject to additional development standards regarding minimum floor area and lot size. These requirements are standard for most California jurisdictions and are similar to those of Riverside County.

**Residential Care Facilities**

The Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (§5115 and §5116 of the *California Welfare and Institutions Code*) declares that mentally and physically disabled persons are entitled to live in normal residential surroundings. The use of property for the care of six or fewer mentally disordered or otherwise handicapped persons is required by law. A state-authorized, certified, or authorized family care home, foster home, or group home serving six or fewer persons with disabilities or dependent and neglected children on a 24-hour-a-day basis is considered a residential use to be permitted in all residential zones. No local agency can impose stricter zoning or building and safety standards on these homes (commonly referred to as “group” homes) for six or fewer persons than are required of other permitted residential uses in the zone. The Lanterman Act covers only licensed residential care facilities. California Housing Element law also addresses the provision of transitional and supportive housing, which covers non-licensed housing facilities for persons with disabilities.

The City of Jurupa Valley defines congregate care facilities as “a housing arrangement, developed pursuant to Article XIX of the Zoning Code, where nonmedical care and supervision are provided, including meals and social, recreational, homemaking and security services.” Congregate care facilities are permitted in the R-2 and R-3 zones, with the approval of a Conditional Use Permit. The City does not currently comply with the Lanterman Act. However, in 2017, Jurupa Valley is developing its first General Plan, to be followed up
with a comprehensive Zoning Code update. As part of this Zoning Code update, the City’s provisions for licensed residential care facilities will be amended as needed to ensure consistency with the Lanterman Act.

**Emergency Shelters**

An emergency shelter is a facility that provides temporary shelter and feeding of indigents or disaster victims, operated by a public or non-profit agency. State law requires jurisdictions to identify adequate sites for housing that will be made available through appropriate zoning and development standards to facilitate and encourage the development of a variety of housing types for all income levels, including emergency shelters and transitional housing (§65583(c)(1) of the *California Government Code*). State law (SB 2) requires that local jurisdictions make provisions in their zoning codes to permit emergency shelters by right in at least one zoning district where adequate capacity is available to accommodate at least one year-round shelter. Local jurisdictions may establish standards to regulate the development of emergency shelters.

The City of Jurupa Valley permits emergency shelters in its Industrial Park (I-P) zone, subject to the development standards allowed under SB 2, such as minimum floor area for each client, minimum interior waiting and client intake areas, off-street parking and outdoor lighting requirements, and the requirement for an on-site manager and at least one additional staff member to be present on-site during hours of operation.

The City has a number of large, vacant I-P zoned sites totaling 290 acres. Upon incorporation, the City adopted the Riverside County Zoning Code by reference. The County Zoning Code contains distance requirements for emergency shelters that are above and beyond the basic 300-foot distance between two shelters as permitted by SB 2. As part of the development of the City’s first General Plan, and accompanying comprehensive Zoning Code update, the City will remove the distance requirement between emergency shelters and airports. With this amendment, the City’s provisions for emergency shelters will fully comply with SB 2.

**Transitional and Supportive Housing**

State law (SB 2) requires local jurisdictions to address the provisions for transitional and supportive housing. Under Housing Element law, transitional housing means buildings configured as rental housing developments, but operated under program requirements that require the termination of assistance and reassignment of the assisted unit to another eligible program participant at a predetermined future point in time that shall be no less than 6 months from the beginning of the assistance (*California
Government Code §65582(h)). For example, a multi-family dwelling that is designated as a temporary (typically 6 months to 1 year) residence for abused women and children, pending relocation to more permanent housing.

Supportive housing means housing with no limit on length of stay, that is occupied by the target population, and that is linked to an on-site or off-site service that assists the supportive housing resident in retaining the housing, improving his or her health status, and maximizing his or her ability to live and, when possible, work in the community. Target population means persons with low incomes who have one or more disabilities, including mental illness, HIV or AIDS, substance abuse, or other chronic health condition, or individuals eligible for services provided pursuant to the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Division 4.5 commencing with §4500 of the Welfare and Institutions Code) and may include, among other populations, adults, emancipated minors, families with children, elderly persons, young adults aging out of the foster care system, individuals exiting from institutional settings, veterans, and homeless people (California Government Code §§65582(f) and (g)).

Accordingly, state law establishes transitional and supportive housing as residential uses and therefore, local governments cannot treat these uses differently from other similar types of residential uses (e.g., requiring a use permit when other residential uses of similar function do not require a use permit). The City of Jurupa Valley’s Zoning Code does not include provisions for transitional or supportive housing. As part of the development of the City’s first General Plan, and accompanying comprehensive Zoning Code update, the City will include provisions for transitional and supportive housing, pursuant to SB 2, as provided in Program HE 3.1.9.

Single Room Occupancy (SRO)

AB 2634 mandates that local jurisdictions address the provision of housing options for extremely low-income households, including Single Room Occupancy units (SRO). SRO units are typically one-room units intended for occupancy by a single individual. It is distinct from a studio or efficiency unit, in that a studio is a one-room unit that must contain a kitchen and a bathroom. Although SRO units are not required to have a kitchen or bathroom, many SROs have one or the other. There are minimum standards for SROs (including a minimum floor area requirement) under the California Health and Safety Code.

The City of Jurupa Valley’s Zoning Code does not specifically address SROs. As part of the development of the City’s first General Plan and accompanying comprehensive Zoning Code update, the City will include provisions to address SRO housing.
Farm Worker and Employee Housing

The California Employee Housing Act requires that housing for six or fewer employees be treated as a regular residential use. In general, the California Health and Safety Code §17008(a) defines “employee housing” as “any portion of any housing accommodation, or property upon which a housing accommodation is located, if all of the following factors exist:

(1) The accommodations consist of any living quarters, dwelling, boardinghouse, tent, bunkhouse, maintenance-of-way car, mobilehome, manufactured home, recreational vehicle, travel trailer, or other housing accommodations, maintained in one or more buildings or one or more sites, and the premises upon which they are situated or the area set aside and provided for parking of mobile homes or camping of five or more employees by the employer.

(2) The accommodations are maintained in connection with any work or place where work is being performed, whether or not rent is involved.”

Section 17005 of the California Health and Safety Code identifies the few types of employees excluded, and Section 17008 provides a detailed definition of employee housing. The Employee Housing Act further defines housing for agricultural workers consisting of 36 beds or 12 units be treated as an agricultural use and permitted where agricultural uses are permitted.

The City of Jurupa Valley permits agricultural uses in a number of its residential zones, although there are no large scale agricultural properties or businesses in the City at this time. The Zoning Code does not specifically address farm worker housing in residential zones, but does allow farm worker housing in the City’s agricultural zones (A-1 and A-2) with Site Development Permit approval, and single-family dwellings are permitted by right in these zones. As part of the implementation of the 2017 General Plan and related comprehensive Zoning Code update, the City will amend the Zoning Code to address the requirements of the Employee Housing Act.

Development Requirements

Upon incorporation as a city, Jurupa Valley adopted the Riverside County Zoning Code by reference. Table 5.48 summarizes the City’s residential zoning districts and their development standards, as established in the County Zoning Code adopted by the City. The City will be comprehensively updating its Zoning Code to implement the 2017 General Plan.
Table 5.48: Summary of Residential Zoning Districts Development Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>21,780</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1/ R-1A</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3-story/40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10% of lot width</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3-story/40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10% of lot width</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2A</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2-story/30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>50-75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3A</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>50-75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>50-75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-6</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-T</td>
<td>3,600/7,200</td>
<td>40/60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30/45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking Requirements

Table 5.49 summarizes the residential parking requirements in Jurupa Valley. Parking requirements do not constrain the development of housing directly. However, parking requirements may reduce the amount of available lot areas for residential development. The City determines the required number of parking spaces based on the type and size of the residential unit and has found the required parking spaces to be necessary to accommodate the number of vehicles typically associated with each residence.

Table 5.49: Residential Parking Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Residential Development</th>
<th>Required Parking Spaces (off street)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>2 spaces per dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>Studio or 1 BR: 1.25 spaces per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 BR: 2.25 spaces per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 BR: 2.75 spaces per unit (add 1 space per employee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRD: 1.5 spaces per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Residential Development</td>
<td>1 BR: 1.5 space per unit; 2 BR or more: 2.5 spaces per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing</td>
<td>See Single-Family and Multi-Family requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Parks</td>
<td>2 spaces per trailer or mobile home space* (add 1 guest space per 8 mobile home spaces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Units</td>
<td>1 BR: 1 space* per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 BR: 2 spaces* per unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates parking spaces may be tandem.
Density Bonus Ordinance

California Government Code §65915 requires local governments to grant a density bonus of at least 20% (5% for condominiums) and an additional incentive, or financially equivalent incentive(s), to a developer of a residential project that agrees to provide at least:

- 10% of the units for lower income households;
- 5% of the units for very low income households;
- 10% of the condominium units for moderate income households;
- A senior citizen housing development; or
- Qualified donations of land, condominium conversions, and childcare facilities.

The density bonus law also applies to senior housing projects and projects that include a childcare facility. In addition to the density bonus stated above, the statute includes a sliding scale that requires:

- An additional 2.5% density bonus for each additional increase of 1% in the number of Very Low income units above the initial 5% threshold;
- A density increase of 1.5% for each additional 1% increase in the number of Low income units above the initial 10% threshold; and
- A 1% density increase for each 1% increase in the number of Moderate income units above the initial 10% threshold.

These bonuses reach a maximum density bonus of 35% when a project provides 11% very-low income units, 20% low-income units, or 40% moderate income units. In addition to a density bonus, at the discretion of the approving jurisdiction, developers may also be eligible for one of the following concessions or incentives:

- Reductions in site development standards and modifications of zoning and architectural design requirements, including reduced setbacks and parking standards;
- Mixed used zoning that will reduce the cost of the housing, if the non-residential uses are compatible with the housing development and other development in the area; and
- Other regulatory incentives or concessions that result in “identifiable, financially sufficient, and actual cost reductions.”

Jurisdictions may not impose any development (or density) standard that, by itself, would preclude the construction of a project with the density bonus and the incentives or concessions to which the developer is entitled. To achieve compliance with the state density bonus law, jurisdictions must reevaluate their development
standards in relation to the maximum achievable densities for multi-family housing.

**Building Codes and Enforcement**

Building and safety codes are adopted to preserve public health and safety, and ensure the construction of safe and decent housing. These codes and standards also have the potential to increase the cost of housing construction or maintenance.

The City of Jurupa Valley has adopted the 2013 California Building Standards Code. Other codes commonly adopted by reference within the region include the California Mechanical Code, the California Plumbing Code, the California or National Electric Code, the Uniform Housing Code, and the California Fire Code. Less common are the California Uniform Code for the Abatement of Dangerous Buildings, the Urban-Wildland Interface Code, and the Uniform Code for Building Conservation. The City has not adopted any local amendments that constrain the development, maintenance, or preservation of housing.

**Housing for Persons with Disabilities**

**Land Use Controls**

As previously noted, the City will address the provision of residential care facilities as part of the comprehensive Zoning Code update.

**Reasonable Accommodation**

Building and development standards may constrain the ability of persons with disabilities to live in housing units that are suited to their needs. Currently, the City considers requests for reasonable accommodation when requests are made, without a formal application and approval process. As part of the development of the comprehensive Zoning Code update, the City will adopt a formal reasonable accommodation ordinance.

**Definition of Family**

The City’s Zoning Code defines *family* as “an individual or two or more persons related by blood or marriage, or a group of not more than five persons, excluding servants, who are not related by blood or marriage, living together as a single housekeeping unit in a dwelling unit.” There are a number of state and federal rules that govern the definition of family, including the Federal Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, the California Fair Housing and Employment Act, the California Supreme Court case, *City of Santa Barbara v Adamson* (1980), and the California Constitution privacy clauses that have prompted redefining *family*. Many traditional zoning definitions of *family* required household members to be
related; however, this definition discriminated against disabled persons sharing housing, and also against other unrelated persons living together, even though related individuals with similar household sizes were allowed to live together.

Pursuant to Program HE 3.1.9, this definition will be amended to remove: 1) any reference to the number of persons that can be considered a “family,” and 2) any reference to how members of a “family” are to be related. This amendment will be processed as part of the comprehensive Zoning Code update.

Building Code
As indicated above, the City of Jurupa Valley has adopted the 2013 California Building Standards Code and routinely adopts updates as they become available. The City has not adopted any special amendments to this Code that would impede housing for persons with disabilities.

Planning and Development Fees
Housing construction imposes certain short- and long-term costs upon local government, such as the cost of providing planning services and inspections. The City of Jurupa Valley relies upon various planning and development fees to recoup costs and ensure that essential services and infrastructure are available when needed. Planning fees for Jurupa Valley are summarized in Table 5.50.

Table 5.50: Planning Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Initial Deposit Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Amendment</td>
<td>$7,479.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Permit</td>
<td>$9,646.14 + $5.10 per lot or site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (filed alone)</td>
<td>$2,625.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Development Permit (Plot Plan)</td>
<td>$4,791.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentative Tract Map (Single-Family Residential)</td>
<td>$11,368.92 + $102 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentative Tract Map (Multi-Family Residential)</td>
<td>$11,368.92 + $102.00 per lot + $19.38 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentative Parcel Map (without waiver of Final Parcel Map)</td>
<td>$5,621.22 + $104.04 per lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone Change</td>
<td>$3,648.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fees vary due to location of the units.
Source: City of Jurupa Valley, January 1, 2012.

Until 1978, property taxes were the primary revenue source for most local governments, supporting municipal operations and, when needed, funding the costs of capital improvements such as streets, drainage, and other public improvements. The passage of Proposition 13 in 1978 limited a local jurisdiction’s ability to raise property taxes and significantly lowered the ad valorem tax rate, increasing reliance on other funding sources to provide infrastructure, public improvements, and public services. More recently,
the loss of redevelopment funds and state vehicle license fees has dramatically affected California cities’ ability to fund public improvements. An alternative funding source widely used among local governments in California is the development impact fee, which is collected for a variety of improvements including street and drainage improvements.

The City of Jurupa Valley collects development impact fees from developers of new housing units, as well as commercial, office, retail, and industrial development. These fees are used to offset costs primarily associated with traffic impacts and City street improvements. *Table 5.51* summarizes the development impact fees required by the City and by other relevant agencies in 2017 for residential developments. Based on 2016 development applications, development impact fees are in the order of $15,500 per unit for a market-rate single-family home and $12,000 per unit for market-rate multi-family apartment projects.

*Table 5.51: Residential Development Impact Fees (Per Unit)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Type</th>
<th>Area 1: Jurupa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities Fee</td>
<td>$1,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Facilities Fee</td>
<td>$705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (Roads, Bridges) Fee</td>
<td>$1,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (Signals) Fee</td>
<td>$420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
<td>$563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Trails Fee</td>
<td>$316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries Fee</td>
<td>$341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration Fee</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family: $8,873 Multi-family: $6,231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 8.0 units per acre: $1,952/unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 8.0-14.0 units per acre: $1,250/unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 14.0 units per acre: $1,015/unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Loma Road and Bridge Benefit District (RBBD) Fee</td>
<td>Zone A: $1,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zone B: $884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zone C: $612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zone D: $1,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zone E: $1,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes: Fees for senior single-family units are reduced by 33%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: City of Jurupa Valley, 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Processing and Permit Procedures**

Considerable holding costs are associated with delays in processing development applications and plans. At times, these holding costs are passed through to renters and homeowners in the price/rent of housing, thus affecting the affordability. The City of Jurupa Valley’s development review process is designed to accommodate housing development applications of various levels of complexity and requiring different entitlements. Processing times vary with the complexity of the project.

Building permit applications for new single-family houses typically take 3 to 6 months to complete the building permit plancheck
process, sometimes longer depending upon the size of the project. Processing multi-family development applications, which often require general plan amendments, rezoning, and CEQA review, typically requires 6 months to 1 year—depending upon the number of dwellings—to complete discretionary planning review. The City's permit procedures expedite planning and building approvals where possible and are not likely to unduly constrain housing development. The following discussion describes in detail the City's administrative development review procedures (such as Site Development Plan Review) as well as discretionary review and approval processes.

**Pre-Application Review**
Prospective applicants are encouraged to meet with a City Planner prior to submitting an application. This preliminary meeting will help expedite the development process. Applicants may also request a more detailed, formal pre-application review. This type of review can be helpful for large or more complex projects, and when the applicant desires review by multiple City departments, such as Engineering, Building, and Public Works. Pre-Application Review requires submittal of an application, fee, plans, and background information and can take from 3 to 5 weeks to process.

Following submittal, the application is routed to all City departments and outside agencies that would review the formal entitlement application. For example, a Tentative Tract Map would be transmitted to utility companies (e.g., Southern California Edison, SoCal Gas), special districts (JCSD/RCSD/ JARPD) and the County of Riverside.

**Site Development Permit (SDP)**
As previously indicated, the City of Jurupa Valley requires a Site Development Permit for all multi-family residential projects, except those within the R-3 zone. Site Development Permits (SDPs), at a minimum, require submittal of an application, fee, checklist, site plan and other exhibits, and supporting information to the Planning Department. Minor Site Development Permits, such as for accessory structures, are exempt from environmental review and can be acted upon by the Planning Director without a public hearing. SDPs requiring environmental review under CEQA require a public hearing held by the Planning Director. All SDPs require written notice to owners of property located within at least 300 feet of the proposed project boundaries. The time for processing an SDP varies with the complexity of the proposal. However, the review process for a minor SDP that is exempt from CEQA can usually be accomplished within 90 to 120 days.
Land Use Controls Analysis

The City of Jurupa Valley’s development approval process is designed to accommodate, not hinder, residential development. For example, developments of single-family homes and manufactured homes on existing, individual lots in any residential zones that meet development standards (setbacks, lot size and coverage, building height, parking) do not require discretionary approval. They require only a building permit - a ministerial process - to allow construction. Similarly, multi-family housing is allowed “by right” in the R-3 Zone (General Residential). In other residential zones, multi-family housing developments require a Site Development Permit (SDP). As described above, the SDP process provides a streamlined, discretionary review process that allows most residential development projects to be evaluated for compliance with General Plan and Zoning Ordinance standards. The primary decision-making criteria to approve an SDP are:

1. The development shall conform to all the requirements of the City’s County General Plan and with all applicable requirements of City and state law.
2. The development shall protect public health, safety and general welfare, conform to the logical development of the land and be compatible with the surrounding property. Development plans shall consider the location and need for dedication and improvement of necessary streets and sidewalks and consider topographical and drainage condition.
3. Developments shall conform to the Subdivision Map Act and with all City subdivision requirements.

The City’s processing and permit procedures are consistent with state planning and zoning law and are not considered to be an unreasonable constraint on the cost or supply of housing. However, the City will amend the Zoning Code to eliminate the requirement for discretionary review for multi-family development in multi-family residential zones to expedite permit processing for projects that conform to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance development standards. Program HE 3.1.9 calls for the Zoning Ordinance amendments to allow multi-family housing development without discretionary approval, such as a conditional use permit or planned unit development review. This would not preclude design review of multi-family housing projects; however, such review must be ministerial and such review must not trigger environmental review under the Public Resources Code (CEQA). For example, staff, the Planning Commission or City Council could review a project’s design merits and call for a project proponent to make design-related modifications, but could not deny a project based on the “residential use” itself if it otherwise met General Plan and Zoning requirements.
Conditional Use Permits (CUP)

A CUP is required for certain limited residential uses that are conditionally permitted in non-residential districts (e.g., General Commercial “C-1/C-P” zone district), such as congregate care residential facilities. CUPs can be approved, approved with conditions, or denied based on specific findings. Typically, the Planning Commission reviews and takes final action on CUPs, and appeals are considered by the City Council, who would then take final action on the matter. Any permit that is granted is subject to such conditions of approval as may be necessary to protect the health, safety, or general welfare of the community. Conditions of approval may include, but are not limited to, hours of operation, duration, site improvements (e.g., access, parking, landscaping, fencing, signage), off-site improvements (e.g., trails, frontage improvements, street trees), and architectural design. The City’s CUP process typically allows the Planning Commission to consider conditional uses within approximately 90 to 150 days.

Environmental Constraints

Potential environmental constraints to future development in the City include seismic and liquefaction hazards, urban and limited wildland fire hazards, and historical contamination by hazardous materials such as the Stringfellow property in the northern portion of the City. All sites identified in the Sites Inventory that are intended to meet the City’s RHNA needs are not within these areas that have development restrictions due to risk of damage from disasters (such as floods, wildfires, seismic events, or hazardous material contamination).

The sites inventory has land use designations that were determined based on surrounding land uses and has already examined potential environmental constraints. Aside from the typical constraints mentioned above, there are no additional constraints that would impede the development of new housing units in the future on the identified sites.

Seismic Hazards

As stated in the General Plan Community Safety, Services and Facilities Element, the entire City, as well as all of Southern California, is a seismically active region that has been subject to major earthquakes in the past. There are no known active faults in Jurupa Valley. However, the Rialto-Colton, San Jacinto, and Chino Faults are all located close to the City (i.e., within 5 miles). The greatest damage from earthquakes results from ground shaking. Although ground shaking is generally most severe near a quake epicenter, property not immediately adjacent to the epicenter may be subject to extreme damage due to liquefaction. The greatest
potential danger is the collapse of older residential units constructed from unreinforced masonry, and explosions of petroleum and fuel lines. Some parts of the City have a combination of silts and sandy soil types and a relatively high water table that are conductive for liquefaction to occur during intense ground shaking. The State Division of Mines and Geology has designated some areas in the City within a liquefaction zone. Most of these areas are along the Santa Ana River, but the far eastern and southwestern portions of the City are also susceptible to liquefaction. Much of the northern portion of the City, north of the SR 60 freeway, has moderate to very high susceptibility to landslides and soil slumps. There are also areas in the central portion of the City with steeper slopes that may be subject to soil block slides.

Development in much of the City will require geotechnical or soil constraints reports to mitigate the potential undermining of structural integrity during earthquakes or due to geologic or soil limitations.

**Flooding**

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) publishes maps that identify areas of the City subject to flooding in the event of a major storm. These Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) indicate areas that may be inundated in the event of a 100-year or a 500-year storm. In addition, the maps indicate the base flood elevations at selected intervals of the floodway. The City had been subject to periodic and historic flooding and flood insurance requirements imposed by FEMA until improvements were constructed by the Army Corps of Engineers on the Santa Ana River and other major flood control channels within the City. FEMA Flood Maps show that the City’s main flood hazard zone lies in the southern portions of the City near the Santa Ana River, along Pyrite Creek, and in the far northwestern and western portions of the City just east of the I-15 freeway.

Some areas of the City that are designated for future residential development fall within the 100-year floodplain and would be subject to specialized flood construction requirements.

**Fire Hazards**

The most serious fire threat within the City is building and structure fires. However, like most southern California cities adjacent to wildland areas (e.g., steep hills in the northern portion of the City), the late summer fires that result from the accumulation of this brush have the potential to spread into the City proper. Since the City center is largely developed, there is less potential for wildland fires in the more central portions of the City. Other fire hazards within the City may be associated with heavy industrial uses, older commercial
and residential structures, the presence of hazardous materials, and arson. Only a small portion of the City is located within a designated Very High Fire Hazard Zone; and the sites identified to accommodate the City’s 2013-2021 RHNA allocation are located outside of the high fire hazard zone and in largely developed urban or suburban areas that are not generally prone to wildland fire hazards.

Noise
Noise generated from mobile sources such as traffic will continue to have the greatest potential impact on land use (e.g., I-15 and SR 60 freeways, Van Buren Boulevard). In addition, noise from rail and aviation sources will also affect some community residents. The General Plan Noise Element describes the existing noise environment using maps that indicate high levels of noise and also contains goals and policies to reduce the effects of noise, if not the actual intensity of noise. Land use policy discourages the placement of noise-sensitive land uses in areas that are subject to high noise levels. The City regulates noise through the Jurupa Valley Ordinance No. 2012-01: Noise Regulations, under the authority of Section 50022.9 of the California Government Code.

Each potential development that would occur as a result of the Housing Element and subsequent implementation would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and be required to adhere to the noise regulations set forth in the General Plan, and when applicable, mitigation measures as part of the CEQA documentation process, which would identify potentially significant impacts and appropriate mitigation measures at the individual project level.

Hazardous Materials
The City contains a number of industrial uses that produce, handle, store, or transport various hazardous materials at various times. However, the use and handling of these materials are governed by a variety of federal, state, and local laws and regulations, and should not pose a significant impediment to development in non-industrial portions of the City.

Portions of the City overlie an historical plume of groundwater contamination from the Stringfellow Class I Site located in Pyrite Canyon in the northern portion of the City at the headwater of Pyrite Creek. The Pyrite Channel runs through the central portion of the City in a northeast-southwest direction toward the Santa Ana River. The Stringfellow site is a major historical regional source of contamination in the Jurupa Valley, and was one of the first designated federal “Superfund” sites. It is listed on many governmental databases regarding hazardous materials (e.g., NPL, CERCLIS, US ENG CONTROLS, ROD, RCRA-SQC, CONCENT, and, PRP
databases). According to the Chino Basin Watermaster, the Stringfellow groundwater contamination plume consists primarily of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and perchlorate; however, the VOCs extend approximately 1 mile from the source area in the down-gradient direction with the remainder of the plume consisting of perchlorate. The presence of perchlorate represents a potential health hazard if the public were to come in contact with the contaminated Stringfellow groundwater plume; however, none of the sites identified to accommodate the City’s 2013-2021 RHNA allocation would be directly affected by the Stringfellow groundwater plume.

**Infrastructure Constraints**

The 2013-2021 Housing Element promotes the production of housing, which in turn may result in population growth. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is responsible for producing socioeconomic projections and developing, refining, and maintaining the SCAG regional and small area forecasting models. These forecast numbers are used to forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Air Quality Management Plan, and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocations. The U.S. Census as reported by the California Department of Finance estimates the City’s 2014 population was 97,774 persons. SCAG projects that the City’s population will grow to 103,700 persons by the year 2020 and 126,000 persons by the year 2035.

With the exception of public streets, Jurupa Valley’s infrastructure, including parks, flood control, sewer and domestic water treatment and facilities are provided and maintained by the County of Riverside and by community service districts (CSDs), primarily the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) and the Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD). These agencies were asked to provide input and received the 2017 draft and adopted General Plan, including the Housing Element, as required law. In addition, the City refers all pertinent development applications to the CSDs and requires that they be reviewed for adequate infrastructure and service capacity. Applications are evaluated on a case-by-case basis to ensure there is enough capacity to service new developments. The CSDs’ development requirements and comments are addressed as part of City approvals of planning applications.

The City has established standard street widths for different road types and Table 5.52 summaries these requirements. In addition to requiring improvements to public streets, the City may also require on- and off-site improvements related to water supply, fire
protection, sewage disposal, fences, and electrical and communication facilities.

**Table 5.52: Street Design Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Type</th>
<th>Street Width (feet)</th>
<th>Number of Lanes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressway</td>
<td>184 to 220</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Arterial</td>
<td>152 min.</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>128 min.</td>
<td>4 to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>118 min.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>100 min.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>74 min.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Local</td>
<td>44-60</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Water Supply**

Jurupa Valley’s domestic water is supplied primarily by the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD), the Rubidoux Community Services District and the Santa Ana Water Company. The JCSD service area comprises about 26,000 acres within Jurupa Valley and the eastern portion of the City of Eastvale. The District’s recorded potable water production was 24,285 acre-feet (AF) or 21.7 million gallons per day (MGD) in 2009. Water sources for the JCSD come primarily from the Chino Groundwater Basin and the Chino Basin Desalter Authority, with the remainder made up of transfers from the Rubidoux Community Services District.

In May 2011, the JCSD adopted its 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), which details the JCSD’s current and future water supply. The UWMP found that with all of its existing and planned supplies, the JCSD can meet 100% of projected demand of growth in the City through 2035 under normal year, single dry year, and multiple dry year demand conditions for expected growth (i.e., even with a repeat of a severe drought conditions). It should be noted that on April 1, 2015, the Governor issued Executive Order B-29-15. Key provisions include ordering the State Water Resources Control Board to impose restrictions to achieve a 25% reduction in potable urban water usage through February 28, 2016. The Governor’s drought declaration also calls upon local urban water suppliers and municipalities to implement their local water shortage contingency plans immediately to avoid or forestall outright restrictions that could become necessary later in the drought season. The JCSD is evaluating the state’s additional emergency drought restrictions to determine its impact on our service area and the community. JCSD is currently in Level 2 (Drought Caution) of its Water Shortage Contingency Plan. JCSD is evaluating whether amendments to the plan are necessary to meet the state’s mandates and to help increase water efficiency. As a result of the Governor’s Executive Order issued on April 1, 2015, the State Water Resources Control
Board’s updated Emergency Water Conservation regulations went into effect on May 18, 2015. JCSD and its customers are mandated to meet a total 28% district-wide reduction in potable water usage.

Some properties within the City do not have piped water systems immediately available to them. As development occurs within the City, water supplies and distribution systems may have to be expanded to adequately serve future development.

Established in 1952, Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) was the first community services district to be formed in California. RCSD provides water and wastewater services to over 6,500 homes, with the capacity to serve an additional 3,000 new homes with existing wells and water treatment facilities. Additional services include trash collection and disposal, street lighting, weed abatement and fire prevention programs. The District’s water supply and distribution system can produce over 8.0 million gallons of potable water per day from groundwater sources in six wells. The District delivers 2.0 million gallons a day to the Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant located in the City of Riverside and supplies a portion of JCSD’s water needs. All of RCSD’s water production comes from 11 active wells (6 potable and 5 non-potable), with a distribution system consisting of approximately 50 miles of pipeline, four storage reservoirs, and two booster stations. Average day water use for retail customers is approximately 10.8 acre-feet or 3.5 million gallons.

Wastewater Treatment

The Jurupa Community Services District and the Rubidoux Community Services District provide wastewater service to most of Jurupa Valley. However, some areas in the City, particularly in Old Mira Loma and Sky Country, still rely on private septic systems. JCSD’s Sewer System serves the residents of the western portion of the City of Jurupa Valley and the adjacent City of Eastvale. The City of Riverside, the Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority, and the Orange County Sanitation District are responsible for treatment of wastewater in the JCSD service area. Wastewater from the project will be conveyed to the City of Riverside Water Quality Control Plant (RWQCP), located in the City of Riverside at 5950 Acorn Street. Currently, the RWQCP treats 40 million gallons per day. A plant-wide expansion, completed in 2015, increased treatment capacity by approximately 46 million gallons per day.

Rubidoux Community Services District’s wastewater treatment capacity is 3 million gallons per day; current need is 2 million gallons per day. Total treatment capacity of the two districts is believed adequate to meet wastewater treatment needs for 100% of the City’s anticipated housing and population growth. Some properties
in the City are on septic systems and are not connected to a piped sewage collection system. To protect regional water quality objectives, it is likely that future development, even larger individual lots and especially larger residential projects, may be required to connect to piped wastewater collection systems. This will require coordination with the JCSD and the City of Riverside to assure adequate sewage collection, and treatment services will be available as growth occurs in the City.

**Market Constraints**

**Land Prices**

Land costs have a demonstrable influence on the cost and availability of affordable housing. Land prices are determined by a number of factors, most important of which are land availability and permitted development density. As land becomes less available, the price of land increases.

According to Lennar Homes, in 2016 unentitled multi-family land in the region typically sells for about $300,000 per acre. By comparison, unentitled single-family land costs between $200,000 and $400,000 per acre. However, land cost is very site-specific; many factors such as location, size, shape, entitlement processes required, and environmental factors can impact land cost significantly. In general, land costs in Riverside County are significantly lower than in more urbanized counties of San Diego, Orange and Los Angeles counties.

**Construction Costs**

Construction costs are primarily determined by the costs of materials and labor. They are also influenced by market demands and market-based changes in the cost of materials. Construction costs depend on the type of unit being built and the quality of the product being produced. However, construction costs are set by regional and national factors that rarely impede housing development in specific localities.

**Financing**

Mortgage interest rates have a large influence over the affordability of housing. Higher interest rates increase a homebuyer’s monthly payment and decrease the range of housing that a household can afford. Lower interest rates result in lower monthly payments for the homebuyer and can increase the buyer’s purchasing ability.

The availability of financing affects a person’s ability to purchase or improve a home. Under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA), lending institutions are required to disclose information on the disposition of loan applications by the income, gender, and race of
the applicants. This applies to all loan applications for home purchases, improvements, and refinancing, whether financed at market rate or with government assistance.

Table 5.53 summarizes the disposition of loan applications submitted to financial institutions in 2014 for home purchase, refinance, and home improvement loans in Jurupa Valley and the County of Riverside. Included is information on loan outcomes (i.e., the number of applications that were approved and originated, denied, withdrawn by the applicant, and incomplete).

**Table 5.53: Disposition of Home Loans, 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loan Type</th>
<th>Total Applicants</th>
<th>Percent Approved</th>
<th>Percent Denied</th>
<th>Percent Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-backed</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinance</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Improvement</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-backed</td>
<td>16,681</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>20,774</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinance</td>
<td>50,825</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Improvement</td>
<td>5,763</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94,043</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1. “Approved” includes loans approved by the lenders whether or not accepted by the applicant.
2. “Other” includes loan applications that were either withdrawn or closed for incompleteness.
3. “Total Applicants” also includes pre-approvals and purchased loans.
4. A custom geography using the following census tracts was used to estimate lending data for Jurupa Valley: 401.01, 401.02, 402.01, 402.02, 402.03, 402.04, 403.01, 403.02, 403.03, 404.02, 404.03, 404.04, 404.05, 405.01, 405.02, 405.03, 406.03, 406.04, 406.05, and 406.06.

**Home Purchase Loans**

In 2014, 484 Jurupa Valley households applied for conventional loans to purchase homes, as shown in Table 5.53. Approximately 59% of these applications were approved and 15% were denied. The City’s approval rate was significantly lower than the overall approval rate for Riverside County. By comparison, 74% of conventional home loan applications countywide were approved while 13% were denied.

601 applications were submitted for the purchase of homes in Jurupa Valley through government-backed loans (e.g., FHA, VA) in 2014. Among applications for government-backed home purchase loans in the City, 50% were approved and 10% were denied. Again, the City’s approval rate for this loan type was much lower than that of Riverside County’s. Countywide, the approval rate for government-backed home purchase loans was 74%.
Refinance Loans
The vast majority of loan applications filed by Jurupa Valley residents in 2014 were for home refinance loans (1,747 applications). About 50% of these applications were approved, while 21% were denied. Countywide, 56% of refinancing applications were approved.

Home Improvement Loans
Within the City of Jurupa Valley, home improvement loans were the least likely to be approved. Approximately 34% of home-improvement loan applications were denied and 44% were approved by lending institutions in 2014. The high proportion of denials may be explained by the nature of these loans. Most home improvement loans are second loans and therefore more difficult to qualify for due to high income-to-debt ratio requirements. Countywide, home improvement loan applications had an approval rate (47%) comparable to that of the City’s.

Energy Conservation
The City of Jurupa Valley is committed to conserving energy and reducing pollution associated with the production of electricity. The City continues to require compliance with Title 24 of the California Administrative Code on the use of energy efficient appliances and insulation. Through compliance with Title 24, new residential development has produced reduced energy demands.

To further its energy conservation objectives, in September 2015, the City adopted an ordinance that establishes an expedited, streamlined permitting process for small residential rooftop solar energy systems. The Jurupa Unified School District improved the energy efficiency of school campuses by implementing a comprehensive organizational behavior-driven energy conservation program in partnership with Energy Education starting in December of 2009.

Southern California Edison, which provides electrical service in Jurupa Valley, offers public information and technical assistance to developers and homeowners regarding energy conservation. Southern California Edison also provides a number of rebate programs for energy efficient new construction and home improvements. Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) financing is also available in Southern California to help homeowners finance energy efficiency upgrades or renewable energy installations.

###
Attachment A – Housing Site Inventory and Analysis

Housing Resources
State law requires that each jurisdiction’s housing element analyze its housing resources and that each jurisdiction prepare a housing site inventory to show there is sufficient zoned and developable land to accommodate its share of the region’s projected housing need. That analysis is provided below. The analysis shows the City has sufficient approved, pending housing units and sufficient developable, zoned land to meet its 5th Cycle Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) for all income categories except Very Low/Extremely Low Income. To incentivize development of housing for the two most difficult income levels to reach – Very Low and Extremely Low income – the City has adopted programs in the Housing Element, including: amending the General Plan and Zoning Map to designate an additional 1637 acres for Highest Density Residential Use (HHDR, 25 du/A) (HE 1.1.1), working with Riverside County Housing Authority to promote affordable housing development in Jurupa Valley (HE 1.1.2), providing new incentives for affordable housing development (HE 1.1.5), updating the City’s density provisions for consistency with state law (HE 1.1.7), establishing a fee assistance program for affordable housing (HE 1.1.7), and pursuing CDBG and HOME funds, or other funding tools, to provide funding assistance for Low and Very Low Income households (HE 1.1.8).

Affordability
In its housing actions and programs, the City is committed to meeting a broad range of household needs and budgets. According to 2008-2012 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data, almost one-half (47%) of Jurupa Valley residents’ incomes are at or below 80% of Area Median Income (AMI), compared with 42% in Riverside County residents as a whole. This suggests Jurupa Valley is already accommodating a higher share of affordable Low, Very Low and Extremely Low income housing than many more affluent Southern California areas. In the City of Jurupa Valley, each parcel’s allowed residential density is determined by its General Plan land use designation and not by its zoning. Therefore, the Residential Land Inventory was based on existing and, in some cases, proposed land use designations. Following Housing Element adoption and certification, the City of Jurupa Valley intends to do a comprehensive zoning update following General Plan adoption to ensure consistency with the 2017 General Plan.

In considering market affordability of the approved development projects listed below, the City has applied the following affordability categories, based on state and federal standards. The standards are based on surveys of local AMI and subject to adjustment using household size and other factors:

- **Extremely Low Income** (0-30% AMI)
- **Very Low Income** (31-50% AMI)
- **Low Income** (51-80% AMI)
- **Lower Income** (0-80% AMI): Refers to a range of income levels that includes Extremely Low, Very Low and Low Income households. Based on the analysis of the adequacy of density and actual housing production in the West Riverside County region during the past several years (as further discussed in the Housing Element), it is assumed that sites with a general plan designation of Highest Density Residential (“HHDR” - 20-25 dwelling units/acre or “du/a”) are adequate to facilitate the construction of housing affordable to Lower Income households in Jurupa Valley.
• **Moderate Income** (80-120% AMI): Based on the analysis of the adequacy of density and actual housing production in the West Riverside County region during the past several years (as further discussed in the Housing Element), it is assumed that sites with a general plan designation of High Density Residential (HDR – 8-14 du/a) or Very High Density Residential (VHDR – 14-20 du/a) are adequate to facilitate the construction of housing affordable to Moderate Income households in Jurupa Valley.

• **Above Moderate Income** (Over 120% AMI): Based on the analysis of the adequacy of density and actual housing production in the West Riverside County region during the past several years (as further discussed in the Housing Element), it is assumed that sites with a general plan designation of Medium High Density (MHDR 5-8 du/a) are adequate to facilitate the construction of housing affordable to Above Moderate Income households in Jurupa Valley.

### Progress in Meeting Housing Needs

*Table 1* summarizes Jurupa Valley’s progress in meeting the 5th Cycle RHNA and its capacity for housing development. Overall, the land use inventory indicates that the City has the *existing* capacity to accommodate its RHNA in all income categories except Extremely/Very Low Income, with an overall surplus capacity of 7,375,595 units. There is an unmet need of 409,199 units to meet the needs of Very Low/Extremely Low Income households. It is expected that these units will primarily be developed as multifamily and Single Room Occupancy (SRO) housing in areas close to public transit, shopping and services, as further described in the *Land Use Element*. A Residential Land Inventory is included in *Table 7*. The site inventory indicates that adequate sites exist, even beyond those required to meet the 5th Cycle RHNA, to meet housing needs in all income categories except Very Low/Extremely Low Income during the remainder of the planning period.

### Opportunities in Meeting Housing Needs

Jurupa Valley is a young and growing city. It has many residential development opportunities and has sufficient capacity to meet its Regional Housing Need Allocation. Housing resources cited to meet RHNA consist of: 1) housing units that have received planning entitlements and/or building permits during the current housing element cycle (October 15, 2013 to October 15, 2021), 2) housing units in specific plan areas that were approved prior to the current housing element cycle but not yet built, 3) approved, pending development to be applied as credits toward meeting the RHNA (e.g., Country Village Senior Apartments land use change), and 4) vacant, suitably zoned sites with development potential.

As part of the 2017 General Plan’s implementation, the City will designate vacant and/or underutilized land for HHDR uses to help achieve its Very Low/Extremely Low Income housing RHNA allocation. Program HE 1.1.1 commits the City to amending the General Plan to designate at least 1,637 additional acres for residential use at HHDR density (25 density units per acre). The City also intends to help meet housing needs by working with the Riverside County Housing Authority and other nonprofit housing agencies and to amend its Zoning Ordinance to facilitate lower income housing.
Table 1 – Progress in Meeting 5th Cycle Regional Housing Need Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Capacity</th>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely/Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Units Built Since 1/1/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lennar Harvest Village</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Redesignation of Country Village Senior Apartments to HHDR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Habitat for Humanity Veteran Housing1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Development Potential in Specific Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Corridor Specific Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Meadows Ranch SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Vista SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Knolls SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Development Potential on Vacant and Underutilized Parcels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranch Residential (EDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Neighborhood (LDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Rural Community – Low Density Residential” (RC-LDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential (HDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Density Residential (VHDR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Density Residential (HHDR)2</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RHNA Credits (Built + Potential)</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA Surplus/[Deficit]</td>
<td>15[199]</td>
<td>158243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Approved in 2016; construction expected in 2017-2018. Cal Vet funded; for Low Income veterans and their families.
2Assumes 6540% of potential HHDR units on vacant or underutilized parcels (653192) applied to “Very Low/Extremely Low” housing need, with the remaining potential HHDR units (314) allocated to meet “Low Income” need.
Entitled and/or Built Dwelling Units

Since January 1, 2014, the City has issued permits for 403 single-family units. In addition, the City issued permits for 319 single-family units in the Lennar Harvest Village development, for a total of 721 above moderate housing units. Dwelling units approved and not yet built, and built units are summarized in Table 1.

Specific Plans

The County of Riverside (prior to incorporation) and the City have approved several specific plans that include large housing developments. In 2017, all of the specific plans are active; however, construction has not yet begun in the Rio Vista and Paradise Knolls specific plan areas. Other specific plan areas are in various stages of buildout, and all have significant remaining residential development capacity. These areas are described below.

I-15 Corridor Specific Plan

The I-15 Corridor Specific Plan is an approved planned community of over 750 acres consisting of a mix of commercial and single-family detached and attached residential uses. It was adopted by the County of Riverside when Jurupa Valley was still a part of the unincorporated County. Upon buildout, the project will provide a total of 2,400 residential dwelling units — of which 1,100 units will be located within the boundaries of the City of Jurupa Valley. Most of the Jurupa Valley units have already been developed or are to be constructed in 2017/2018; however, there is a remaining capacity of 508 single-family units in Jurupa Valley, Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Number of Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units in Jurupa Valley</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 17, 19</td>
<td>[319]</td>
<td>Completed in 2014 — Lennar Harvest Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>[273]</td>
<td>Completed in 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 and 13</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>Remaining units to be developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Jurupa Valley (2015).

Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan

The Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan was also adopted prior to Jurupa Valley’s incorporation. The Plan area proposes a variety of uses, including a mix of residential single-family and multifamily uses. Upon buildout, the Specific Plan will add a total of 1,196 new dwelling units to the City, as shown in Table 3. As of June 2017, none of the units have been constructed; however, the project is active and construction is expected to start in 2017-2018.
Table 3: Approved Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Number of Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>Medium Density</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>Medium High Density</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached or Attached</td>
<td>High Density</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Residential</td>
<td>Very High Density</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total units remaining to be built</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,196</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan, 2005

Rio Vista Ranch Specific Plan

The Rio Vista Ranch Specific Plan was also adopted prior to Jurupa Valley’s incorporation. The Plan area proposes a variety of uses, including a mix of residential single-family and multifamily uses, retail and commercial services, parks and open space covering 918 acres. Upon buildout, the Specific Plan will add a total of 1,697 new dwelling units consisting of both single-family and multifamily units, as shown in Table 4. As of December 2017, none of the units had been constructed; however, the project is active and construction is expected to start in 2018-2019.

Table 4: Approved Rio Vista Specific Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Number of Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>Low Density</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>Medium Density</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>1,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Attached</td>
<td>High Density Townhomes/ Condos</td>
<td>8-14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Apartments</td>
<td>Very High Density</td>
<td>14-20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units Remaining to be Built</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,697</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rio Vista Specific Plan

Paradise Knolls Specific Plan

Approved in 2016, the Paradise Knolls specific plan created a master planned residential community for the development of 650 dwelling units, plus commercial, recreational and open space uses on about 107 acres in the Pedley Town Center Village Area. Of about 71 acres to be developed with housing, just over 10 acres (about 15% of the housing area) is planned for Highest Density Residential uses (HHDR). A summary of approved housing types, development densities, acreages and number of units is shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Approved Paradise Knolls Specific Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Number of Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached or Attached</td>
<td>Medium High Density Residential</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Residential</td>
<td>Highest Density Residential</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>650</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Paradise Knolls Specific Plan, 2016
Residential Land Inventory

As part of the General Plan, a parcel-specific sites inventory of vacant and underutilized sites was conducted using GIS analysis to identify properties with development potential. The results of the inventory are summarized in Table 6 and the Inventory data is shown in Table 7. For this analysis, the following definitions apply:

- **Vacant Parcels**: Undeveloped properties that contain no structures and previously developed properties where only former building foundations remain;
- **Underutilized Parcels**: Parcels that are partially developed with buildings or other real improvements, but that have residential development potential based on their existing or proposed land use designation.
- **Constrained Parcels**: Parcels with constraints that impede development; and
- **Partially Constrained Parcels**: Parcels that have some development potential on areas which are free from development constraints.

Factors Affecting Development Potential

A review of parcels with development potential started with identifying the City’s vacant parcels using 2014 aerial photos compiled by ESRI, an international supplier of Geographic Information System (GIS) software, web GIS, and geodatabase data. The vacant parcels were subsequently checked against data compiled by the Riverside County Assessor’s Office and a database of various hazards and development constraints compiled for the 2011 update to the Riverside County General Plan. The following factors were considered in determining the potential for each vacant parcel to be developed with housing:

- **Basins/Mines/Quarries**: Flood control channels and basins, mines and quarries remain undeveloped because development would interfere with their current use and potentially subject the community to hazards. Because the existing uses are anticipated to continue on these parcels, all such parcels are classified as Constrained. Further, mining operations typically require buffers to minimize impacts on nearby land uses; therefore, vacant parcels surrounding existing mines/quarries that are owned by mining companies were also classified as Constrained.
- **Conservation Easements and Land Designated as Open Space**: Parcels that are subject to conservation easements held by public or quasi-public organizations, including land held in trust by the Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) and conservation land acquired under the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), are undevelopable. Areas currently designated as open space in the City’s General Plan are also considered undevelopable. Therefore, all parcels subject to conservation easements and all areas designated as open spaces are classified as Constrained.
- **Flood Hazards**: Parcels that lie within the City’s 100-year flood zones are at risk for damage from flooding. Although flooding risks can be mitigated by raising the elevation of building pads through grading, such efforts are often considered to be cost-prohibitive, especially if most of a parcel is subject to flood hazards. Therefore, most parcels within the 100-year flood zone are classified as Constrained. In recognition of the fact that minor flood risks can often be mitigated in a cost-effective manner, those parcels that have only small portions within the 100-year flood zone are classified as Partially Constrained Parcels, with only the portions of such parcels that lie within the 100-year flood zone identified as Constrained.
• **Airport Hazard Zones:** Some parcels in the City are subject to the airport land use plans for the Riverside Municipal and Flabob Airports. All development on parcels within the compatibility zones for those airports is required to comply with the compatibility criteria, including maximum densities/intensities, land use restrictions and other development conditions set forth in the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (RCALUCP) Policy Document. In addition, the RCALUCP discourages new residential development within the 60-decibel (dB) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contour for both airports unless certain conditions are met. The 2017 General Plan includes a program that requires each development proposal within RCALUCP compatibility zones and subject to discretionary review to be considered by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission prior to approval by the City. Therefore, none of the parcels that are subject to the RALUCP are classified as Constrained. Nevertheless, the vacant parcels within the RCALUCP compatibility zones and/or the 55- and 60-dB noise contours for the Riverside Municipal and Flabob Airports are noted in the “Factors Affecting Development Potential” column in Table 7.

• **Landslide Risks:** Landslide risks and previous slide areas (soil block slides and soil slumps) exist in various parts of the City. Landslide risks within the City were categorized into three different categories: moderate, high and very high. In cases where the majority of the parcel is affected by high or very high landslide risks, the entire parcel was classified as Constrained. Where high or very high landslide risks only affected a portion of a parcel, the parcel was classified as Partially Constrained, with only the portion affected by such risks identified as Constrained. Many of these parcels were also classified as Constrained due to the presence of slope constraints (see “Topography/Slope Constraints” below). The presence of moderate landslide risks, soil block slides and soil slumps on the Opportunity Parcels is noted in the “Factors Affecting Development Potential” column in Table 7.

• **Parcel Size:** In order to accommodate economically viable development and meet minimum lot standards, vacant parcels should typically be 0.1 acre or more in size. Therefore, most vacant parcels that are less than 0.1 acre are considered undevelopable and classified as Constrained. Those parcels that are less than 0.1 acre, but located adjacent to one or more parcels held under the same ownership, are classified as Opportunity Parcels because such parcels may be combined to create larger parcels that are easier to develop.

• **Parks/Greenbelts:** For the purposes of this analysis, parcels that function as unimproved parks are considered undevelopable. In addition, it is unlikely that vacant parcels currently maintained as greenbelts within existing developments will be sold and developed. Therefore, all such parcels are classified as Constrained.

• **Potential Hazardous Materials Releases:** Previous hazardous materials releases were considered; however, the specific development constraints associated with each release can only be determined based on additional research regarding the nature and extent of each release. It is also important to note that some or all of the identified releases may have already been remediated. Therefore, only four of the vacant parcels in the City (those known to be the subject of ongoing testing for contamination due to their proximity to the Stringfellow site) were classified as Constrained based on the presence of previous hazardous materials releases. The presence of potential hazardous materials releases on the vacant parcels is noted in the “Factors Affecting Development Potential” column in Table 7.

• **Public Parcel Ownership:** Most parcels that are currently owned by public agencies are likely to continue to be held for public purposes, unless the agency that owns the land intends to develop affordable housing or encourage economic development. Therefore, parcels owned by
most public agencies (the California Department of Transportation [Caltrans], the County, the
County’s former Redevelopment Agency, the County Flood Control District, the County Office of
Education, Flabob Airport, the Jurupa Community Services District [CSD], the Jurupa Unified
School District, the Rubidoux CSD, the Santa Ana Watershed Protection Authority and the State
of California) are classified as Constrained. Because parcels owned by the County’s Housing
Authority and former Redevelopment Agency are likely to be developed with affordable housing
or some type of economic generator, such parcels are classified as Opportunity Parcels. Several
vacant parcels identified as “tax exempt” by the County Assessor’s Office were also classified as
Constrained due to the likelihood that such parcels are likely to be future sites for public uses.

- **Topography/Slope Constraints:** Slope constraints apply to many of the vacant parcels in the
City. Slopes within the City were placed into four different categories corresponding with the
development constraints associated with each category.
  
  - 0–10% (few or no constraints)
  - 11–25% (moderate constraints)
  - 26–40% (severe constraints)
  - >40% (unsuitable for development)

In cases where the majority of the parcel is affected by slopes that exceed 26 percent, the entire
parcel was classified as Constrained. Where slopes in excess of 26 percent only affected a portion of a
parcel, the parcel was classified as Partially Constrained, with only the portion affected by slope
constraints identified as Constrained. Many of the parcels affected by slope constraints were also
classified as Constrained due to the presence of high and very high landslide risks.

- **Utilities:** Parcels that are currently owned by utility service providers are likely to be planned for
future utility facilities rather than development. Therefore, parcels owned by utility service
providers (i.e., the Empire Water Company, the Metropolitan Water District, Southern California
Edison and the Southern California Gas Company) are classified as Constrained.

For the purpose of this inventory, the residential sites identified primarily include the Opportunity
Parcels, along with a very limited number of Partially Constrained parcels. However, excluding the
Constrained and Partially Constrained parcels from the sites inventory does not necessarily prevent
these parcels from being developed. Changing real estate market factors or removal of site
constraints may make additional parcels available to address future housing needs.
### Table 6: Residential Land Inventory Results Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th># of Parcels</th>
<th>Residential Density Range (ду/ac)</th>
<th>Developable Acres</th>
<th>Assumed Density</th>
<th>Potential Units</th>
<th>Potential Affordability Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranch Residential (EDR)</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.2-0.5</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above Moderate Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Neighborhood Residential (LDR)</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.0-2.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Above Moderate Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Community – Low Density Residential (RC-LDR)</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.0-2.0</td>
<td>279.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>Above Moderate Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR)</td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.0-5.0</td>
<td>369.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>Above Moderate Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)</td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.0-8.0</td>
<td>126.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>Above Moderate Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential (HDR)</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.0-14.0</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>Moderate Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Density Residential (VHDR)</td>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0-20.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Moderate Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Density Residential (HHDR)</td>
<td>R-6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.0-25.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>852,624</td>
<td>Lower Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>943</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,110,981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Potential Units differs from straight calculation of acres X assumed density due to reductions for site constraints. The reductions are shown in Table 7.

4Requires General Plan amendments.

**Conclusion: Adequacy of Sites to Meet the 1/1/2014-10/1/2021 RHNA**

For the 5th Cycle Housing Element and RHNA, the City has a total regional housing need allocation of 1,712 units. The Residential Land Inventory, Table 7, identifies 2234 parcels covering 94315 acres (this represents less than 1% of the City’s total land area), with a development potential of 4,110330 dwellings. The locations of these parcels are shown in Figure 1. As shown in Table 1 – Progress in Meeting the 5th Cycle RHNA, the City has sufficient, developable land to meet housing needs in all income levels except Extremely Low/Very Low Income households, except the Very Low/Extremely Low category, plus a “surplus” to help meet future housing needs. Jurupa Valley’s 5th Cycle RHNA identifies a need of 409 units of Extremely Low/Very Low Income housing. As shown in Table 1, to meet the RHNA Extremely Low/Very Low housing need, the City needs to designate additional HHDR land to accommodate at least 409 dwelling units of Extremely Low/Very Low income housing. This translates into a need of approximately 16 acres of HHDR land at 25 dwelling units per acre.

Pursuant to Housing Element Program HE 1.1.1, the City intends to redesignate at least 16 acres of HHDR to help meet its RHNA requirement. The Land Use Inventory identifies approximately 26 acres of vacant or underutilized land available for redesignation to HHDR to help meet the City’s Lower Income housing needs. The following maps, in Figure 1 below, show the locations of the sites identified in the inventory with housing development potential.
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Table 7: Residential Site Inventory – Vacant and Underutilized Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Site No.</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Factors Affecting Development Potential</th>
<th>Existing GP Designation</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Developable Acreage</th>
<th>New or Proposed GP Designation</th>
<th>Min. Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Max. Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Reduced Density²</th>
<th>Potential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>181180003</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>181180004</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>solid block slides, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>R-1-100</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>181180005</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>181210002</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>181210014</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>181210015</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone C, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>181210036</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>in 100-year flood zone, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zones A, B1, in 60-65 dB CNEL contour</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>181220037</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>in 100-year flood zone, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zones A, B2, in 65+ dB CNEL contour</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>M-SC</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>181230002</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>in 100-year flood zone, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone C, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>181230012</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>in 100-year flood zone, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>181361033</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone B1</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>181370001</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zones A, B1, in 55-65 dB CNEL</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>M-SC</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>181370003</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zones A, B1, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>182333003</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>R-T</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>186160015</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>soil block slides, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>186200019</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>soil block slides, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>186200020</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>186200021</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>186200022</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>186230007</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>in 100-year flood zone, potential haz mat site, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone C</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>R-1-100</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal 61.5 37.7 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Factors Affecting Development Potential</th>
<th>Existing GP Designation</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Developable Acreage</th>
<th>New or Proposed GP Designation</th>
<th>Min. Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Max. Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Reduced Density²</th>
<th>Potential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>152020005</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>W-1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>152020007</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>W-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>152020008</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>W-1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>152020010</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>W-1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 7: Residential Site Inventory – Vacant and Underutilized Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Site No.</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Factors Affecting Development Potential</th>
<th>Existing GP Designation¹</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Developable Acreage</th>
<th>New or Proposed GP Designation</th>
<th>Min. Density (du/±)</th>
<th>Max. Density (du/±)</th>
<th>Reduced Density²</th>
<th>Potential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>159030001</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>(LUA-17)</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>159030002</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>(LUA-17)</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>159030005</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>parking and storage uses (LUA-17)</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>169181018</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>170162014</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>170220012</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>170220013</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>171150008</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>186260018</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>soil block slides, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>R-1-80</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>38.8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>157041015</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>in 100-year flood zone</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>157150001</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>157190007</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1-10</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>157190008</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1-10</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>157190009</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1-10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>157240001</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>157250011</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>in 100-year flood zone</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>159202014</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>159242011</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>C-1/C-P</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>159242013</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>C-1/C-P</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>159220004</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>161082008</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>161260008</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>161300015</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>161332003</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>W-2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>162032008</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A-20000</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>162110004</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1-4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>162170001</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A-20000</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>162170040</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A-20000</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>162170041</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A-20000</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>162200008</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1-4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>162200009</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>in 100-year flood zone, soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1-4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>162210004</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1-4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>162210011</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1-4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>162210012</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1-4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>165020004</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>moderate landslide risk</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1-1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>165020007</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1-1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Designation: A, RC, LDR, DR, LD
² Density: Max. (du/±), Reduced Density (du/±), Potential Units

City of Jurupa Valley
### Table 7: Residential Site Inventory – Vacant and Underutilized Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Site No.</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Factors Affecting Development Potential</th>
<th>Existing GP Designation</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Developable Acreage</th>
<th>New or Proposed GP Designation</th>
<th>Min. Density (du/acre)</th>
<th>Max. Density (du/acre)</th>
<th>Reduced Density²</th>
<th>Potential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>165020010</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1-1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>165060015</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1-4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>165070005</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>165080002</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>165080008</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1-1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>165100027</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>165140027</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>165140028</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>165140039</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>soil block slides and slumps, moderate landslide risks, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>165140042</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>soil block slides, moderate landslide risks, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>165140045</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>soil block slides, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1-1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>165150021</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>165150022</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>166070018</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>soil block slides and slumps</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>166070035</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>166090029</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>166090030</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>166120001</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>166120003</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1-4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>167220015</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>in 100-year flood zone</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>169290003</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>169290012</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>169290013</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>169300005</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>in 100-year flood zone</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>169300006</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>169300012</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>in 100-year flood zone, soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>169310013</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>169310040</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>173050014</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>173080016</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>soil block slides and slumps</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>173090003</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>moderate landslide risk</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>W-2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>173090008</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>soil block slides and slumps, moderate landslide risks</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>173130001</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>moderate landslide risk</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>173160001</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>in 100-year flood zone, soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>W-2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7: Residential Site Inventory – Vacant and Underutilized Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Site No.</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Factors Affecting Development Potential</th>
<th>Existing GP Designation</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Developable Acreage</th>
<th>New or Proposed GP Designation</th>
<th>Min. Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Max. Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Reduced Density</th>
<th>Potential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>173160004</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>soil block slides and slumps</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>W-2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>174250001</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>W-2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>174250003</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>W-2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>174260016</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>W-2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>174340037</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>174340040</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>183080021</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>183080024</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>169330010</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>moderate landslide risk</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>169330111</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>moderate landslide risk</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>174330113</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>moderate landslide risk</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>183220006</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>moderate landslide risk</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>183320001</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>moderate landslide risk</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>183230002</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>moderate landslide risk; in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>183310030</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>298.3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>279.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>403</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Table 7: Residential Site Inventory – Vacant and Underutilized Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Site No.</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Factors Affecting Development Potential</th>
<th>Existing GP Designation¹</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Developable Acreage</th>
<th>New or Proposed GP Designation</th>
<th>Min. Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Max. Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Reduced Density²</th>
<th>Potential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>177080031</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>moderate landslide risk</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>177130007</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>177142018</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>177231019</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>178070006</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>soil block slides and slumps (LUA-11)</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>178120001</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>soil block slides (LUA-11)</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>M-SC</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>178191001</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>(LUA-11)</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>178191002</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>(LUA-11)</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>M-SC</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>178191004</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>(LUA-11)</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>M-SC</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>178290009</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>178310023</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>178310025</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>178310026</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>178310046</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>179140008</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>179170005</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>179170016</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>179170018</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>179270001</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>179310001</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>179340001</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>181220039</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>in 100-year flood zone, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zones A, B1, in 55-65 dB CNEL</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>182190015</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>182190016</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>182240009</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>182240006</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>182350002</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>soil block slides, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone C, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>183030045</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-A-20000</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>183090009</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>183110258</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>183170001</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>183380204</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>186080011</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-1-80</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>186170001</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-1-100</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 7: Residential Site Inventory – Vacant and Underutilized Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Site No.</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Factors Affecting Development Potential</th>
<th>Existing GP Designation¹</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Developable Acreage</th>
<th>New or Proposed GP Designation</th>
<th>Min. Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Max. Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Reduced Density²</th>
<th>Potential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>177110016</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>paved, former lumberyard (LUA-156A)</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>M-SC</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>23.7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>163400001</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>partially in 100-year flood zone, utility easement crosses site, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E (LUA-14)</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>M-SC</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>163400002</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>partially in 100-year flood zone, potential hazmat site, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone D, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour (LUA-14)</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>M-SC</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>169070006</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>owned by (Riverside) County Housing Authority</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>169080003</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>owned by (Riverside) County Housing Authority</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>169100057</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>owned by (Riverside) County Housing Authority</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>175080021</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>owned by (Riverside) County Housing Authority</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>175080022</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>owned by (Riverside) County Housing Authority</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>177030010</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>177030016</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>177250029</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>C-1/C-P</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>178182018</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>partially developed (LUA-7)</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>N-A</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>178271001</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>178290012</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>partially developed (LUA-6)</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>N-A</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>178310008</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>178310011</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>178310013</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>178310031</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>178310042</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>178310051</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>179082013</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>179101002</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>179170007</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>179170008</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>179270017</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>179270033</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>179330002</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone C</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>185470001</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>owned by County Housing Authority, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>185470002</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>owned by County Housing Authority, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>154.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Footnotes

¹ GP = General Plan

² Density calculated as (acres / potential units) x 100

---
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### Table 7: Residential Site Inventory – Vacant and Underutilized Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Site No.</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Factors Affecting Development Potential</th>
<th>Existing GP Designation</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Developable Acreage</th>
<th>New or Proposed GP Designation</th>
<th>Min. Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Max. Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Reduced Density</th>
<th>Potential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>174150021</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>soil block slides and slumps, moderate landslide risks</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>178262001</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>potential hazmat site, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>178262002</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>178262003</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>178262004</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>178300003</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>soil block slides, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>178310001</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>178310004</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>178310005</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>178310006</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>178310007</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>178310009</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>179060006</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>soil block slides (LUA-12)</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>M-SC</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>179060007</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>(LUA-12)</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>M-SC</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>182331007</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>182342010</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>soil block slides, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>182350005</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>75.7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>63.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>New or Proposed GP Designation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Min. Density (du/ac)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Max. Density (du/ac)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reduced Density</strong></td>
<td><strong>Potential Units</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>175100002</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>VLDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>VHDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>175100007</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>VLDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>VHDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>175100008</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>VLDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>VHDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>178250003</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>potential hazmat site, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>VHDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>VHDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>178261001</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>VHDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>VHDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>178261002</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>VHDR</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>VHDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>13.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>New or Proposed GP Designation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Min. Density (du/ac)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Max. Density (du/ac)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reduced Density</strong></td>
<td><strong>Potential Units</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>152630027</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>in 100-year flood zone</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>I-P</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>177210002</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>building on north end of parcel</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>M-SC</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>177210003</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>freeway noise</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>M-SC</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>177210005</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>freeway noise</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>M-SC</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>55.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>179021001</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>freeway noise</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>181030010</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>55.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>181030011</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>R-VC</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Residential Site Inventory – Vacant and Underutilized Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Site No.</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Factors Affecting Development Potential</th>
<th>Existing GP Designation¹</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Developable Acreage</th>
<th>New or Proposed GP Designation</th>
<th>Min. Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Max. Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Reduced Density²</th>
<th>Potential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>181030012</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>R-3-2500</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>57.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>R-VC</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>104.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>181041013</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>C-1/JC-P</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>36.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>181041014</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>C-1/JC-P</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>30.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>181041015</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>R-3-2500</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>77.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>665524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LSA Associates, Inc. (2015); Riverside County Assessor (2015); Riverside County Information Technology Geographic Information Systems (2015); City of Jurupa Valley, Draft Proposed General Plan Land Use Amendments (2015); City of Jurupa Valley, Staff Reports for Agenda Item No. 3.1, January 13, 2016 and February 10, 2016; and information provided by City staff on June 19 and 29, 2017.

¹Existing General Plan designations just prior to adoption of the 2017 General Plan.

²In all Residential designations except HHDR, Reduced Density is used for estimate purposes. It is assumed to be 20 percent below the maximum density to reflect development constraints, such as lot configuration, dedication requirements and required setbacks. Actual density is likely to be higher with on-site density transfer, density bonus and project design. In the HHDR designation, the minimum 25 du/A is also assumed to be the achieved density.

Assumed base density. In most cases, this is 20 percent below the maximum density. Actual density could be higher with density bonus and depending on project design.

Note: See following page for a list of land use designations, zoning districts, and overlays.
## Abbreviations Used in Table 7:

### Non-Residential Land Use Designations:
- OS-C = Conservation
- OS-CH = Conservation Habitat
- OS-W = Water
- OS-R = Recreation
- OS-MR = Mineral Resources
- CR = Commercial Retail
- CN = Commercial Neighborhood
- CT = Commercial Tourist
- CO = Commercial Office
- LI = Light Industrial
- HI = Heavy Industrial
- BP = Business Park
- PF = Public/Institutional
- Railroad/Utility Corridor

### Residential Land Use Designations:
- OS-RUR = Rural
- RCC = Residential/Commercial Corridor
- EDR = Estate Density Residential
- VLDR = Very Low Density Residential
- LDR = Low Density Residential
- RC-LDR = Rural Community-Low Density Residential
- MDR = Medium Density Residential
- MHDR = Medium High Density Residential
- HDR = High Density Residential
- VHDR = Very High Density Residential
- HHDR = Highest Density Residential

### Zoning Districts:
- R-R = Rural residential
- R-1 = One-family dwellings
- R-A = Residential agriculture
- R-2 = Multiple-family dwellings
- R-2A = Limited multiple-family dwellings
- R-3 = General residential
- R-T = Mobilehome subdivision and mobilehome park
- R-4 = Planned residential
- R-5 = Open area combining zone/residential development
- R-VC = Rubidoux Village Commercial
- C-1/C-P = General commercial
- C-P-S = Scenic highway commercial
- C-O = Commercial office
- I-P = Industrial park
- M-SC = Manufacturing, service commercial
- M-M = Manufacturing, medium
- M-H = Manufacturing, heavy
- A-1 = Light agriculture
- A-2 = Heavy agriculture
- W-2 = Controlled development areas
- W-1 = Watercourse, watershed and conservation areas
- SP ZONE = Specific Plan

### Overlays
- CDO = Community Development Overlay
- TCO = Town Center Overlay
- SP = Specific Plan
- ELO = Equestrian Lifestyle Overlay
- MPO = Mixed Use Overlay
- BPO = Business Park Overlay
- HO = Historic Overlay

---

***

---
October 25, 2018

Mr. Thomas Merrell, Planning Director
City of Jurupa Valley
8930 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509

Dear Thomas Merrell:

RE: Review of the City of Jurupa Valley’s 5th Cycle (2013-2021) Draft Housing Element

Thank you for submitting Jurupa Valley’s revised draft housing element update received for review on September 4, 2018, along with revisions received on October 22, 2018. Pursuant to Government Code, section 65585, subdivision (b), the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is reporting the results of its review. Our review was facilitated by a telephone conversation on September 19, 2018.

The revised draft housing element meets the statutory requirements described in HCD’s February 22, 2018 review. The revised element will comply with state housing element law (Article 10.6 of the Government Code) when it is adopted and submitted to HCD, in accordance with Gov. Code section 65585, subdivision (g).

Public participation in the development, adoption and implementation of the housing element is essential to effective housing planning. Throughout the housing element process, the city must continue to engage the community, including organizations that represent lower-income and special needs households, by making information regularly available while considering and incorporating comments where appropriate.

Several federal, state, and regional funding programs consider housing element compliance as an eligibility or ranking criteria. For example, CalTrans Senate Bill (SB) 1 Sustainable Communities grants; the Strategic Growth Council and HCD’s Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities programs; and the upcoming SB 2 Planning grant as well as ongoing SB 2 funding considering housing element compliance and/or annual reporting requirements pursuant to Gov. Code section 65400. Without a compliant housing element, Jurupa Valley may be ineligible for some funding sources.

For your information, some general plan element updates are triggered based upon housing element adoption. For example, a jurisdiction must address environmental justice in their general plans, by the adoption of a separate environmental justice element or to integrate environmental justice goals, policies, and objectives into their general plans. This requirement is applicable upon the adoption or next revision of two or more elements.
concurrently on or after January 1, 2018 (Gov. Code 65302, subd. (h)). In addition, the safety and conservation elements of the general plan must include analysis and policies regarding fire and flood hazard management (Gov. Code section 65302, subd. (g)). Also, the land-use element must address disadvantaged communities (unincorporated island or fringe communities within spheres of influence areas or isolated long established legacy communities). HCD urges Jurupa Valley to consider timing provisions and welcomes the opportunity to provide assistance. For information, please see the Technical Advisories issued by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research at: http://opr.ca.gov/docs/SB244_Technical_Advisory.pdf and http://opr.ca.gov/docs/Final_6.26.15.pdf.

HCD appreciates the hard work and dedication Jeff Hook, Thomas Merrell, and Mary Wright provided in preparation of the housing element and looks forward to receiving the City of Jurupa Valley’s adopted housing element. If you have any questions or need technical assistance, please contact Hillary Prasad, of our staff, at (916) 263-1784.

Sincerely,

Zachary Olmstead
Deputy Director
Previous Environmental Document Review Determination

City of Jurupa Valley
General Plan Amendment (GPA) No. 19002

Applicant & Lead Agency

City of Jurupa Valley
8390 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
Contact: Mary P. Wright, General Plan Program Manager
(951) 332-6464
mwright@jurupavalley.org

February 19, 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 for the 2017 General Plan, SCH #2016021025, certified by the Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2017-14 on September 7, 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.

The City of Jurupa Valley comprises 45 square miles located in Western Riverside County. The City is bordered by the San Bernardino and the cities of Fontana and Colton on the north, the City of Riverside to the south and east, and the I-15 freeway and the City of Eastvale on the west. (See Exhibit 1). The 2017 General Plan and Housing Element covers the entirety of the City of Jurupa Valley.

Exhibit 1 – Map of Jurupa Valley
GPA No. 19002
Previous Environmental Document Review Determination
February 19, 2019

Project Description.

Approved Project

On September 7, 2017, the City of Jurupa Valley adopted the 2017 General Plan, including the seven elements required by State law as well as three optional elements. The Housing Element is one of the required elements and outlines how the City will accommodate housing for all income groups. The Element includes a Housing Needs Assessment which quantifies projected housing needs based on the City's share of the 'Regional Housing Needs allocation' (RHNA). It also includes a summary of resources and constraints including an analysis of population and household characteristics and needs, an inventory of land and an analysis of governmental and non-governmental constraints to providing adequate housing. The Element includes a number of policies and programs specifically designed to meet housing needs for all income levels, including affordable and market rate housing. It was prepared to meet the State’s 5th Cycle Housing Element Update Planning Period from October 15, 2013 to October 15, 2021.

Proposed Project

Following adoption of the 2017 General Plan, staff submitted the Housing Element to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for a mandatory certification review. This is a required step for all jurisdictions following adoption of a Housing Element and allows HCD to determine whether the element is in compliance with State housing element law. On October 25, 2018, HCD sent the City a letter indicating they will find the Housing Element in compliance with state housing law if certain minor amendments discussed with staff are approved by the City Council. Proposed GPA No. 19002 is an amendment to the 2017 General Plan Housing Element to make the changes requested by HCD. If approved by the City Council, the revised Housing Element will be transmitted to HCD for final approval.

GPA No. 19002 includes the following changes to the 2017 General Plan Housing Element:

1. Revisions to Table 5.33 to more accurately reflect Jurupa Valley’s progress in meeting the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).
2. A reduction in the number of acres needed to be rezoned to the Highest Density Residential land use designation (HHDR) to meet regional housing needs for Extremely Low/Very Low income housing.
3. A listing of specific parcels in the Adequate Sites Inventory.
4. Modifications to Housing Element Program 2.1.9 to address the removal of governmental constraints.
5. Other minor changes.

2.0 USE OF PREVIOUS EIR

The 2017 General Plan EIR was certified by the Jurupa Valley City Council by Resolution No. 2017-14 on September 7, 2017. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) allows a previously adopted 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 2017 General Plan 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 Sections 4.1 through 4.17 of 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

__________________________
February 19, 2019
Date
4.0 ANALYSIS

The analysis in Sections 4.1 through 4.17 of this document has been prepared to determine if the changes proposed by the Proposed Project are within the scope of the analysis contained in the 2017 General Plan EIR and to ensure the proposed changes do not create new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously analyzed impacts as compared to those identified previously.

4.1 Aesthetics

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined the Approved Project would have a less than significant impact on visual character, scenic resources, and light and glare, and no mitigation measures related to aesthetics were required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to aesthetics.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

The 2017 General Plan determined that the Approved Project would have no impact on the loss of forest land, zoning for forest land and the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. However, the Approved Project would have a significant impact on the conversion of agricultural land, the loss of Prime Farmland, and the cumulative loss of agriculture in the region. As there are no mitigation measures available for these impacts, they remained a significant, unmitigated impact. A Statement of Overriding Considerations prepared for the project indicated that the benefits of developing the City in accordance with the 2017 General Plan would outweigh impacts related to agriculture and farmland.

Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan 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 2017 General Plan EIR. Thus, although the impact to agricultural resources remains a significant, unmitigated impact, no new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.3 Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that General Plan goals, policies and programs will provide sufficient protection for air quality impacts of future development on nearby sensitive receptors, would protect from adverse odors and would be consistent with the overall goals and intent of the AQMP. Therefore, impacts related to those issues were determined to be less than significant and no mitigation was deemed to be necessary.
The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that the Approved Project will help reduce programmatic air quality impacts from future land uses (i.e., air pollutants generated by new development) but will not be able to reduce impacts from future development to less than significant levels when compared to SCAQMD daily thresholds. Future development projects may exceed SCAQMD daily thresholds even with project-specific mitigation, so this long-term impact remains significant and no additional feasible mitigation is available at a programmatic level. A Statement of Overriding Considerations prepared for the project indicated that the benefits of developing the City in accordance with the 2017 General Plan would outweigh impacts related to air quality.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan 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 2017 General Plan EIR. Thus, although the impact to air quality remains a significant, unmitigated impact, no new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.4 Biological Resources

The 2017 General Plan determined that implementation of the General Plan would have no impact related to local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Furthermore, the General Plan would have a less than significant impact on habitat modifications, impacts to threatened habitat and species, and other biological considerations. As impacts would be less than significant, no mitigation related to biological resources was required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to biological resources.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.5 Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that the General Plan contains adequate goals, policies and programs to ensure that build-out under the General Plan would not adversely affect archaeological resources, tribal cultural resources or human remains. In addition, mitigation measures were incorporated into the 2017 General Plan EIR to ensure that impacts related to potential historic and paleontological resources would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not change the assessment of cultural and tribal cultural resource impacts in the 2017 General Plan EIR. In addition, mitigation measures related to historic and paleontological resources would remain in effect and no additional mitigation measures are needed.
4.6 Geology and Soils

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that the Approved Project could have a significant impact related to geology and soils. However, with the incorporation of mitigation measures involving site specific geotechnical investigations for individual projects, impacts related to geology and soils would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not change the assessment of geology and soils impacts in the 2017 General Plan EIR. In addition, mitigation measures related to geology and soils would remain in effect and no additional mitigation measures are needed.

4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions and climate change were less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Mitigation Measure 4.7.5.2A requires that the City prepare and adopt a Climate Action Plan (CAP) specifically for the City of Jurupa Valley, including a 2030 reduction target and local emission inventory. With the incorporation of Mitigation Measure 4.7.5.2A, impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions and climate change would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to greenhouse gas emissions and climate change.

4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that the Approved Project would not have a potentially significant impact related to hazards and hazardous materials and no mitigation would be required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to hazards and hazardous materials.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that impacts related to hydrology and water quality were less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Mitigation Measure 4.9.5.6A requires that non-residential development projects be required to mechanically sweep their parking areas once every two weeks to minimize the amount of particulate matter entering surface and groundwater resources.
The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to hydrology and water quality.

4.10 Land Use and Planning

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that impacts related to land use and planning were less than significant and no mitigation measures were required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to land use and planning.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.11 Mineral Resources

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that impacts related to mineral resources were less than significant and no mitigation measures were required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to mineral resources.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.12 Noise

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that the Approved Project will not be able to reduce impacts related to long-term noise levels in exceedance of City standards or traffic related noise levels along several major roadways. A Statement of Overriding Considerations prepared for the project indicated that the benefits of developing the City in accordance with the 2017 General Plan would outweigh impacts related to noise.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan 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 2017 General Plan EIR. Thus, although the impact to noise remains a significant, unmitigated impact, no new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.13 Population and Housing

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that impacts related to population and housing was less than significant and no mitigation measures were required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to population and housing.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.14 Public Services

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that impacts related to public services was less than significant and no mitigation measures were required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to public services.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.15 Recreation and Parks

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that impacts related to recreation and parks were less than significant and no mitigation measures were required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to recreation and parks.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.16 Transportation and Traffic

The 2017 General Plan determined that the Approved Project would have a significant unmitigable impact related to roadway and cumulative levels of service. A Statement of Overriding Considerations prepared for the project indicated that the benefits of developing the City in accordance with the 2017 General Plan would outweigh impacts related to transportation and traffic.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan 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 2017 General Plan EIR. Thus, although the impact to transportation and traffic remains a significant, unmitigated impact, no new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

4.17 Utilities and Service Systems

The 2017 General Plan EIR determined that impacts related to utilities and service systems were less than significant and no mitigation measures were required.

The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan that do not increase the intensity of development. The Proposed Project would make minor amendments to the Housing Element of the 2017 General Plan. Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan EIR and the information 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 2017 General Plan EIR related to utilities and service systems.

No new significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no new mitigation measures are required as a result of the Proposed Project.

Conclusion

Based on a review of the 2017 General Plan 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 2017 General Plan EIR.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Site No.</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Factors Affecting Development Potential</th>
<th>Existing GP Designation</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Developable Acreage</th>
<th>New or Proposed GP Designation</th>
<th>Min. Density (du/acre)</th>
<th>Max. Density (du/acre)</th>
<th>Reduced Density</th>
<th>Potential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>157250011</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>in 100-year flood zone</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>159030001</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>(LUA-17)</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>159030002</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>(LUA-17)</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>159030005</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>soil block slides (LUA-17)</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>162200008</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>162200009</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>in 100-year flood zone, soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>162210004</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>162210011</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>162210012</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>165080002</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>165140027</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>165140028</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>165150021</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>165150022</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>165140039</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>soil block slides and slumps, moderate landslide risks, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>165140042</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>soil block slides, moderate landslide risks, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>165140045</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>soil block slides, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>A-1-1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>169032001</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>soil block slides, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>C.P.S</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>169070006</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>soil block slides, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>C.P.S</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>169080003</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>soil block slides, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>A-1-1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>169100057</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Owned by (Riverside) County Housing Authority</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>169150020</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0/5.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>169150021</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>169180101</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>169290003</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>soil block slides</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>169300012</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>in 100-year flood zone, soil</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Site No.</td>
<td>APN</td>
<td>Total Acres</td>
<td>Factors Affecting Development Potential</td>
<td>Existing GP Designation1</td>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>Developable Acreage</td>
<td>New or Proposed GP Designation</td>
<td>Min. Density (du/ac)</td>
<td>Max. Density (du/ac)</td>
<td>Reduced Density2 Potential Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>170030004</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>block slides</td>
<td></td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>171040044</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>freeway noise</td>
<td></td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>173160001</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>soil block slides and slumps</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>173160004</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>freeway noise</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>RC-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>177110016</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>paved, former lumberyard (LUA-15[A])</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>M-SC</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>177210002</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>building on north end of parcel</td>
<td></td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>177210003</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>freeway noise</td>
<td></td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>177210005</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>freeway noise</td>
<td></td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>55.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>177231019</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td></td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>179021001</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>freeway noise</td>
<td></td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>178262003</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HID</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>178262004</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HID</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>178300003</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>soil block slides, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HID</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>178310001</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HID</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>178310004</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HID</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>178310005</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HID</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>178310006</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HID</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>178310007</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HID</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>178310009</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HID</td>
<td>SP ZONE</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>181030010</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HID</td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>5544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>181030011</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>R-VC</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>181030012</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HID</td>
<td>R-3-2500</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>57548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>181041013</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>C-1/C-P</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>3528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Site No.</td>
<td>APN</td>
<td>Total Acres</td>
<td>Factors Affecting Development Potential</td>
<td>Existing GP Designation1</td>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>Developable Acreage</td>
<td>New or Proposed GP Designation</td>
<td>Min. Density (du/ac)</td>
<td>Max. Density (du/ac)</td>
<td>Reduced Density2</td>
<td>Potential Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>181041014</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>C-1/C-P</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>3024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>181041015</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>R-3-2500</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>HHDR</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>77.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>182350002</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>soil block slides, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone C, in 55.60 dB CNEL contour</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>185470001</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>owned by County Housing Authority, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>R.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>185470002</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>owned by County Housing Authority, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>R.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>186080011</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>R.1.80</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site 12

South side of Limonite between Lucretia & Dollar Storage
Sites 13-15

South side of Bellegrave west of Bain
Sites 31-35

North side of Limonite at Beach
Sites 43-52

West side of Van Buren north of 60th
Sites 48-50

East side of Pedley Road north of Limonite
Site 61

South side of Ben Nevis west of Pedley Road
Sites 62-67

Mission & Pedley Road – various sites
Sites 68 & 73

West side of Van Buren south of Jurupa Road
Site 76

South side of Ben Nevis east of Country Village

Jurupa Valley Housing Element
Potential Housing Sites – March 2019
Sites 89 & 90

North side of Granite Hill west of Pedley Road
Site 112

North side of SR-60 at Florine and 33rd
Sites 115-117

East side of Pacific south of Canal
Site 118

South side of Canal west of La Rue
Sites 131-143

Portion of Emerald Meadow south of SR-60 at 30th & Hall
Site 153

South side of Canal east of La Rue
Sites 170-175

South of Mission Plaza site north side of Tilton (RCHA)
Site 198

East side of Limonite south of Pacific
Sites 214-215

Northeast of Limonite and Camino Real (RCHA)
Site 216

Northwest side of Limonite south of Pacific
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 21, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

FROM: GARY THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER

BY: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 15.B

PUBLIC HEARING FOR RECONSIDERATION OF MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 17099: CHANGE OF ZONE (CZ) NO. 17003 TO CHANGE THE ZONING CLASSIFICATION OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY FROM R-1 (ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS) TO R-4 (PLANNED RESIDENTIAL) AND TO CONSIDER AN APPEAL OF TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 37211, SUBDIVISION OF SAID PROPERTY INTO 48 LOTS FOR FUTURE SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, THREE LETTERED STREET LOTS, 2 LETTERED LOTS FOR DRAINAGE FACILITIES, AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF ASSOCIATED ON-SITE AND OFF-SITE INFRASTRUCTURE. PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018). APPLICANT: (SEQUANATA PARTNERS, LP) (CONTINUED FROM THE JANUARY 17, 2019 MEETING)

RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council approve Change of Zone (CZ) No. 17003, approve Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211, approve an Exception to Subsection G of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and approve the Development Plan approving the project as follows:

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

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR A PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION (“SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS”) (48 UNITS) LOCATED ON 10.4 ACRES AT THE INTERSECTION OF
b. That the City Council conduct a first reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2019-01, entitled:

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

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


ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATION

2. That the City Council deny Change of Zone (CZ) No. 17003, approve the revised Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211, proposing 41 lots with minimum 7,200 square foot lot sizes and approve an Exception to Subsection G of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code approving the alternative project as follows:

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

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

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

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

c. That the City Council pass and adopt Resolution No. 2019-03(a), entitled:


PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

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

**LOCATION**

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

**EXHIBIT 1: SITE LOCATION MAP**

A summary of the existing General Plan land use and existing zoning designations for the project site and surrounding properties is provided in Table 2 and maps are provided under Exhibit 2.
TABLE 2: EXISTING AND SURROUNDING GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS

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

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

EXHIBIT 2: LAND USE AND ZONING MAPS

BACKGROUND

On December 6, 2018, the City Council decided to reconsider the introduction of Ordinance No. 2018-13, changing the zone of the subject 10.4-acre property from R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) and setting the public hearing for the reconsideration of Ordinance No. 2018-03 and the appeal of the Planning Commission’s decision to approve Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211 (at request of Mayor Goodland).
The City Council voted unanimously to set the public hearing to reconsider Ordinance No. 2018-03 and the appeal by Mayor Goodland of the Planning Commission’s approval of TTM No. 32711 for the January 17, 2019 Council meeting.

At the January 17, 2019 City Council meeting, the Council heard public testimony from the Applicant and the public. Upon closure of the public hearing, the City Council discussed the project and expressed concerns with the project’s density, lack of amenities and reduced lot sizes. The Council then voted unanimously to continue the public hearing to a later date, see excerpt of the January 17, 2019 City Council minutes and the January 17, 2019 City Council staff report (Attachments 6 and 7).

ANALYSIS

In reviewing the project and taking into account the Council’s concerns, staff has prepared the following Table 1 and Table 2 to better analyze the pros and cons for the proposed Change of Zone and TTM. Table 1 reviews the code differences between the project’s R-4 standards versus the R-1 standards and Table 2 reviews the project benefits based on R-4 and R-1 zones.

### Table 1: R-4 and R-1 Code Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-4 ZONE</th>
<th>R-1 ZONE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Size: 3,500 sq.ft.</td>
<td>Minimum 7,200 sq.ft. lots</td>
<td>790 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Lot Size: 6,410 sq.ft. average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width: 40 feet</td>
<td>Minimum Lot Width: 60 feet</td>
<td>Two (2) feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Lot Width: 58 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Depth: 80 feet</td>
<td>Minimum Lot Depth: 100 feet</td>
<td>10 feet over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Lot Depth: 110 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Plan Required</td>
<td>No Development Plan required</td>
<td>No approval of architecture required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: R-4 vs. R-1 Project Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-4 PROJECT</th>
<th>R-1 PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Development Plan with various architectural styles: Tuscan, Spanish, Traditional and Craftsman</td>
<td>No Development Plan Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Six (6) different plans with three varying exterior elevations and a different floor plan per each of the six (6) plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community Wall and Fence Plan / Entry Monuments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Detailed Landscape Plan

| Benefits project site and entire housing tract north of the 60 Freeway by providing freeway noise and aesthetic mitigation |
| Without added lots, Developer lacks funding for 60 Freeway sound wall installation; noise mitigation measures will require 7.5 foot high walls within several individual lots |

- **Sewer and water upgrades in partnership with the Riverside County Flood Control District (RCFCD) on Master Plan Facility Line C.**
- **Storm drain improvement will eliminate seasonal flooding that occurs at the homes south of Canal St., west of Opal St.**

In response to the Council's request that the Applicant provide for future sewer stub out connection for adjacent property owners on the west side of Opal, the Applicant contacted the Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD). RCSD told the Applicant that the district would not construct a sewer line in Opal Street, as it is not cost effective. Extending the sewer line 600 feet to the north with stub outs for properties on the west of Opal Street would be the applicant’s responsibility in addition to the $5,000 per unit connection fee. The Applicant indicated to staff that extending the sewer line over to Opal Street with stub out for each homeowner would be cost prohibitive.

### GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY / LAND USE COMPATIBILITY

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

The R-4 project alternative is consistent with applicable policies of the MDR land use and density level, which permits 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre. Under the current land use designation, up to 52 dwelling units are permitted. The project proposes 48 residential lots at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density and an average lot size of 6,410 square feet which is greater than the 5,500 square foot parcel size achievable at 5 units per acre within the MDR.

Per the General Plan Land Use Element, Table 2.5, the R-4 zone is classified as consist with the MDR land use designation:
Additionally, the project complies with the following General Plan Land Use Element Policies:

**LUE 8.1 Land Use Compatibility**

Require land to be developed and used in accordance with the General Plan, specific plans, and community and town center plans to ensure compatibility and minimize impacts.

The proposed R-4 zone and TTM32711 is being developed in accordance to the permitted density and zone deemed consistent with the MDR land use designation as shown within the General Plan Land Use Element. The project layout, development standards and average lot sizes are compatible with the adjacent residential development. The development of attractive decorative walls, landscaping and a freeway sound wall will help to minimize any impacts to adjacent land uses.

**LUE 8.2 High Quality Development**

Require that all development be of high quality and enhance the positive characteristics and unique features of the project site, neighboring properties and the surrounding community.

The proposed Development Plan features high quality architectural design elements and various architectural styles consisting of Tuscan, Spanish, Traditional and Craftsman designs; six (6) different plans with three varying exterior elevations and a different floor plan per each of the six (6) plans; community wall and fence plan along with decorative entry monument signs; and an attractive detailed landscape plan.

The project will upgrade existing site conditions and will be an asset to the neighboring properties and the surrounding community by enhancing the character of the neighborhood and promoting an increase in property values.
ALTERNATIVE R-1 PLAN

Should the City Council decide to deny the Change of Zone, the Applicant has prepared a revised map which is consistent with the R-1 (One Family Dwellings) zone, see Attachment 15. The revised project would now divide the 10.4-acre site into 41 single-family residential lots with minimum lot size of 7,200 square feet; two (2) water quality basin lots (Lot A & B) and three (3) lettered street lots (A-C). The applicant is also requesting an exception to Section 7.10.080 (G) of Title 7 (Subdivisions) for double frontage lots on Lots 3-9.

REVISED / ALTERNATIVE R-1 MAP ANALYSIS

As the property is currently zoned R-1 (One Family Dwellings), the minimum required lot size is 7,200 square feet, with a minimum average lot width of 60 feet and a minimum average lot depth of 100 feet. The revised map would be in compliance with the R-1 development standards as shown on the revised map.

With the revised map approval however, many of the benefits which would have been provided within the R-4 zone and Development Plan (see Table 2) would now be eliminated, such as elimination of the proposed sound wall along the SR-60 Freeway whereby the recommended noise mitigation measures shown within Exhibit C of the Noise Study (dated March 4, 2019) would now prevail.

It is important to note that the R-4 zone and proposed 48-lot subdivision is consistent with the MDR land use designation as identified in the Land Use Element of the General Plan and that by denying the project as proposed, many site upgrades would be eliminated.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The City of Jurupa Valley has prepared and intends to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Project. The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration is supported by an Initial Study that evaluated potential effects with respect to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forest Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration determines that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made or agreed to by the Applicant. The City's decision to prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration should not be construed as a recommendation of either approval or denial of this Project. Planning Condition No. 5 requires all the mitigation measures of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to be as conditions.

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

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

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

It is important to note however, that although not a requirement of CEQA, analyzing the noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway on future residents of the project is an essential factor to protect the health of future residents. As such, staff is recommending a sound wall as discussed in the October 24, 2018 Planning Commission staff report.

**Public Review Period**

The public review period for the environmental document began on July 5, 2018 and ended on August 3, 2018. The City did not receive any comments.

**CONCLUSION**

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

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

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

FINANCIAL IMPACT

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

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the project, taking the following actions:

   a) Adopt Resolution No. 2019-02, entitled:

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

   b) Conduct a first reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2019-01, entitled:

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

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

2. Approve the alternative to the project, taking the following actions:

   a. Adopt Resolution No. 2019-02, entitled:

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

   b. Conduct a first reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2019-01(a), entitled:

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

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

PLANNING COMMISSION'S APPROVAL OF A DEVELOPMENT PLAN
AND DENYING THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

3. Provide alternative direction to staff.

Prepared by:

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director

Submitted by:

Gary Thompson
City Manager

Reviewed by:

Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Reviewed by:

Peter M. Thorson
City Attorney

Reviewed by:

George A. Wentz
Deputy City Manager

ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution No. 2019-02
   a) Exhibit A: Mitigated Negative Declaration with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)

2. Ordinance No. 2019-01
   a) Exhibit A: Change of Zone Exhibit

3. Resolution No. 2019-03
   a) Exhibit A: Recommended Conditions of Approval
   b) Exhibit B: Mitigated Negative Declaration with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) (see Attachment 1 a)

4. Ordinance No. 2019-01(a), denying the Change of Zone

5. Resolution No. 2019-03(a), denying the 48-lot TTM, denying the Development Plan, approving the Exception, and approving the 41-Lot TTM
   a) Exhibit A: Recommended Conditions of Approval
   b) Exhibit B: Mitigated Negative Declaration with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) (see Attachment 1 a)

6. January 17, 2019 City Council Staff Report (without Attachments)
7. Excerpt of the January 17, 2019 City Council Minutes
8. October 24, 2018 Planning Commission Staff Report (without exhibits)
9. Letter from Applicant (January 4, 2019)
10. Radius Map showing 1,000 foot radius from project boundaries
11. Development Plan workbook
12. Tentative Tract Map No. 32711 and Development Plan (Sheets 1-2)
13. Architectural Set of Plans
14. Conceptual Landscape Plans (Wall/Fence and Maintenance Plan included)
15. Revised Tentative Tract Map No. 32711 (41-lots)
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-02

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

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

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

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

(a) The application for MA No. 17099 was processed including, but not limited to, a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(h) On January 17, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the introduction of this Ordinance and the Appeal, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council continued the public hearing to a date uncertain.

(i) On March 21, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a continued public hearing on the introduction of this Ordinance and the Appeal, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing.

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

Section 3. California Environmental Quality Act Findings for Adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby makes the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the Project:
Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Cal. Pub. Res. Code §21000 et seq.) and the State Guidelines (the “Guidelines”) (14 Cal. Code Regs. §15000 et seq.), City staff prepared an Initial Study of the potential environmental effects of the approval of the Project as described in the Initial Study. Based upon the findings contained in that Study, City staff determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there was no substantial evidence that the Project could have a significant effect on the environment and a Mitigated Negative Declaration (“MND”) was prepared by the City in full compliance with CEQA.

Thereafter, City staff provided public notice of the public comment period and of the intent to adopt the MND as required by law. The public comment period commenced on July 5, 2018, and expired on August 3, 2018. Copies of the documents have been available for public review and inspection at City Hall, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509. The City received did not receive any comments during the public review period.

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

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

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

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

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

Section 4. **Certification.** The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.
PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 21st 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. 2019-02 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 21st 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 21st day of March, 2019.

___________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
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1.0. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of an Initial Study Checklist

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

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

1.2 Purpose of a Mitigated Negative Declaration

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

1.3 Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration Document

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

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

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

1) The State Clearinghouse;

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

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

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

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

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

For this Project, the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission has the authority to recommend, conditionally recommend, or not recommend the Project for approval. The Jurupa Valley City Council has exclusive authority to approve, conditionally approve, or deny the Project. Accordingly, public hearings will be held before the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission and City Council to consider the proposed Project and the adequacy of this Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

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

1.5 Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration Findings and Conclusions

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

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

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

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

The Initial Study Checklist determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the Lead Agency (City of Jurupa Valley), that the Project may have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, based on the findings of the Initial Study Checklist, the City of Jurupa Valley determined that a Mitigated Negative Declaration is the appropriate CEQA determination for the Project pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15070(b).
2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

2.1 Project Location

The City of Jurupa Valley covers approximately 43.5 square miles within the County of Riverside. The City is bordered by the City of Fontana and County of San Bernardino to the north, City of Norco to the south, City of Eastvale to the west, and City of Riverside and County of San Bernardino to the east. Specifically, the Project is located on the southeast corner of Canal and Opal Streets, north of the State Route 60 freeway and east of Pacific Avenue (Refer to Exhibit 1).

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

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

2.2 Existing Site Conditions/Environmental Setting

CEQA Guidelines §15125 establishes requirements for defining the environmental setting to which the environmental effects of a proposed project must be compared. The environmental setting is defined as “...the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the Notice of Preparation is published, or if no Notice of Preparation is published, at the time the environmental analysis is commenced...” (CEQA Guidelines §15125[a]). A Notice of Preparation was not required at the time the Initial Study Checklist was commenced. Thus the environmental setting for the Project is the approximate date that the Project’s Initial Study Checklist commenced in September 2017.

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

Access to the Project site is provided by Canal Street (a paved roadway with no curb, gutter, or sidewalk) which abuts the northern boundary of the site; Opal Street (a paved roadway with no curb, gutter, or sidewalk) which abuts the eastern boundary of the site; and by Pacific Avenue (a paved roadway with a rolled curb and no sidewalk).
Existing and surrounding land uses are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Existing and Surrounding Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Vacant land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Canal Street with vacant land and railroad tracks further to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>State Route 60 Freeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Opal Street with single-family residential further to the east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Concrete lined flood control channel with single-family residential to the west; and Pacific Avenue with vacant land further to the west.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Inspection, September 2017

2.3 Existing General Plan Land Use and Zoning Designations

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

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

Table 2. Existing and Surrounding General Plan and Zoning Designations

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

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

2.4 Project Description

The Project Applicant, Sequanota Partners, LP, submitted the following applications to the City of Jurupa Valley, which comprise the proposed Project: Change of Zone (CZ) No. 17003 and Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211. The City of Jurupa Valley also refers to these applications as Master Application (MA) No. 17099. The Project’s application materials are on file with the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509 and are hereby incorporated by reference.
A. **Change of Zone 17003:** Amend the City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential).

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

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

**Street Improvements**

The Project proposes the following street improvements:

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Drainage Infrastructure**

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

**Sewer and Water Infrastructure**

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

**B. Extension of Infrastructure**

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

Evaluation Format

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

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

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

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

The effects of the Project are then placed in the following four categories, which are each followed by a summary to substantiate why the Project does not impact the particular factor with or without mitigation. If “Potentially Significant Impacts” that cannot be mitigated are determined, then the Project does not qualify for a Mitigated Negative Declaration and an Environmental Impact Report must be prepared:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially significant impact(s) have been identified or anticipated that cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance. An Environmental Impact Report must therefore be prepared.</td>
<td>Potentially significant impact(s) have been identified or anticipated, but mitigation is possible to reduce impact(s) to a less than significant category. Mitigation measures must then be identified.</td>
<td>No “significant” impact(s) identified or anticipated. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td>No impact(s) identified or anticipated. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Throughout the impact analysis in this Initial Study Checklist, reference is made to the following:

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

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

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

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) and the Project Design Features (PDF) were assumed and accounted for in the assessment of impacts for each issue area if applicable.

Mitigation Measures (MM) were formulated only for those issue areas where the results of the impact analysis identified significant impacts that could be reduced to less than significant levels.

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

**Environmental Factors Requiring Mitigation**

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

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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

______________________________
Signature

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

City of Jurupa Valley
Agency

______________________________
June 27, 2018
Date
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Appendix I.  *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment*, Geotek, July 14, 2016.

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


3.1 AESTHETICS

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

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Sources: General Plan, Google Earth, Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

PPP 3.1-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 9.199.040.C, one (1) family residences shall not exceed forty (40) feet in height. No other building or structure shall exceed fifty (50) feet in height, unless a greater height is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.370. In no event, however, shall a building or structure exceed seventy-five (75) feet in height, unless a variance is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.270.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

The Project site is approximately 10.4 gross acres in size and is located in an area largely characterized by residential development and vacant land. The site is bounded by Canal Street, followed by vacant land, followed by a railroad easement or residential development to the north; a flood control channel, followed by residential development or Pacific Avenue, followed by vacant land to the east; State Highway 60 or a flood control channel, followed by State Route 60, to the south; and scattered residences to the west.
According to the General Plan, scenic vistas are points or corridors that are accessible to the public and that provide a view of scenic areas and/or landscapes. According to General Plan Figure 4-23, the Project site is not adjacent to a scenic corridor.

Scenic vistas in the Project vicinity are the Jurupa Hills located approximately 5,000 feet to the northwest of the Project site and the Rattlesnake Mountains located approximately 2,000 feet to the northeast of the Project site.

As required by PPP 3.1-1 above, the future buildings proposed on the property will be restricted to 40 feet in height. As such, the Project would not block or completely obstruct views from surrounding public vantage points to the Jurupa Hills or Rattlesnake Mountain visible in the horizon under existing conditions.

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

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

**Determination:** No Impact.

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

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

According to the California Department of Transportation, the Project site is not located within a State Scenic Highway. In addition, according to General Plan Figure 4-23, the Project site is not adjacent to a scenic corridor. As such, there is no impact.

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

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Sources: Project Application Materials, Google Earth.*
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Construction Impacts

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

Operational Impacts

The visual character of the Project site would change from disturbed, vacant land to a 48 lot subdivision for construction of single-family residences. A project is generally considered to have a significant impact on visual character if it substantially changes the character of the project site such that it becomes visually incompatible or visually unexpected when viewed in the context of its surroundings.

The Project site is in an area largely characterized by residential development and vacant land. The site is bounded by Canal Street, followed by vacant land, followed by a railroad easement or residential development to the north; a flood control channel, followed by residential development or Pacific Avenue, followed by vacant land to the east; State Route 60 or a flood control channel to the south; and scattered residences to the west. In addition, the Project site is planned for low density residential uses by the General Plan and this type of development has been anticipated for the subject site.

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

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Sources: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)
The following apply to the Project and would help reduce impacts related to light and glare. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

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

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Description</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 (a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? .

Determination: No Impact
Sources: California Department of Conservation “Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

Determination: No Impact.
Sources: General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Agricultural Zoning

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

Williamson Act

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

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

**Determination:** No Impact.
*Sources: General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map.*

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

The Project site has a zoning classification R-1 (One Family Dwellings). The Project is proposing a zone change from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential). The Project site does not contain any forest lands, timberland, or timberland zoned as Timberland Production, nor are any forest lands or timberlands located on or nearby the Project site. Because no lands on the Project site are zoned for forestland or timberland, the Project has no potential to impact such zoning. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

The Project site and surrounding properties do not contain forest lands, are not zoned for forest lands, nor are they identified as containing forest resources by the General Plan. Because forest land is not present on the Project site or in the immediate vicinity of the Project site, the Project has no potential to result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur.
3.2 (e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

Sources: California Department of Conservation.

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program classifies the eastern portion of the Project site as “Local Importance.” Farmland of “Local Importance” is either currently producing, or has the capability of production; but does not meet the criteria of Prime, Statewide or Unique Farmland. The General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element contains policies to encourage the continuation of land that is in active agricultural production. According to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the Project (Appendix G), the site has not been used for agricultural purposes since 1985. One (1) vegetation community/land cover type was mapped within the Project site, agriculture land (fallow agriculture). The description of this habitat and vegetation communities is based on the definitions found in MSHCP Section 2.1.3 and *A Manual of California Vegetation: Second Edition* (Sawyer et al. 2009). Fallow Agricultural land includes fallow fields that have been recently disked, plowed, or are no longer used to produce crops and are slowly being encroached by non-native herbaceous plant species. In some cases, native annual wildflowers become established in fallow agricultural lands. Fallow agriculture was the only land cover type found throughout the Project site. Non-native plant species, including Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*) and brome grasses (*Bromus* spp.), were present in the fallow agricultural areas on site. As such, it is not currently providing active agricultural land of use to the local economy.

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

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

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

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

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

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Federal Air Quality Standards**

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

- Ozone (8-hour standard)
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM\(_{10}\))
Fine Particulate Matter (PM\(_{2.5}\))
Carbon Monoxide (CO)
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO\(_x\))
Sulphur Dioxide (SO\(_2\)), and
Lead.

State Air Quality Standards

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

- Ozone (1-hour standard)
- Ozone (8-hour standard)
- Respirable Particulate Matter (PM\(_{10}\))
- Fine Particulate Matter (PM\(_{2.5}\))
- Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NO\(_x\))
- Sulphur Dioxide (SO\(_2\)), and
- Lead

Regional Air Quality Standards

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

Attainment Designation

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Pollutant</th>
<th>State Designation</th>
<th>Federal Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone – 1 hour standard</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>No Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone – 8 hour standard</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respirable Particulate Matter (PM(_{10}))</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Particulate Matter (PM(_{2.5}))</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Air Quality Management Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

The General Plan Land Use Designation currently assigned to the Project is Medium Density Residential (MDR). The future emission forecasts contained in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan are primarily based on demographic and economic growth projections provided by the Southern California Association of Governments. The Project was planned for residential development with a density of 3-5 dwelling units per acre at the time the 2016 Air Quality...
Management Plan adopted. Therefore, the Project will not exceed the growth forecast estimates used in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan.

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

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

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

*Regional Impact Analysis*

As with any new development project, the Project has the potential to generate pollutant concentrations during both construction activities and long-term operation. The following provides an analysis based on the applicable regional significance thresholds established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District in order to meet national and state air quality standards which are shown in Table 4 below.
Table 4. South Coast Air Quality Management District Air Quality Regional Significance Thresholds

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

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

Both construction and operational emissions for the Project were estimated by using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) which is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies to quantify potential criteria pollutant emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. The model can be used for a variety of situations where an air quality analysis is necessary or desirable such as California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents and is authorized for use by the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

Construction Related Impacts

Short-term criteria pollutant emissions will occur during site grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating activities. Emissions will occur from use of equipment, worker, vendor, and hauling trips, and disturbance of onsite soils (fugitive dust). Construction activities within the Project site will consist of demolishing portions of the existing flood control channel, site preparation, on-site grading, building, paving, and architectural coating. The Project is expected to export approximately 3,000 cubic yards of soil during the flood control channel excavation. The estimated maximum daily construction emissions are summarized in Table 5 below.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ROG (VOC)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>30.07</td>
<td>57.78</td>
<td>34.65</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>30.06</td>
<td>57.82</td>
<td>34.55</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

As shown in Table 5, emissions resulting from the Project construction would not exceed numerical thresholds established by the SCAQMD and therefore no mitigation is required.
Long-Term Regional Operation Related Impacts

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

The results of the CalEEMod model for summer and winter operation of the Project are summarized in Table 6 below (Maximum Operational Daily Emissions). Based on the results of the model, operational emissions associated with operation the Project will not exceed the thresholds established by SCAQMD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ROG (VOC)</th>
<th>NO\textsubscript{X}</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO\textsubscript{X}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{10}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Localized Impact Analysis

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

Localized Significance Thresholds are only applicable to the following criteria pollutants: oxides of nitrogen (NO\textsubscript{X}), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter less than 10 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM\textsubscript{10}) and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM\textsubscript{2.5}). Localized Significance Threshold’s represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable national or state ambient air quality standard, and are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each source receptor area and distance to the nearest sensitive receptor.

Construction-Related Localized Emissions

Construction localized impacts were evaluated pursuant to the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Final Localized Significance Thresholds Methodology. This methodology
provides screening tables for one through five acre project construction scenarios, depending on the amount of site disturbance during a day. Maximum daily oxides of nitrogen (NO\textsubscript{X}), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM\textsubscript{10} and PM\textsubscript{2.5}) emissions will occur during construction of the Project, grading of the Project site, and paving of streets and driveways. Table 7 below summarize on-site emissions as compared to the local screening thresholds established for Source Receptor Area (SRA) 23 (Metropolitan Riverside/Mira Loma).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>NO\textsubscript{X}</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{10}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Emissions</td>
<td>57.82</td>
<td>34.65</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Operational-Related Localized Emissions

On-site operational activities can result in localized increases in criteria pollutant levels that can cause air quality standards to be exceed even if standards are not exceeded on a regional level. On-site area and energy sources were evaluated. As shown in Table 8, emissions resulting from the Project operations would not exceed LST numerical thresholds established by the SCAQMD and no mitigation is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>NO\textsubscript{X}</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{10}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Emissions</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

CO Hot Spots

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

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

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

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

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

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

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

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sensitive Receptors

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

Localized Impacts

As shown on Table 8 above under the discussion of Issue 3.3 (b), the Project would not exceed any of the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Localized Significance Thresholds during near-term construction or long-term operation. In addition, the Project would not create a CO Hot Spot. Accordingly, Project-related localized emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction or long-term operation and impacts would be less than significant.

Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC)

In regards to air quality hazards, TACs are defined as substances that may cause or contribute to an increase in deaths or in serious illness, or that may pose a present or potential hazard to human health.

IMPORTANT NOTE #1: As determined in the California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (2015) 62 Cal. 4th 369 (CBIA) case the California Supreme Court determined that CEQA is not generally required to analyze impacts of the existing environmental conditions on the future residents of a proposed project and generally only requires an analysis of the proposed project’s impact on the environment. However, the CBIA case also stated that when a proposed project brings development and people into an area already subject to specific hazards and the new development/people exacerbate the existing hazards, then CEQA requires an analysis of the hazards and the proposed project’s effect in terms of increasing the risks related to those hazards. The following analysis is consistent with the CBIA case.
Existing Conditions

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

The Projects' Contribution to Existing Conditions

Construction Impacts: During construction diesel particulate matter emissions would be emitted from heavy equipment use and heavy-duty trucks and would temporarily add to the health risk from diesel particular matter in the project area that is primarily a result from heavy-duty trucks operating on State Route 60, adjacent to the Project site. Heavy-duty construction equipment is subject to a California Air Resources Board Airborne Toxics Control Measure for in-use diesel construction equipment to reduce diesel particulate emissions. As described above for the LST analysis, PM$_{10}$ (representative of diesel particulate matter, which is a TAC) emissions and exposure would be minimal and below the SCAQMD LSTs. The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project site are residences located approximately 15 feet from the proposed construction boundary. According to Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), health risks should be based on a 70-year exposure period for the maximally exposed individual resident; however, such assessments should be limited to the period/duration of activities associated with the Project.

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

Operational Impacts: The Project is a residential development and will not be a source of toxic air contaminants. Operation of the proposed Project would not result in any non-permitted direct emissions (e.g., those from a point source such as diesel generators) or result in a substantial increase in diesel vehicles (i.e., delivery trucks). Overall, the proposed Project would not exacerbate pre-existing health risk hazards from the SR-60 Freeway. Impacts are less than significant in this regard.

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

IMPORTANT NOTE #2: As noted above, the CBIA case stated that when a proposed project brings development and people into an area already subject to specific hazards and the new development/people exacerbate the existing hazards, then CEQA only requires an analysis of the hazards and the proposed project's effect in terms of increasing the risks related to those hazards. Notwithstanding this legal requirement, because the Project is locating sensitive receptors in proximity to freeway-related DPM sources, a Health Risk Assessment was conducted at the request of the City of Jurupa Valley for informational and disclosure purposes only.

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

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

The SCAQMD has established the following health risk thresholds.

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

**Cancer Risk**

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

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

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

**Non-Cancer Related Impacts**

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

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*
The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts related to objectionable odors. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program:

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.4(a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

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

*Source: Biological Reports (Appendix C).*
Impact Analysis

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

*Sensitive Plant Species*

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

*Sensitive Wildlife Species*

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

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

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

**MM-BIO-1: Pre-Construction Burrowing Owl Survey.** Within 30 calendar days prior to grading, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey of the Project’s proposed impact footprint and make a determination regarding the presence or absence of the burrowing owl. The determination shall be documented in a report and shall be submitted, reviewed, and accepted by the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit and subject to the following provisions:

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

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

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, the Project will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

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

**3.4(b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
Sources: Biological Reports (Appendix C), DBESP (Appendix D).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

**MM BIO-2. Coordination With USACE, CDFW, and RWQCB.** Prior to the issuance of grading permit, the applicant shall contact the United State Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to positively determine whether or not either agency wishes to exert jurisdiction of the onsite drainage feature. If either agency decides to exert jurisdiction, Mitigation Measures BIO-3 and BIO-4 shall be implemented.

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

**BIO-4. Federal Jurisdiction.** If federal jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-2, the following shall be implemented: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall obtain a Clean Water Act Section 404 Nation-Wide Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) and compensate for the loss of more than 0.1 acre of wetlands and 1,278 lineal feet of streambed channel, and a Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification from the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). These permits will address impacts to identified jurisdictional resources on the Project site and appropriate offsite mitigation such as such as the Santa Ana Watershed Project Area (SAWPA), Prado Basin, or an appropriate nearby downstream established mitigation bank area. The developer shall implement this measure to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department. The above described ratios may be increase by the USACOE or the RWQCB as part of the permit process.

With implementation of Mitigations BIO-2 through BIO-4, impacts would be less than significant.
3.4(d) **Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

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

*Source: Biological Reports (Appendix C).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

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

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

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

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-5, impacts would be less than significant.
3.4(e) **Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.**  
*Source: Tree Survey Report (Appendix E).*

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

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

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

**Mitigation Measure BIO-6-Tree Preservation and Replacement.** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the measure listed below (or equivalent language) shall appear on all Project grading plans, construction specifications and bid documents, and the City shall ensure such language is incorporated prior to issuance of any permits:

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

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

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

3.4(f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
Source: Biological Reports (Appendix C), DBESP (Appendix D).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

- The Project site is not in an MSHCP survey area for riparian/riverine areas or vernal pools.
- The Project site is not in an MSHCP survey area Narrow Endemic Plant Species.
- The Project site does not contain suitable soils to support the Delhi Sand Flower-Loving Fly.
- The Project site is not required to comply with the Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines.
- Burrowing owl habitat exists on the site. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 (30-day Pre-Construction Survey) is required:
With implementation of PPP 3.4-1 and Mitigation Measure BIO-1, impacts related to conflicts with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan are less than significant.
3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.
*Source: Cultural Resources Study (Appendix F).*

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

Archaeological sites are locations that contain resources associated with former human activities, and may contain such resources as human skeletal remains, waste from tool manufacture, tool concentrations, and/or discoloration or accumulation of soil or food remains.
As noted under Issue 3.5 (b) above, the cultural resource records search identified no previously recorded cultural resources on the Project site and no resources were identified as a result of the pedestrian survey or through documentary research. The potential for buried deposits may be considered low based upon the lack of identified resources and previous impacts to the property. However, if intact buried cultural materials are encountered during construction, work in that area must halt until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the find. As such, the following mitigation measure is required:

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.5(c)</th>
<th><strong>Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determination:</strong> Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Riverside County Geographic information System.*

**Impact Analysis**

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

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.
Paleontological resources are the preserved fossilized remains of plants and animals. Fossils and traces of fossils are preserved in sedimentary rock units, particularly fine to medium grained marine, lake, and stream deposits, such as limestone, siltstone, sandstone, or shale, and in ancient soils. They are also found in coarse-grained sediments, such as conglomerates or coarse alluvium sediments. Fossils are rarely preserved in igneous or metamorphic rock units. Fossils may occur throughout a sedimentary unit and, in fact, are more likely to be preserved subsurface, where they have not been damaged or destroyed by previous ground disturbance, amateur collecting, or natural causes such as erosion.

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

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

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

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

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

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**


**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*
The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to disturbing human remains. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.5-1 The project is required to comply with the applicable provisions of California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 as well as Public Resources Code §5097 et. seq.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

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

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

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

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

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

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: Updated Geotechnical Evaluation and Infiltration Study (Appendix G), Riverside County GIS.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

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

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

Additionally, detailed design-level geotechnical studies and building plans pursuant to the *California Building Code* are required prior to approval of construction, as required by PPP 3.6-1. Compliance with the recommendations of the geotechnical study for soils conditions, is a standard practice and would be required by the City Building and Safety Department. Therefore, compliance with the requirements of the *California Building Code* as identified in a site specific geotechnical design would be reviewed by the City for appropriate inclusion, as part of the building plan check and development review process, would reduce the low potential for liquefaction to a less than significant level.
3.6 (a) (4) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Landslides?

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

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

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**
*Source: Updated Geotechnical Evaluation and Infiltration Study (Appendix G).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

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

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

Operation

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

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

3.6(c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on-or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Updated Geotechnical Evaluation and Infiltration Study (Appendix G).
Impact Analysis

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

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Landslide**

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

**Lateral Spreading**

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

**Subsidence**

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

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

**Liquefaction**

As noted in the response to Issue 3.6 (a) (3) above, the potential for exposure to liquefaction is not expected because the depth of groundwater is more than 50-feet.
Collapse

Collapse occurs in saturated soils in which the space between individual particles is completely filled with water. This water exerts a pressure on the soil particles that influences how tightly the particles themselves are pressed together. The soils lose their strength beneath buildings and other structures.

As noted in the response to Issue 3.6 (a) (3) above, the Project site’s potential for exposure to collapse is considered “low” because the depth of groundwater is more than 50-feet. As such, impacts are less than significant.

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

Determination: Less than Significant Impact.
Source: Updated Geotechnical Evaluation and Infiltration Study (Appendix G).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

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

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**
*Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Study (Appendix A).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

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

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

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

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

A summary of the Project’s projected annual operational greenhouse gas emissions, including amortized construction-related emissions, is provided in Table 9.

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

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

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

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.


Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Determination:** Less than Significant Impact.
Impact Analysis

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

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

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

**Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Historic Agricultural Use**

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

**Construction Activities**

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

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

Operational Activities

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

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

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

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

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

The Project site is located within ¼ mile of Mission Middle School. As discussed in the responses to issues 3.8 (b) and 3.8 (b) above, the all hazardous or potentially hazardous materials would comply with all applicable federal, State, and local agencies and regulations with respect to hazardous materials. As such, impacts are less than significant.
3.8(d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

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

Impact Analysis

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

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

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

3.8(e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?

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

Impact Analysis

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

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

The Project site is located approximately 1.4 miles northwest of the Flabob Airport. According to Map FL-1, Flabob Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Project site is not located within Compatibility Zone of the Flabob Airport Influence Area. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

3.8(f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?

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

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

The Project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, no impact would occur.

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

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

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

3.8(h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: General Plan.

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

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue. According to *General Plan Figure 8-11: Wildfire Severity Zones in Jurupa Valley*, the Project site is shown as being in a “Moderate” fire hazard area. Therefore development of the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires and no impact would occur.
### 3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**
*Source: Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulic Study (Appendix H).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

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

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

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

1. Increase permeable areas by leaving highly porous soil and low lying area undisturbed by:

   a. Incorporating landscaping, green roofs and open space into the project design;
(b) Using porous materials for or near driveways, drive aisles, parking stalls and low volume roads and walkways; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

PDF 3.9-1 The Project will provide a site-specific storm drain system to prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials, or other elements that might degrade or harm biological resources or ecosystem processes. This will be accomplished by constructing two (2) detention basins with a design capture volume (DCV) sufficient retain all stormwater runoff for percolation into the groundwater. The detention basins will provide water quality treatment during percolation.
Construction Impacts

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

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

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

Operational Impacts

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

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

Onsite runoff will be conveyed in the street and collected at catch basins provided at critical points to avoid gutter flow depths exceeding top of curb for 10-year flows or right-of-way for 100-year flows. Offsite flows from the northwest end of the project will be intercepted and conveyed with a proposed Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District Master Drainage Plan storm drain pipe to the existing Sunnyslope Channel. Existing runoff on the westerly side of Opal Street will continue to be conveyed by the street towards an existing drainage swale that runs adjacent to Project site and the State Route 60 Freeway. From there the runoff will be collected by the existing drainage inlet and outlets to the Sunnyslope Channel. Treatment of first flush waters from the development will be accomplished by routing them through the proposed on-site water quality basins.
Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.9-1 through PPP 3.9-4, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulic Study (Appendix H).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

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

Development of the Project would increase impervious surface coverage on the site which would in turn reduce the amount of direct infiltration of runoff into the ground. This would have a less than significant impact on groundwater recharge in the areas of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin 1 that are managed for that purpose, since those recharge areas do not encompass the Project site.
According to a review of historical groundwater data (California Department of Water Resources and California State Water Resources Control Board groundwater well data [http://wdl.water.ca.gov and http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov]), depth to groundwater is greater than 50 feet bgs in the general site area, with a flow direction to the south-southwest. As such, the Project will not impact groundwater.

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

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

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

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

Determination: Less than Significant Impact.
Source: Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulic Study (Appendix H).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**
*Source: Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulic Study (Appendix H).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

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

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

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

**Determination: No Impact.**
*Source: General Plan Figure 8-9: Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, Programs (PPP)*

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

Determination: No Impact.

Source: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

Determination: No Impact.

Sources: Project Application Materials, Google Earth.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

The Pacific Ocean is located more than 30 miles from the Project site; consequently, there is no potential for tsunamis to impact the Project. In addition, no steep hillsides subject to mudflow are located on or near the Project site. The nearest large body of surface water to the site is Lake Mathews, located approximately 12 miles to the south. Due to the distance of Lake Mathews from the Project site, a seiche in Lake Mathews would have no impact on the Project. Therefore, the Project site would not be subject to inundation by a seiche, mudflow, and/or tsunami. Therefore, no impact would occur.
3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.10(a) Physically divide an established community?

Determination: No Impact.

Sources: Project Application Materials, Google Earth.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

An example of a Project that has the potential to divide an established community includes the construction of a new freeway or highway through an established neighborhood. The Project is located in an area largely characterized by residential development and vacant land. The site is bounded by Canal Street, followed by vacant land, followed by a railroad easement or residential development to the north; a flood control channel, followed by residential development or Pacific Avenue, followed by vacant land to the east; State Highway 60 or a flood control channel to the south; and scattered residences to the west. Therefore, no impacts would occur with respect to dividing an established community.
**3.10(b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to a conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. This measure would be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:
PPP 3.4-1 The Project is required to pay mitigation fees pursuant to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MHSCP) as required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.80.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

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

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

- The Project site is not in an MSHCP survey area for riparian/riverine areas or vernal pools.
- The Project site is not in an MSHCP survey area Narrow Endemic Plant Species.
- The Project site does not contain suitable soils to support the Delhi Sand Flower-Loving Fly.
- The Project site is not required to comply with the Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines.
- Burrowing owl habitat exists on the site. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 (30-day Pre-Construction Survey) is required:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Determination: No Impact.
Source: General Plan.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

According to General Plan Figure 4-16: Jurupa Valley Mineral Resources, the Project site is mapped within MRZ-3, which is defined as "Areas containing known or inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resources significance." No mineral resource extraction activity is known to have ever occurred on the Project site. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State of California. Therefore, no impact would occur.

3.11(b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: General Plan.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

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

According to General Plan Figure 4-16: Jurupa Valley Mineral Resources, the Project site is mapped within MRZ-3, which is defined as "Areas containing known or inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resources significance." However, no mineral resource extraction activity is known to have ever occurred on the Project site. As such, impacts are less than significant.
### 3.12 NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to noise but not to the degree that impacts would be less than significant. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

**PPP 3.12-1** As required by Municipal Code Section 11.05.020 (9), private construction projects located within one-quarter (¼) of a mile from an inhabited dwelling shall not perform construction between the hours of six (6:00) p.m. and six (6:00) a.m. during
the months of June through September and between the hours of six (6:00) p.m. and seven (7:00) a.m. during the months of October through May.

PPP 3.12-2 As required by Jurupa Valley Municipal Code Section 11.05.040, no person shall create any sound, or allow the creation of any sound, on any property that causes the exterior sound level on any other occupied property to exceed the sound level standards set forth in Table 1 of this section or that violates the special sound source standards set forth in Section 11.05.060.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

*Existing Ambient Noise Environment*

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

*Construction Noise*

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

**Table 10. Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Equipment</th>
<th>Range of Sound Levels Measured (dBA at 50 feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pile Drivers</td>
<td>81 to 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Drills</td>
<td>83 to 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Hammers</td>
<td>75 to 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
<td>78 to 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumps</td>
<td>68 to 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozers</td>
<td>85 to 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractors</td>
<td>77 to 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-End Loaders</td>
<td>86 to 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Equipment</td>
<td>Range of Sound Levels Measured (dBA at 50 feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graders</td>
<td>79 to 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Compressors</td>
<td>76 to 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks</td>
<td>81 to 87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Per Section 11.05.020 (9) of the Municipal Code, construction activities occurring between the hours of 6:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of June through September and between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of October through May are exempt from noise standards.

Regardless of the Project’s consistency with the *Municipal Code* as described above, construction activities on the Project site, especially those involving heavy equipment, would result in noise levels up to 75 dBA to 99 dBA when measured at 50 feet. The following mitigation measure is required to reduce construction noise impacts to the maximum extent feasible:

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

**Mitigation Measure NOI-1-Construction Noise Mitigation Plan.** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the developer is required to submit a construction-related noise mitigation plan to the City Planning Department for review and approval. The plan must depict the location of construction equipment and how the noise from this equipment will be mitigated during construction of this project. In addition, the plan shall require that the following notes are included on grading plans and building plans. Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the notes and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by City of Jurupa Valley staff or its designee to confirm compliance. These notes also shall be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors.

“a) Haul truck deliveries shall be limited to between the hours of 6:00am to 6:00pm during the months of June through September and 7:00am to 6:00pm during the months of October through May.

b) Construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers’ standards.

c) All stationary construction equipment shall be placed in such a manner so that emitted noise is directed away from any sensitive receptors adjacent to the Project site.

d) Construction equipment staging areas shall be located the greatest distance between the staging area and the nearest sensitive receptors.”
**Operational Noise**

The Project is proposed to consist of 48 single-family detached residential lots and the only potential for the Project to create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels would be from future traffic generated by the proposed homes. The proposed Project is expected to generate approximately 456 average daily vehicle trips (36 trips in the AM Peak hours and 48 trips in the PM Peak hours) which will not noticeably increase ambient noise levels in the Project area. Typically, a doubling of traffic volumes is required to result in an increase of 3 dBA, which is considered to be a barely audible change. Based on Project trip generation and distribution information provided by the Traffic Impact Study prepared for the Project (Appendix L), Project generated traffic will not result in a doubling of traffic volumes along any affected roadway segment. As such, the proposed Project traffic would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient roadway noise levels. Off-site transportation-related noise impacts created by the Project would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

**Traffic Source Noise**

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

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

Source: Noise Impact Analysis (Appendix K).

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

**Mitigations Measures (MM)**

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

Future Interior Noise

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

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

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

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

Mitigations Measures (MM)

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

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

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

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

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

Rail Line Source Noise

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

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

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: Noise Impact Analysis (Appendix K).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Construction Vibration

Under existing conditions, there are no known sources of ground-borne vibration or noise emanating from the Project site. The Project will not employ any pile driving, rock blasting, or rock crushing equipment during construction activities, which are the primary sources of ground-borne noise and vibration during construction.

The City has relied upon vibration standards promulgated by Caltrans in past CEQA documents. (California Department of Transportation, Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. September, 2013). According to Caltrans, the threshold at which there may be a risk of architectural damage to normal houses with plastered walls and ceilings is 0.20 PPV inch/second. Primary sources of vibration during construction would be bulldozers. A large bulldozer could produce up to 0.089 PPV at 25 feet. At a distance of 15 feet a bulldozer would yield a worst-case 0.027 PPV (inch/sec) which is within the threshold of perception and below any risk or architectural damage.

There are single family residences located near the Project site. The level of anticipated vibration does not exceed 0.20 PPV inch/second. As such, vibration would not result in the excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Operational Vibration
Typically, groundborne vibration sources that could potentially affect nearby properties are from rail roads and trucks traveling at higher speeds on freeways and highways. The Project does not have rail access nor is it a major transportation facility or roadway. Therefore, the operational impacts associated with ground-borne vibration would be less than significant at nearby sensitive uses.

**Train Vibration**

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

### 3.12(c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?

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

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

As discussed above under Issue 3.12(a), with implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-3, impacts would be less than significant.

### 3.12(d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?

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

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*
As discussed above under Issue 3.12(a), the only potential for the Project to create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels is during its construction phase. The analysis presented under Issue 3.12(a) concluded that the Project would result in elevated noise levels during construction but were less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1.

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

**Determination: No Impact.**

*Source: Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

According to *Map FL-3, Noise Compatibility Contours*, the Project site is not located within an area that will be significantly impacted by aircraft noise. As such, the Project will not result in excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area.

### 3.12(f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?

**Determination: No Impact.**

*Source: Google Earth, Field Inspection.*

The Project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impacts will occur.
3.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Determination: Less than Significant Impact.
Source: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

The Project would not result in substantial population growth because it only will allow up to forty-eight (48) dwelling units. According to the California Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2018 Jurupa Valley has 3.35 persons per household. The increase in population would be 161 persons assuming all the future residents of the houses would come from outside the city limits.

Typically, growth would be considered a significant impact pursuant to CEQA if it directly or indirectly affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public services and requires the expansion or new construction of public facilities and utilities.

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

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

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

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

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

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

As described above under the response to Issue 3.13(b), the Project site does not contain residential housing units. Therefore, the Project would not displace substantial numbers of people and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Impacts would be less than significant.
3.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

FIRE PROTECTION

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Source: Riverside County Fire Department.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

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

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

The Riverside County Fire Department provides fire protection services to the Project area. The Project would be primarily served by the Glen Avon Fire Station No. 18, an existing station located at an existing station located approximately 1.4 miles northeast of the Project site at 7545 Mission Boulevard.

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

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

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

**POLICE PROTECTION**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: Riverside County Sheriff's Department “Stations,” Riverside County General Plan, Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

The Riverside County Sheriff’s Department provides community policing to the Project area via the Jurupa Valley Station located at 7477 Mission Boulevard, Jurupa Valley, CA. The Project would increase the demand for police protection services. The Project would be required to comply with the provisions of Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 which requires payment of the Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing for public services, including police protection services. Payment of the Development Impact Fee would ensure that the Project provides its fair share of funds for additional police protection services, which may be applied to sheriff facilities and/or equipment, to offset the incremental increase in the demand that would be created by the Project. Although the Project would increase the demand for police protection services, it is not anticipated that it would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities as the Sheriff’s Department has reviewed the Project and will provide police protection services from existing facilities. As such, the Project would not result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives.

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

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

SCHOOLS

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

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

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

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

The Project proposes forty-eight (48) dwelling units which could create additional students to be served by the Jurupa Unified School District assuming future students will come from outside the District. However, the Project would be required to contribute fees to the Jurupa Unified School District in accordance with the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (Senate Bill 50). Pursuant to Senate Bill 50, payment of school impact fees constitutes complete mitigation under CEQA for Project-related impacts to school services.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.14-3, impacts related to schools are less than significant.

PARKS

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

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

PPP 3.14-4 Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant shall pay required park development impact fees to the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District pursuant to District Ordinance No. 01-2007 and 02-2008.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

As noted in the response to Issue 3.13 (a) above, the Project proposes forty-eight (48) dwelling units. According to the California Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2018 Jurupa Valley has 3.35 persons per household. The increase in population would be 161 persons assuming all the future residents of the houses would come from outside the city limits. As such, the Project will generate additional need for parkland. The payment of development impact fees will reduce any indirect Project impacts related to parks.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.14-4, impacts related to parks are less than significant.

OTHER PUBLIC FACILITIES

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Project Application Materials.
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

PPP 3.14-2 above is applicable to the Project.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

As noted in the response to Issue 3.13(a) above, development of the Project could result in a direct increase in the population of the Project area and would not increase the demand for public services, including public health services and library services which would require the construction of new or expanded public facilities.

The Project would be required to comply with the provisions of Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 which requires payment of the Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing public services. Payment of the Development Impact Fee would ensure that the Project provides fair share of funds for additional public services. These funds may be applied to the acquisition and/or construction of public services and/or equipment.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.14-2 above, impacts related to other public facilities are less than significant.
3.15 RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

3.15(a) Would the proposed Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact.
Source: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

PPP 3.14-4 Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant shall pay required park development impact fees to the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District pursuant to District Ordinance No. 01-2007 and 02-2008.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

The Project would not result in substantial population growth because it only will allow forty-eight (48) dwelling units. According to the California Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2018 Jurupa Valley has 3.35 persons per household. The increase in population would be 161 persons assuming all the future residents of the houses would come from outside the city limits. As such, the Project would not cause a substantial physical deterioration of any park facilities or would accelerate the physical deterioration of any park facilities because the Project because of the relatively small increase in population. The payment of Development Impact Fees will reduce any indirect Project impacts related to recreational facilities.
Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.14-1, impacts related to recreational facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

**3.15(b) Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment?**

**Determination: Less than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Project Application Materials*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

The Project does not propose any recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment. In addition, no offsite parks or recreational improvements are proposed or required as part of the Project.

Based on the analysis above, impacts related to parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
### 3.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Source. Project Application Materials.*
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

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

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Motor Vehicle Analysis

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 13. Study Area Intersections

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

Source: Traffic Impact Study(Appendix L)

Traffic Scenarios Analyzed

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

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

Trip Generation

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

Scenario #1: Existing Traffic Conditions

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

Scenario #2: Project Opening Year (2019)

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

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

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

Summary

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

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

Source: Traffic Impact Study(Appendix L)

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

Pacific Avenue Roadway Segment Level of Service Analysis

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

Transit Service Analysis

The Riverside Transit Agency, a public transit agency serves the region and the City of Jurupa Valley. There is no bus service adjacent to the Project site. In addition, the Project is not proposing to construct any improvements would interfere with any future bus service.

Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Analysis

The Project is not proposing to construct any improvements that will interfere with bicycle and pedestrian use. Pedestrian and bicycle access will be available to the Project site from Opal Street,
Canal Street, and Pacific Avenue. Therefore, the Project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy applying to non-motorized travel. Impacts are less than significant.

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Traffic Impact Study (Appendix L).

Impact Analysis

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

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

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

There are no roadways affected by the Project that are identified as part of the Riverside CMP System according to Exhibit 2-1 of the 2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program, December 14, 2011. As such, Project traffic will not result in significant direct and cumulatively considerable impacts to the Congestion Management Program roadway system. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not conflict with the applicable Congestion Management Program, including Level of Service standards, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

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

  a) Northbound: One shared left/right turn lane.
  b) Southbound: N/A.
  c) Eastbound: One shared through/right lane.
  d) Westbound: One shared left/through lane.

• The intersection of B Street (NS) and C Street (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on B Street and the following:

  a) Northbound: N/A.
  b) Southbound: One shared left/right lane.
  c) Eastbound: One shared left/through lane.
  d) Westbound: One shared through/right lane.

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

3.16(e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

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

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

The Project proposes forty-eight (48) residential homes which would increase the need for emergency access to-and-from the site. Adequate emergency access would be provided to the Project site from Opal Street, Canal Street, and Pacific Avenue. During the course of the preliminary review of the Project, the Project’s transportation design was reviewed by the City’s Engineering Department, County Fire Department, and County Sheriff’s Department to ensure that adequate access to and from the site would be provided for emergency vehicles.

With the adherence to mandatory requirements for emergency vehicle access, there are no impacts and no mitigation measures are required.
3.16(f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

**Determination: No Impact.**

*Source: General Plan Circulation Element, Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

The Riverside Transit Agency, a public transit agency serves the region and the City of Jurupa Valley. In addition, the Project is not proposing to construct any improvements would interfere with any future bus service. As such, the Project as proposed will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy applying to transit services. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.
### 3.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Source: Cultural Resources Study (Appendix F), AB52 Tribal Consultation.*

### Impact Analysis

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

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

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

Based on the above, there are no resources listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k). As such, there is no impact and no mitigation measures are required. (Also refer to analysis under Cultural Resources, Issue 3.5(a).

Determination: Potentially Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Source: AB 52 Consultation.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

On July 1, 2015 AB 52 (Gatto, 2014) went into effect. AB 52 established “Tribal Cultural resources” as a resource subject to CEQA review. Tribal Cultural Resources are either of the following:

(1) Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:

(A) Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.

(B) Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.

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

AB 52 also created a process for consultation with California Native American Tribes in the CEQA process. Tribal Governments can request consultation with a lead agency and give input into potential impacts to tribal cultural resources before the agency decides what kind of environmental assessment is appropriate for a proposed project.
The Planning Department notified the following California Native American Tribes per the requirements of AB52:

- Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation
- Soboba Band Luiseño Indians
- Torres Martinez Band of Cahuilla Indians.

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

**Mitigation Measure (MM)**

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

**MONITORING:**

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall contact the consulting Native American Tribe(s) that have requested monitoring through consultation with the City during the AB 52 process. The applicant shall coordinate with the Tribe to develop a Tribal Monitoring Agreement(s). A copy of the agreement shall be provided to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

**TREATMENT OF DISCOVERIES:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With implementation of Mitigation Measure TCR-1, impacts will be less than significant.
### 3.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.17(a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Source: Rubidoux Community Services District.*

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*
Wastewater collection services would be provided to the Project site by the Rubidoux Community Services District ("District"). Pursuant to General Waste Discharge Requirements for Wastewater Collection Agencies (State Water Resources Control Board Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ) the District must demonstrate, through sanitary sewer system use ordinances, service agreements, or other legally binding procedures, that it possesses the necessary legal authority to prevent illicit discharges into its sanitary sewer system as set forth in the District's Sewer System Management Plan.

Wastewater generated by the Project will be collected and conveyed through wastewater conveyance facilities (trunk sewer, lift station, and force main) to the Riverside Water Quality Control Plant (RWQCP), which is located on Acorn Street in the City of Riverside. The RWQCP is required to operate its treatment facility in accordance with the waste treatment and discharge standards and requirements set forth by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. The proposed Project would not install or utilize septic systems or alternative wastewater treatment systems; therefore, the Project would have no potential to exceed the applicable wastewater treatment requirements established by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

**3.17(b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

Sources: Rubidoux Community Services District, Project Application Materials.

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

Water and sewer service to the Project site will be provided by the Rubidoux Community Services District. New water and sewer lines will connect to the existing facilities in Canal Street, Opal Street and Pacific Avenue. No additional water or sewer infrastructure will be needed to serve the Project other than connection to the existing water and sewer lines in the immediate vicinity of the Project site.

The installation of water and sewer lines as proposed by the Project would result in physical impacts to the surface and subsurface of the Project site. These impacts are considered to be part of the Project’s construction phase and are evaluated throughout this Initial Study Checklist. In instances where impacts have been identified for the Project’s construction phase, Plans, Policies, Programs (PPP), Project Design Features (PDF), or Mitigation Measures (MM) are required to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, additional measures beyond those identified throughout this Initial Study Checklist would not be required.
3.17(c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Source: Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

Refer to PPP 3.9-1 through PPP 3.9-4 under Section 3.9-Hydrology and Water Quality.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

Refer to PDF 3.9-1 under Section 3.9-Hydrology and Water Quality.

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

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

The construction of the on-site and off-site drainage facilities would result in physical impacts to the surface and subsurface of the Project site. These impacts are part of the Project’s construction phase and are evaluated in the appropriate sections of this Initial Study Checklist. In any instances where impacts have been identified for the Project’s construction phase, Plans, Policies, Programs (PPP), Project Design Features (PDF), or Mitigation Measures are required to reduce impacts to
less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, additional measures beyond those identified throughout this Initial Study Checklist would not be required.

3.17(d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Rubidoux Community Services District.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

Water service would be provided to the Project site by the Rubidoux Community Services District ("District"). According to the District's *Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan*, the base daily water use is 208 gallons per day per capita (gpcd). According to the California Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2018* Jurupa Valley has 3.35 persons per household. Thus the Project would generate 161 residents. Based on the 208 gpcd, the Project would result in an estimated water demand of 9,984 gpcd.

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

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

In August 2015, DWR released a draft list of 21 groundwater basins and subbasins significantly overdrafted by "excessive" pumping in response to a series of executive orders issued by Governor Brown since January 2014. The Riverside-Arlington Subbasin was not included in this list. DWR published the final list in January 2016, with no changes to the designation of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin.
The District does not have an immediate concern with water supply reliability. Because the District’s water supply is groundwater, which has historically not been impacted by seasonal or year-to-year climatic change, the District is not subject to short-term water shortages resulting from temporary dry weather conditions. In the foreseeable future, the District will continue to be reliant on local groundwater supplies. The District will develop additional groundwater extraction and groundwater treatment facilities as needed to ensure a continuous and adequate water supply for its service area.

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

Based on the analysis above, impacts are less than significant.

3.17(e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Rubidoux Community Services District.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

The current capacity of the RWQCP is 40 million gallons per day (approximately 123 acre-feet per day). The District is currently in the early planning stages for construction of additions to the plant. Quantities of wastewater collected and conveyed by the District to the RWQCP in 2015 was 2,212 AF/yr. The quantities projected to be conveyed by District and treated by the City of Riverside over the next 25 years are: 2,290 AF/yr in 2020; 2,310 AF/yr in 2025; 2,320 AF/yr in 2030; 2,330 AF/yr in 2035; and 2,350 SF/yr in 2040.

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

Based on the above analysis, impacts are less than significant.

3.17(f)  Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project’s solid waste disposal needs?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

PPP 3.17-1  The Project shall comply with Section 4.408 of the *2013 California Green Building Code Standards*, which requires new development projects to submit and implement a construction waste management plan in order to reduce the amount of construction waste transported to landfills. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the City of Jurupa Valley shall confirm that a sufficient plan has been submitted, and prior to final building inspections, the City of Jurupa shall review and verify the Contractor’s documentation that confirms the volumes and types of wastes that were diverted from landfill disposal, in accordance with the approved construction waste management plan.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

**Construction Related Impacts**

Waste generated during the construction phase of the Project would primarily consist of discarded materials from the construction of streets, common areas, infrastructure installation, and other project-related construction activities. Solid waste generated in Jurupa Valley is generally transported to the Agua Mansa Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility at 1830 Agua Mansa Road. From there, recyclable materials are transferred to third-party providers, and waste materials are transported to various landfills in Riverside County, including the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and the El Sobrante Landfill.

According to the Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details website accessed on June 2, 2018, these landfills receive well below their maximum permitted daily disposal volume and demolition and construction waste generated by the Project is not anticipated to cause these landfills to exceed
their maximum permitted daily disposal volume. Furthermore, none of these regional landfill facilities are expected to reach their total maximum permitted disposal capacities during the Project’s construction period. As such, these regional landfill facilities would have sufficient daily capacity to accept construction solid waste generated by the Project.

**Operational Related Impacts**

To determine the solid waste demand of the proposed Project, default values for single-family residential housing were taken from CalEEMod. Based on CalEEMod default estimates for the proposed Project’s land uses, the proposed Project would result in a solid waste generation of approximately 56.1 tons per year. Based on the current recycling requirements, which require diversion of 50 percent of solid waste away from landfills, the proposed Project’s solid waste generation would be reduced to 28.08 tons of solid waste per year. In 2020, state regulations per AB 341 will become effective, which will require diversion of 75 percent of solid waste from landfills. Thus, it is anticipated that solid waste landfill disposal from operation of the Project in 2020 would be further reduced to approximately 14.02 tons per year.

According to the Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details website accessed on June 2, 2018 the Badlands Sanitary Landfill has a permitted disposal capacity of 4,000 tons per day with a remaining capacity of 14,730,020 cubic yards. The Badlands Sanitary Landfill is estimated to reach capacity, at the earliest time, in the year 2024. The El Sobrante Landfill has a permitted disposal capacity of 16,034 tons per day with a remaining capacity of 145,530,000 tons. The El Sobrante Landfill is estimated to reach capacity, at the earliest time, in the year 2045.

Solid waste generated during long-term operation of the Project would ultimately be disposed of at the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and/or the El Sobrante Landfill. During long-term operation, the Project’s solid waste (without the 50% and 75% reduction described above) would represent less than 0.003% of the daily permitted disposal capacity at the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and less than 0.0009% of the daily permitted disposal capacity at the El Sobrante Landfill.

Because the Project would generate a relatively small amount of solid waste per day, as compared to the permitted daily capacities for Badlands Sanitary Landfill and the El Sobrante Landfill, these regional landfill facilities would have sufficient daily capacity to accept solid waste generated by the Project.

Based on the above analysis, impacts are less than significant.

**3.17(g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

Sources: California Assembly Bill 939 (Sher), Riverside County Waste Resources Management District, Riverside County Integrated Waste Management Plan, Riverside County Waste Management Department, Solid Waste System Study Report, Waste Management “El Sobrante Landfill”

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*
The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to solid waste. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program:

PPP 3.17-1 The Project shall comply with Section 4.408 of the 2013 California Green Building Code Standards, which requires new development projects to submit and implement a construction waste management plan in order to reduce the amount of construction waste transported to landfills. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the City of Jurupa Valley shall confirm that a sufficient plan has been submitted, and prior to final building inspections, the City of Jurupa shall review and verify the Contractor’s documentation that confirms the volumes and types of wastes that were diverted from landfill disposal, in accordance with the approved construction waste management plan.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Construction Related Impacts

Waste generated during the construction phase of the Project would primarily consist of discarded materials from the construction of streets, common areas, infrastructure installation, and other project-related construction activities. According to the Riverside County Waste Management Department, solid waste generated within the City of Jurupa Valley is deposited at the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and the El Sobrante Landfill.

According to the Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details website accessed on March 28, 2018, these landfills receive below their maximum permitted daily disposal volume and demolition and construction waste generated by the Project is not anticipated to cause these landfills to exceed their maximum permitted daily disposal volume. Furthermore, none of these regional landfill facilities are expected to reach their total maximum permitted disposal capacities during the Project’s construction period. As such, these regional landfill facilities would have sufficient daily capacity to accept construction solid waste generated by the Project.

Operational Related Impacts

The California Integrated Waste Management Act established an integrated waste management system that focused on source reduction, recycling, composting, and land disposal of waste. In addition, the Act established a 50% waste reduction requirement for cities and counties by the year 2000, along with a process to ensure environmentally safe disposal of waste that could not be diverted. Per the requirements of the Integrated Waste Management Act, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors adopted the Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan which outlines the goals, policies, and programs the County and its cities will implement to create an integrated and cost effective waste management system that complies with the provisions of California Integrated Waste Management Act and its diversion mandates.

The Project’s waste hauler would be required to coordinate with the waste hauler to develop collection of recyclable materials for the Project on a common schedule as set forth in applicable local, regional, and State programs. Recyclable materials that would be recycled by the Project include paper products, glass, aluminum, and plastic.
Additionally, the Project’s waste hauler would be required to comply with all applicable local, State, and Federal solid waste disposal standards, thereby ensuring that the solid waste stream to the landfills that serve the Project are reduced in accordance with existing regulations.

Based on the analysis above, impacts are less than significant.
### 3.19 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the Project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact Analysis

**3.19(a)** Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

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

*Source: This Initial Study Checklist.*

#### Impact Analysis

As noted in the analysis throughout this Initial Study Checklist, the following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to this issue. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:
Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

All Plans, Policies, or Programs pertaining to Biological Resources and Cultural Resources shall apply.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Mitigation Measure(s)

BIO-1 through BIO-6, CR-1 through CR-4, and TCR-1 shall apply.

In instances where impacts have been identified, the Plans, Policies, or Programs were applied to the Project based on the basis of federal, state, or local law currently in place which effectively reduces environmental impacts, or Mitigation Measures are required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, Project does not have impacts which would have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

3.19(b) Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Source: This Initial Study Checklist.

Impact Analysis

As noted in the analysis throughout this Initial Study Checklist, the following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to this issue. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

All Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) identified in this Initial Study Checklist document shall apply.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Mitigation Measures (MM)

BIO-1 through BIO-6, CR-1 through CR-4, NOI- through NOI-3, and TCR-1 shall apply.
In instances where impacts have been identified, the Plans, Policies, or Programs were applied to the Project based on the basis of federal, state, or local law currently in place which effectively reduces environmental impacts, or Mitigation Measures are required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, Project does not have impacts that are cumulatively considerable.

**3.19(c) Does the Project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Source: This Initial Study Checklist.*

**Impact Analysis**

As noted in the analysis throughout this Initial Study Checklist, the following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to this issue. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

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


**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

NOI-1 through and NOI-3 shall apply.

In instances where impacts have been identified, the Plans, Policies, or Programs were applied to the Project based on the basis of federal, state, or local law currently in place which effectively reduces environmental impacts. Therefore, Project does not have impacts which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
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6.0 MITIGATION MONITORING REPORTING PROGRAM

PROJECT NAME: Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, Change of Zone No. 17003 (MA 17009)

DATE: June 27 2018

PROJECT MANAGER: Rocio Lopez, Senior Planner

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

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

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

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

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

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

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) and Project Design Features (PDF) were assumed and accounted for in the assessment of impacts for each issue area. Mitigation Measures were formulated only for those issue areas where the results of the impact analysis identified significant impacts. All three types of measures described above will be required to be implemented as part of the Project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AESTHETICS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.1-1</strong> As required by Municipal Code Section 9.199.040.C, one (1) family residences shall not exceed forty (40) feet in height. No other building or structure shall exceed fifty (50) feet in height, unless a greater height is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.370. In no event, however, shall a building or structure exceed seventy-five (75) feet in height, unless a variance is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.270.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.1-2</strong> As required by <em>General Plan</em> Policy COS 10.1, require outdoor lighting to be shielded and prohibit outdoor lighting that:</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Operates at unnecessary locations, levels, and times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Spills onto areas off-site or to areas not needing or wanting illumination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Produces glare (intense line-of-site contrast).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Includes lighting frequencies (colors) that interfere with astronomical viewing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIR QUALITY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.3-1</strong> The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, &quot;Fugitive Dust.&quot; Rule 403 requires implementation of best available dust control measures during construction activities that generate fugitive dust, such as earth moving and stockpiling activities, grading, and equipment travel on unpaved roads. Measures listed below (or equivalent language) shall appear on all Project grading plans, construction specifications and bid documents, and the City shall ensure such language is incorporated prior to issuance of any grading permits:</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>During grading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• &quot;All clearing, grading, earth-moving, or excavation activities shall cease when winds exceed 25 mph per SCAQMD guidelines in order to limit fugitive dust emissions.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• &quot;The contractor shall ensure that all disturbed unpaved roads and disturbed areas within the Project are watered at least three (3) times daily during dry weather. Watering, with complete coverage of disturbed areas, shall occur at least three times a day, preferably in the mid-morning, afternoon, and after work is done for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</td>
<td>VERIFIED BY:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and Project site areas are reduced to 15 miles per hour or less.”</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.3-2 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1186 “PM10 Emissions from Paved and Unpaved Roads and Livestock Operations” and Rule 1186.1, “Less-Polluting Street Sweepers.” Adherence to Rules 1186 and 1186.1 reduces the release of criteria pollutant emissions into the atmosphere during construction.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department Engineering Department Planning Department</td>
<td>During construction and on-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.3-3 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113; “Architectural Coatings” Rule 1113 limits the release of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) into the atmosphere during painting and application of other surface coatings. The measure listed below (or equivalent language) shall appear on all Project grading plans, construction specifications and bid documents, and the City shall ensure such language is incorporated prior to issuance of any building permits: “In order to limit the VOC content of architectural coatings used in the SCAB, architectural coatings shall be no more than a low VOC default level of 50 g/L unless otherwise specified in the SCAQMD Table of Standards (pg. 32-33).”</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department Engineering Department Planning Department</td>
<td>During construction and on-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.3-4 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1186 “PM10 Emissions from Paved and Unpaved Roads and Livestock Operations” and Rule 1186.1, “Less-Polluting Street Sweepers.” Adherence to Rule 1186 and Rule 1186.1 reduces the release of criteria pollutant emissions into the atmosphere during construction.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.3-5 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 402 “Nuisance.” Adherence to Rule 402 reduces the release of odorous emissions into the atmosphere.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF 3.3-1 As required by the Project’s Conditions of Approval, residential dwelling units within 500 feet of the SR-60 Freeway shall be required to install high building</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</td>
<td>VERIFIED BY:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiency Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) filters of MERV 13 or better as indicated by the American Society of Heating Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers ASHRAE) Standard 52.2, in the intake of ventilation systems. Heating, air conditioning and ventilation (HVAC) systems shall be installed with a fan unit power designed to force air through the MERV 13 filter.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

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

**MM-BIO-1: Pre-Construction Burrowing Owl Survey.** Within 30 calendar days prior to grading, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey of the Project’s proposed impact footprint and make a determination regarding the presence or absence of the burrowing owl. The determination shall be documented in a report and shall be submitted, reviewed, and accepted by the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit and subject to the following provisions:

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

b. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies the presence of burrowing owl, then prior to the issuance of a grading permit and prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities on the property, the qualified biologist shall follow the methods recommended by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW, 2012) and Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP, 2006) for passive or active relocation of burrowing owls. Passive relocation, including the required use of one-way doors to exclude owls from the site and the collapsing of burrows, will occur if the biologist determines that the proximity and availability of alternate habitat is suitable for successful passive relocation. Passive relocation shall follow California Department of Fish and Wildlife relocation protocol. If proximate alternate habitat is not present as determined by the biologist, active...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM)</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relocation shall follow California Department of Fish and Wildlife relocation protocol. The biologist shall provide evidence in writing to the Planning Department that the species has fledged or been relocated prior to the issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM BIO-2. Coordination With USACE, CDFW, and RWQCB.</strong> Prior to the issuance of grading permit, the applicant shall contact the United State Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to positively determine whether or not either agency wishes to exert jurisdiction of the onsite drainage feature. If either agency decides to exert jurisdiction, Mitigation Measures BIO-3 and BIO-4 shall be implemented.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-3. CDFW Jurisdiction.</strong> If state jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-2, the following shall be implemented: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project applicant shall obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement under Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The following shall be incorporated into the permitting, subject to approval by the regulatory agencies: (a) Replacement and/or restoration of jurisdictional “waters of the State” within the Santa Ana River watershed at a ratio of not less than 1:1 onsite or not less than 2:1 for permanent impacts; (b) The applicant shall restore any onsite or offsite temporary impact areas to pre-project conditions and revegetate where applicable; and (c) Off-site mitigation may occur on land acquired for the purpose of in-perpetuity preservation, or through the purchase of mitigation credits at an agency approved off-site mitigation bank or within an agency-accepted off-site permittee responsible mitigation area such as the Santa Ana Watershed Project Area (SAWPA), Prado Basin, or an appropriate nearby downstream established mitigation bank area.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-4. Federal Jurisdiction.</strong> If federal jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-2, the following shall be implemented: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall obtain a Clean Water Act Section 404 Nation-Wide Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and compensate for the loss of more than 0.1 acre of wetlands and 1,278 lineal feet of streambed channel, and a Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification from the Los Angeles Regional Water</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality Control Board. These permits will address impacts to identified jurisdictional resources on the Project site and appropriate offsite mitigation such as the Santa Ana Watershed Project Area (SAWPA), Prado Basin, or an appropriate nearby downstream established mitigation bank area. The developer shall implement this measure to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department.

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measure BIO-6: Tree Preservation and Replacement.** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the measure listed below (or equivalent language) shall appear on all Project grading plans, construction specifications and bid documents, and the City shall ensure such language is incorporated prior to issuance of any permits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control Board. These permits will address impacts to identified jurisdictional resources on the Project site and appropriate offsite mitigation such as the Santa Ana Watershed Project Area (SAWPA), Prado Basin, or an appropriate nearby downstream established mitigation bank area. The developer shall implement this measure to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Nesting Bird Survey.</strong> As a condition of approval for all grading permits, vegetation clearing and ground disturbance shall be prohibited during the migratory bird nesting season (February 1 through October 1), unless a migratory bird nesting survey is completed in accordance with the following requirements:</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to recordation of the Final Map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Prior to the removal of any trees, the issuance of a grading permit, or approval of a Site Development Permit, whichever comes first, a Tree Removal and Planting and Monitoring Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department that demonstrates that the following will be implemented:

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

**CULTURAL RESOURCES**

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

**MM- CR-2: Archeological Treatment Plan.** If a significant archaeological resource(s) is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). The archaeological monitor, the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented by the archaeologist to protect the identified archaeological resource(s) from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>research potential of the archaeological resource(s) in accordance with current professional archaeology standards (typically this sampling level is two (2) to five (5) percent of the volume of the cultural deposit). At the completion of the laboratory analysis, any recovered archaeological resources shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department and the Eastern Information Center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM-CR-3: Paleontological Monitoring. A qualified paleontologist (the “Project Paleontologist”) shall be retained by the developer prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Project Paleontologist will be on-call to monitor ground-disturbing activities and excavations on the Project site following identification of potential paleontological resources by project personnel. If paleontological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project, ground-disturbing activities will be temporarily redirected from the vicinity of the find. The Project Paleontologist will be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading or excavation activities in the vicinity in order to make an evaluation of the find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure CR-4 shall apply.</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>During grading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM-CR-4: Paleontological Treatment Plan. If a significant paleontological resource(s) is discovered on the property, in consultation with the Project proponent and the City, the qualified paleontologist shall develop a plan of mitigation which shall include salvage excavation and removal of the find, removal of sediment from around the specimen (in the laboratory), research to identify and categorize the find, curation in the find a local qualified repository, and preparation of a report summarizing the find.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit or as otherwise determined by the Planning Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.5-1 The project is required to comply with the applicable provisions of California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 as well as Public Resources Code §5097 et. seq.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>During grading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</td>
<td>VERIFIED BY:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.6-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, the Project is required to comply with the most recent edition of the <em>California Building Code</em> to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic hazards.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP’s 3.91-1 through PPP 3.9-4 in Section 3.9, <em>Hydrology and Water Quality</em> shall apply.</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and during operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

| PPP 3.7-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, *California Energy Code*, prior to issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant shall submit showing that the Project will be constructed in compliance with the most recently adopted edition of the applicable California Building Code Title 24 requirements. | Building & Safety Department | Prior to the issuance of building permits | |
| PPP 3.7-2 As required by Municipal Code Section 9.283.010, *Water Efficient Landscape Design Requirements*, prior to the approval of landscaping plans, the Project proponent shall prepare and submit landscape plans that demonstrate compliance with this section. | Building & Safety Department | Prior to the issuance of building permits | |
| PPP 3.7-3 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010 (8), the Project proponent shall comply with the *California Green Building Standards*. | Building & Safety Department | Prior to the issuance of building permits | |

**HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

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

**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.9-1</strong> As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, <em>Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section B (1)</em>, any person performing construction work in the city shall comply with the provisions of this chapter, and shall control storm water runoff so as to prevent any likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. The City Engineer shall identify the BMPs that may be implemented to prevent such deterioration and shall identify the manner of implementation. Documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 shall be required when requested by the City Engineer.</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.9-2</strong> As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, <em>Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section B (2)</em>, any person performing construction work in the city shall be regulated by the State Water Resources Control Board in a manner pursuant to and consistent with applicable requirements contained in the General Permit No. CAS000002, State Water Resources Control Board Order Number 2009-0009-DWQ. The city may notify the State Board of any person performing construction work that has a non-compliant construction site per the General Permit.</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.9-3</strong> As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, <em>Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section C</em>, new development or redevelopment projects shall control storm water runoff so as to prevent any deterioration of water quality that would impair subsequent or competing uses of the water. The City Engineer shall identify the BMPs that may be implemented to prevent such deterioration and shall identify the manner of implementation. Documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 shall be required when requested by the City Engineer. The BMPs may include, but are not limited to, the following and may, among other things, require new developments or redevelopments to do any of the following: (1) Increase permeable areas by leaving highly porous soil and low lying area undisturbed by: (a) Incorporating landscaping, green roofs and open space into the project</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) Using porous materials for or near driveways, drive aisles, parking stalls and low volume roads and walkways; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

NOISE

**PPP 3.12-1** As required by Municipal Code Section 11.05.020 (9), private construction projects located within one-quarter (¼) of a mile from an inhabited dwelling shall not perform construction between the hours of six (6:00) p.m. and six (6:00) a.m. during the months of June through September and between the hours of six (6:00) p.m. and seven (7:00) a.m. during the months of October through May.

Building & Safety Department

Prior to the issuance of a building permit

**PPP 3.12-2** As required by Jurupa Valley Municipal Code Section 11.05.040, no person shall create any sound, or allow the creation of any sound, on any property that causes the exterior sound level on any other occupied property to exceed the sound level standards set forth in Table 1 of this section or that violates the special sound source standards set forth in Section 11.05.060.

Building & Safety Department

During operation

**Mitigation Measure NOI-1-Construction Noise Mitigation Plan** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the developer is required to submit a construction-related noise mitigation plan to the City Planning Department for review and approval. The plan must depict the location of construction equipment and how the noise from this equipment will be mitigated during construction of this project. In addition, the plan shall require that the following notes are included on grading plans and building plans. Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the notes and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by City of Jurupa Valley staff or its designee to confirm compliance. These notes also shall be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors.

Planning Department

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit

"a) Haul truck deliveries shall be limited to between the hours of 6:00am to 6:00pm during the months of June through September and 7:00am to 6:00pm during the months of October through May.

b) Construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile,
### Mitigation Measure NOI-1. Engine Mufflers:

with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers’ standards.

c) All stationary construction equipment shall be placed in such a manner so that emitted noise is directed away from any sensitive receptors adjacent to the Project site.

d) Construction equipment staging areas shall be located the greatest distance between the staging area and the nearest sensitive receptors.”

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure NOI-3 Interior Noise Analysis:</th>
<th>Prior to issuance of any residential building permit, an interior noise analysis shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department demonstrating that proposed building materials will achieve interior noise levels less than 45 dBA CNEL. Measures that would facilitate compliance with the 45dBA CNEL interior noise standard include, but are not limited to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of any residential building permit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---
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| b) Upgraded windows and sliding glass doors are required on all homes. See Tables 5 and 6 of Noise Impact Analysis, Appendix K of this Initial Study Checklist for specific STC requirements. |
| c) Attic and roof vents that directly face the SR-60, if applicable, shall include an acoustical baffle to prevent vehicle noise intrusion. See Exhibits D and E of Noise Impact Analysis, Appendix K of this Initial Study Checklist for examples acoustical baffles. The contractor may install similar measures to provide noise reduction. |
| d) For proper acoustical performance, all exterior windows, doors, and sliding glass doors must have a positive seal and leaks/cracks must be kept to a minimum. |

### PUBLIC SERVICES

<p>| PPP 3.14-1 The Project applicant shall comply with all applicable Riverside County Fire Department codes, ordinances, and standard conditions regarding fire prevention and suppression measures relating to water improvement plans, fire hydrants, automatic fire extinguishing systems, fire access, access gates, combustible construction, water availability, and fire sprinkler systems. |
| PPP 3.14-2 As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 et seq., the Project proponent shall pay a Development Impact Fee (DIF) following protocol for impact fee collection. |
| PPP 3.14-3 As required by Section 65995 of the Government Code, the Project Applicant shall pay required development impact fees to the applicable school district following protocol for impact fee collection required by that district. |
| PPP 3.14-4 Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Project Applicant shall pay required park development impact fees to the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District pursuant to District Ordinance No. 01-2007 and 02-2008. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.16-1</strong> Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Project Proponent shall make required per-unit fee payments associated with the Western Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF), and the City of Jurupa Valley Development Impact Fee (DIF).</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.16-2</strong> As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75, the Project is required to pay a Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing revenue that the City can use to fund transportation improvements such as roads, bridges, major improvements and traffic signals.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM- TCR-1: Native American Monitoring, Treatment of Discoveries, and Disposition of Discoveries.</strong></td>
<td>Planning Department Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and during grading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONITORING:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall contact the consulting Native American Tribe(s) that have requested monitoring through consultation with the City during the AB 52 process. The applicant shall coordinate with the Tribe to develop a Tribal Monitoring Agreement(s). A copy of the agreement shall be provided to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TREATMENT OF DISCOVERIES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a significant tribal cultural resource is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). A representative of the appropriate Native American Tribe(s), the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented to protect the identified tribal cultural resources from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the tribal cultural resources in accordance with current professional archaeology standards. The treatment plan shall require monitoring by the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during data recovery and shall require that all recovered artifacts undergo basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, whichever is appropriate. At the completion of the basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, any recovered tribal cultural resources shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility, or, the artifacts may be delivered to the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) if that is recommended by the City of Jurupa Valley. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department, the Eastern Information Center, and the appropriate Native American Tribe.

**DISPOSITION OF DISCOVERIES:**

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the tribal cultural resources in accordance with current professional archaeology standards. The treatment plan shall require monitoring by the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during data recovery and shall require that all recovered artifacts undergo basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, whichever is appropriate. At the completion of the basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, any recovered tribal cultural resources shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility, or, the artifacts may be delivered to the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) if that is recommended by the City of Jurupa Valley. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department, the Eastern Information Center, and the appropriate Native American Tribe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>been completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

PPP 3.17-1 The Project shall comply with Section 4.408 of the 2013 California Green Building Code Standards, which requires new development projects to submit and implement a construction waste management plan in order to reduce the amount of construction waste transported to landfills. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the City of Jurupa Valley shall confirm that a sufficient plan has been submitted, and prior to final building inspections, the City of Jurupa shall review and verify the Contractor’s documentation that confirms the volumes and types of wastes that were diverted from landfill disposal, in accordance with the approved construction waste management plan.
ORDINANCE NO. 2019-01

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

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

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

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

(b) All of the components of Master Application No. 17099 shall collectively be known as the “Project.” Change of Zone Application No. 17003 is the subject of this Ordinance.

(c) The Applicant is seeking approval of Change of Zone No. 17003 to rezone 10.4 combined gross acres located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) Zone.

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

(e) Section 9.285.020.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that applications for change of zone must be made to the Planning Commission on forms provided by the Planning Department, must supply all required information, and must be accompanied by the filing fee set forth in Chapter 3.65.
(f) Section 9.285.020.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that an application for a change of zone may not be set for a public hearing until (1) all procedures required by the Jurupa Valley Rules Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) to hear a matter have been completed; and (2) the requested change of zone is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan.

(g) Sections 9.285.040.(1) and (2) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provide that the Planning Commission shall hold a noticed public hearing on a proposed amendment to Title 9 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code that proposes to change property from one zone to another.

(h) Section 9.285.040.(3) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that, after closing the public hearing, the Planning Commission must render its decision within a reasonable time and transmit it to the City Council in the form of a written recommendation, which shall contain the reasons for the recommendation and the relationship of the proposed amendment to 2017 General Plan. A copy of the Planning Commission’s recommendation must be mailed to the applicant and proof thereof must be shown on the original transmitted to the City Council.

(i) Section 9.285.040.(4)(a) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that upon receipt of a recommendation for approval by the Planning Commission, the City Clerk shall set the matter for public hearing before the City Council at the earliest convenient day, and give notice of the time and place of the hearing in the same manner as notice was given of the hearing before the Planning Commission.

(j) Section 9.285.040.(5) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after closing the public hearing the City Council must render its decision within a reasonable time and may approve, modify, or disapprove the recommendation of the Planning Commission; provided, however, that any proposed modification of the Planning Commission's recommendation not previously considered by the Planning Commission must first be referred back to the Planning Commission for a report and recommendation.

(k) The Project was processed including, but not limited to a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

(l) On October 24, 2018, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 17099, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing. At the conclusion of the Planning Commission hearing and after due consideration of the testimony, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01, recommending that the City Council adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approve Change of Zone No. 17003 to change the zoning classification of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres of real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) Zone. Additionally, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution
No. 2018-10-24-02, approving an exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and Tentative Tract Map No. 37211.

(m) On October 26, 2018, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 with the City Clerk and a copy of the notice was mailed to the Applicant, the Applicant’s authorized agent, and all interested parties requesting a copy.

(n) On November 15, 2018, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 with the City Council, which notice was placed on the City Council’s regular meeting agenda on that date.

(o) On November 15, 2018, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the proposed Change of Zone No. 17003, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing and voted to deny the proposed Change of Zone No. 17003.

(p) On November 20, 2018, Mayor Goodland filed a timely appeal of the Planning Commission’s approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, which includes an appeal of the Planning Commission’s approval of the exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and the Development Plan (the “Appeal”). The Appeal set aside the Planning Commission’s action and made the Council the approving body.

(q) On December 6, 2018, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley adopted a motion to reconsider the introduction of this Ordinance (which would, if adopted, approve Change of Zone No. 17003), and then set the public hearing on the introduction of this Ordinance and the Appeal for the City Council’s regular meeting on January 17, 2019.

(r) On January 17, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the introduction of this Ordinance and the Appeal, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council continued the public hearing to a date uncertain.

(s) On March 21, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a continued public hearing on the introduction of this Ordinance and the Appeal, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing.

(t) All legal preconditions to the adoption of this Ordinance have occurred.

Section 2. California Environmental Quality Act Findings. The City Council hereby makes the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Project:

§15000 et seq.), City staff prepared an Initial Study of the potential environmental effects of the approval of the Project. Based upon the findings contained in that Study, City staff determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there was no substantial evidence that the Project could have a significant effect on the environment and a Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND") was prepared by the City in full compliance with CEQA.

(b) Thereafter, City staff provided public notice of the public comment period and of the intent to adopt the MND as required by law. The public comment period commenced on July 5, 2018, and expired on August 3, 2018. Copies of the documents have been available for public review and inspection at City Hall, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509. The City received did not receive any comments during the public review period.

(c) On October 24, 2018, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Project and the MND, reviewed the staff report, accepted and considered public testimony. After due consideration, the Planning Commission found that agencies and interested members of the public were afforded ample notice and opportunity to comment on the MND and the Project and approved Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01 recommending that City Council adopt the MND, adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and approve the proposed Change of Zone No. 17003.

(d) On November 15, 2018, January 17, 2019, and March 21, 2019, the City Council conducted duly noticed public hearings to consider the Project and the MND, reviewed the staff reports, and accepted and considered public testimony. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearings, including the staff reports and oral testimonies, the City Council, by separate Resolution No. 2019-17, adopted the MND and a MMRP for the Project as set forth in Exhibit “A” to City Council Resolution No. 2019-17.

(e) All actions taken by City have been duly taken in accordance with all applicable legal requirements, including the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code, § 21000 et seq.) (“CEQA”), and all other requirements for notice, public hearings, findings, votes and other procedural matters.

(f) The custodian of records for the MND, MMRP, and all other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City Council’s decision was based, including, without limitation, the staff reports for Master Application No. 17099, all of the materials that comprise and support the MND and all of the materials that support the staff reports for Master Application No. 17099, is the Planning Department of the City of Jurupa Valley. Those documents are available for public examination during normal business hours at the City of Jurupa Valley, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509.

Section 3. Findings for Approval of Change of Zone. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby finds and determines that Change of Zone No. 17003 should be adopted because the proposed change of zoning classification from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and the requirements of the General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) in that the proposed Project, which proposes a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre, complies with the maximum five (5) dwelling unit per acre requirement for premises designated MDR.
Section 4. Approval of Zone Change. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby rezones the approximately 10.4 combined gross acres of real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) Zone, and directs the City Manager to revise the official City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map to designate the property as being in this new zone.

Section 5. Severability. If any sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions of this Ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this Ordinance and each sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or otherwise invalid.

Section 6. Effect of Ordinance. This Ordinance is intended to supersede any ordinance or resolution of the County of Riverside incorporated by the City of Jurupa Valley that may in conflict with the terms of this Ordinance.

Section 7. Certification. The City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley shall certify to the passage and adoption of this Ordinance and shall cause the same to be published or posted in the manner required by law.

Section 8. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall take effect on the date provided in Government Code Section 36937.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 4th day of April, 2019.

______________________________
Brian Berkson
Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  )
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  ) ss.
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY  )

I, Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance No. 2019-01 was regularly introduced at a regular meeting of the City Council held on the 21st day of March, 2019 and thereafter at a regular meeting held on the 4th day of April, 2019 it was duly passed and adopted by the following vote of the City Council:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, this 4th day of April, 2019

________________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
EXHIBIT A OF ATTACHMENT 2

Change of Zone Exhibit
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-03


THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Project. Sequanata Partners, LP (the “Applicant”) has applied for Change of Zone No. 17003, Exception to Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and a Development Plan (collectively, Master Application No. 17099 or MA No. 17099) to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) in the One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone and designated Medium Density Residential (MDR) (the “Project”). The Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and the Development Plan are the subject of this Resolution.

Section 2. Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(a) Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code states: “Lots less than two (2) acres in gross area shall not have double street frontage except that in hillside areas where the topography requires, lots may abut two (2) or more streets provided that the frontage and vehicular access is from only one (1) such street.”
The Applicant is seeking approval of an exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code to permit double street frontage for Lots 3-7 on Opal Street and proposed “A” Street.

Section 7.10.010.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that exceptions from the requirements of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code relating to the design or improvement of land divisions may granted by the appropriate advisory agency or appeal board only when it is determined that there are special circumstances applicable to the property, such as, but not limited to, size, shape, or topographical conditions, or existing road alignment and width, and that the granting of the modification will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or be damaging to other property in the vicinity.

Section 3. Tentative Tract Map.

The Applicant is seeking approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018).

Section 7.05.020.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission is designated as the “Advisory Agency” charged with the duty of making investigations and reports on the design and improvement of all proposed Schedule “A” maps. Further, Sections 7.05.020.A. and 7.15.150 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provide that the Planning Commission is authorized to approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove all such tentative map land divisions and report the action directly to the City Council and the land divider.

Section 7.15.130.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that within fifty (50) days after the date of filing of a commercial parcel map, a public hearing on the map must be held before the Planning Commission. Section 7.15.130.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after the close of the hearing, the Planning Commission must approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove the proposed tentative map, file notice of the decision with the City Clerk, and mail notice of the decision to the land divider, or his or her authorized agent, and any interested party requesting a copy.

Section 7.15.180 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code requires denial of a tentative tract map if it does not meet all of the requirements of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, or if any of the following findings are made:

1) That the proposed land division is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans.

2) That the design or improvement of the proposed land division is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans.

3) That the site of the proposed land division is not physically suitable for the type of development.
4) That the site of the proposed land division is not physically suitable for the proposed density of the development.

5) That the design of the proposed land division or proposed improvements are likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.

6) That the design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements are likely to cause serious public health problems.

7) That the design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements will conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed land division. A land division may be approved if it is found that alternate easements for access or for use will be provided and that they will be substantially equivalent to ones previously acquired by the public. This subsection shall apply only to easements of record or to easements established by judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction.

8) Notwithstanding subsection 5) above, a tentative map may be approved if an environmental impact report was prepared with respect to the project and a finding was made, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), that specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

(e) Section 7.15.140 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the action of the Planning Commission on a tentative Schedule “A” map will be final, unless the final decision is appealed by the land divider or any interested party.

(f) Sections 7.05.030.B. and 7.15.150 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provide that if a land divider or any interested party believes that they may be adversely affected by the decision of the Planning Commission, the land divider or any interested party may appeal the decision to the City Council. Any such appeal shall be filed with the City Clerk within ten (10) days after the notice of decision of the Planning Commission appears on the City Council’s agenda. The appeal must be filed in writing, stating the basis for appeal, and must be accompanied by the applicable fee.

(g) Section 7.15.150 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that, upon the filing of the appeal, the City Clerk must set the matter for public hearing on a date within thirty (30) days after the date of the filing of the appeal and must give notice of the public hearing in the same manner as was given for the original hearing. The City Council must render its decision on the appeal within ten (10) days of the closing of the hearing.

Section 4. Development Plan.

(a) Section 9.100.050 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that before any structure is erected or use established in the R-4 Zone, there shall be a subdivision map recorded and a development plan approved as set forth in Section 9.100.060 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.
The Applicant is seeking approval of a Development Plan for a proposed Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018).

Section 9.100.060.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that a development plan conforming to the requirements of Chapter 9.100 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and containing the minimum information set forth in Section 9.100.060.B.(1)-(4) may be approved by the Planning Commission.

Section 5.  **Procedural Findings.** The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that:

(a) The application for MA No. 17099 was processed including, but not limited to, a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

(b) On October 24, 2018, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 17099, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing. At the conclusion of the Planning Commission hearing and after due consideration of the testimony, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01, recommending that the City Council adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approve Change of Zone No. 17003 to change the zoning classification of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres of real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) Zone. Additionally, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02, adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approving an exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and a Development Plan to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres of real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots.

(c) On October 26, 2018, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 with the City Clerk and a copy of the notice was mailed to the Applicant, the Applicant’s authorized agent, and all interested parties requesting a copy.

(d) On November 15, 2018, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 with the City Council, which notice was placed on the City Council’s regular meeting agenda on that date.

(e) On November 15, 2018, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the proposed Change of Zone No. 17003, at which time all persons interested
in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing and voted to deny the proposed Change of Zone No. 17003.

(f) On November 20, 2018, Mayor Goodland filed a timely appeal of the Planning Commission’s approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, which includes an appeal of the Planning Commission’s approval of the exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and the Development Plan (the “Appeal”). The Appeal set aside the Planning Commission’s action and made the Council the approving body.

(g) On December 6, 2018, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley adopted a motion to reconsider the introduction of Ordinance No. 2018-13 (which would, if adopted, approve Change of Zone No. 17003), and then set the public hearing on the introduction of Ordinance No. 2018-13 and the Appeal for the City Council’s regular meeting on January 17, 2019.

(h) On January 17, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the introduction of Ordinance No. 2018-13 and the Appeal, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council continued the public hearing to a date uncertain.

(i) On March 21, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a continued public hearing on the introduction of this Ordinance and the Appeal, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing.

(j) All legal preconditions to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

Section 6. California Environmental Quality Act Findings for Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby make the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Project:

(a) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Cal. Pub. Res. Code §21000 et seq.) and the State Guidelines (the “Guidelines”) (14 Cal. Code Regs. §15000 et seq.), City staff prepared an Initial Study of the potential environmental effects of the approval of the Project as described in the Initial Study. Based upon the findings contained in that Study, City staff determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there was no substantial evidence that the Project could have a significant effect on the environment and a Mitigated Negative Declaration (“MND”) was prepared by the City in full compliance with CEQA.

(b) Thereafter, City staff provided public notice of the public comment period and of the intent to adopt the MND as required by law. The public comment period commenced on July 5, 2018, and expired on August 3, 2018. Copies of the documents have been available
for public review and inspection at City Hall, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509. The City received did not receive any comments during the public review period.

(c) On October 24, 2018, the Planning Commission reviewed the MND and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”) and found that (1) the MND was prepared in compliance with CEQA, (2) with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment, and (3) the MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Planning Commission. Based on those findings, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02, adopting the MND and MMRP for the Project, and approving the Exception to Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and the Development Plan.

(d) Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing, including the staff report and oral testimony, the City Council hereby sustains the Planning Commission’s adoption of the MND and MMRP for the Project, attached as Exhibit “B” to Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02.

Section 7. Findings for Approval of Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the Planning Commission’s approval of an exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code should be sustained because:

(a) There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property, including, but not limited to, size, shape, or topographical conditions, or existing road alignment and width, in that Lots 3-7 have only one vehicular access from the interior street of the proposed subdivision by design (as illustrated on Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, the Development Plan and the Conceptual Landscape Plan, which includes the Wall Plan);

(b) The granting of the modification will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare in that a community perimeter wall is proposed to be located on the rear lot lines of interior lots, thereby preventing multiple vehicular access points onto the Lots 3-7 and creating a lot design and layout similar to the proposed interior lots; and

(c) The granting of the modification will not be damaging to other property in the vicinity in that the proposed Development Plan and Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 create a unified and cohesive community and the proposed Conceptual Landscape Plan creates a desirable streetscape along Opal Street.

Section 8. Findings for Approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37211. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the Planning Commission’s approval of proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 should be sustained because:

(a) The proposed land division is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan. The proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 is consistent with the requirements of the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation, which permits up to five (5) dwelling units per acre. The proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 will facilitate the
construction of forty-eight (48) single family homes at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre, which is below the maximum allowable density for the MDR land use designation;

(b) The design or improvement of the proposed land division is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan in that the proposed layout of the forty-eight (48) parcels is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan;

(c) The site of the proposed land division is physically suitable for the type of development in that it is a relatively flat, undeveloped, vacant lot located adjacent to other single-family residential land uses, with adequate water and sewer connections and public services are available to the site;

(d) The site of the proposed land division is physically suitable for the proposed density of the development in that it proposes forty-eight (48) single-family residential dwelling units at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre, which is below the maximum allowable density under the MDR land use designation;

(e) The design of the proposed land division or proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat in that the subject site is highly disturbed and occupied by ruderal flora and bare ground. Because of the existing degraded site condition, the absence of special-status plant communities, and overall low potential for most special-status species to utilize or reside on-site, the design of the proposed land division and the proposed improvements are not expected to directly impact federal or state-listed threatened or endangered species;

(f) The design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements are not likely to cause serious public health problems. An Initial Study was prepared that evaluated potential effects with respect to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The MND determined that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because mitigation measures have been required or revisions in the Project have been made or agreed to by the Applicant. Furthermore a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) report prepared for the proposed Project did not reveal evidence of a recognized environmental condition in connection with the subject site. The Initial Study determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the proposed Project may have a significant effect on the environment. As such, the proposed Project will not cause serious public health problems; and

(g) The design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed land division in that there are no on-site easements within the subject site, the proposed Project will connect to existing water and sewer lines located on Canal Street, Opal Street, and Pacific Avenue, and all proposed utilities are required to be undergrounded.
Section 9. **Findings for Approval of Development Plan.** The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the Planning Commission’s approval of the proposed Development Plan should be sustained because:

(a) The proposed Development Plan conforms to and satisfies all the requirements of Chapter 9.100 of Jurupa General Municipal Code, including Section 9.100.060 (Conditions of Development) of Chapter 9.100.

(b) The proposed Development Plan identifies the location of each existing and each proposed structure in the development area and the uses or uses to be contained therein by depicting the locations of the building footprints, including setbacks and layout, which future residential units must comply with.

(c) The proposed Development Plan identifies the location of all pedestrian walks, malls, recreation, and other open spaces for the use of the occupants and members of the public by depicting private open space, public sidewalks, and landscaped parkways throughout the proposed development.

(d) The proposed Development Plan identifies the location and height of all walls, fences, and screen planting, including a plan for the landscaping of the development, types of surfacing, such as paving, turfing, or other landscaping to be used at various locations in that the proposed Landscape Plan included within the proposed Development Plan includes a Wall/Fence Plan that identifies landscaping, paving, monument walls, and interior and perimeter walls throughout the proposed development; and

(e) The proposed plans and elevations of typical structures indicate the architectural type and construction standards in that the proposed Development Plan workbook depicts six (6) different plans for the single-family residential structures with three (3) varying exterior elevations (Tuscan, Spanish, Traditional, and Craftsman architectural styles) and a different floor plan per each of the six (6) plans.

Section 10. **Approval of Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and Development Plan with Conditions.** Based on the foregoing, the City Council hereby sustains the Planning Commission’s approval of an Exception to Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and a Development Plan to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue, subject to the recommended conditions of approval attached hereto as Exhibit “A”, and denies the Appeal of the Appellant. The Planning Commission’s approval of the Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and the Development Plan is conditioned upon the City Council’s adoption of an ordinance approving Change of Zone No. 17033, and the Commission’s approval shall not take effect until the effective date of the ordinance adopting Change of Zone No. 17003.
Section 11. Certification. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 21st 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. 2019-03 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 21st 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 21st day of March, 2019.

___________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
EXHIBIT “A”

Conditions of Approval
EXHIBIT A OF ATTACHMENT 3
Recommended Conditions of Approval
EXHIBIT “A”

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR MA17099 (TTM37211 & CZ17003)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. PROJECT PERMITTED. Master Application (MA) No. 17099: Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211, Change of Zone (CZ) No. 17003 and Exception to Section 7.10.080 (G) is for the approval to subdivide a combined 10.4 property into 48 single-family residential lots with two (2) water quality basin lots (Lot A & B) and three (3) lettered street lots (A-C). An exception to Section 7.10.080 (G) of Title 7 (Subdivisions) for double frontage lots on Lots 3-7 is also included. The property is located at the SEC of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60 Fwy and east of Pacific Avenue, APNS: 177-130-007 & 177-142-018.

2. INDEMNIFY CITY. The applicant, the property owner or other holder of the right to the development entitlement(s) or permit(s) approved by the City for the project, if different from the applicant (herein, collectively, the “Indemnitor”), shall indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the City of Jurupa Valley and its elected city council, its appointed boards, commissions, and committees, and its officials, employees, and agents (herein, collectively, the “Indemnites”) from and against any and all claims, liabilities, losses, fines, penalties, and expenses, including without limitation litigation expenses and attorney’s fees, arising out of either (i) the City’s approval of the project, including without limitation any judicial or administrative proceeding initiated or maintained by any person or entity challenging the validity or enforceability of any City permit or approval relating to the project, any condition of approval imposed by City on such permit or approval, and any finding or determination made and any other action taken by any of the Indemnites in conjunction with such permit or approval, including without limitation any action taken pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), or (ii) the acts, omissions, or operations of the Indemnitor and the directors, officers, members, partners, employees, agents, contractors, and subcontractors of each person or entity comprising the Indemnitor with respect to the ownership, planning, design, construction, and maintenance of the project and the property for which the project is being approved. The City shall notify the Indemnitor of any claim, lawsuit, or other judicial or administrative proceeding (herein, an “Action”) within the scope of this indemnity obligation and request that the Indemnitor defend such Action with legal counsel reasonably satisfactory to the City. If the Indemnitor fails to so defend the Action, the City shall have the right but not the obligation to do so and, if it does, the Indemnitor shall promptly pay the City’s full cost thereof. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the indemnity obligation under clause (ii) of the first sentence of this condition shall not apply to the extent the claim arises out of the willful misconduct or the sole active negligence of the City.

3. CONSENT TO CONDITIONS. Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to the required conditions of approval to the Planning Director or designee.

4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM. Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to having received a copy of the “Applicant’s Acknowledgement of Comments and Code Information from
5. **MITIGATION MEASURES.** This project shall be subject to the mitigation measures adopted with the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) prepared for the project and included with these conditions of approval.

6. **FEES.** The approval of MA17099 (TTM37211 & CZ17003) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

7. **CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA).** This project is approved subject to the provisions of a Mitigated Negative Declaration. Within forty-eight (48) hours of final approval for this project, the owner or designee shall deliver to the Planning Department a check payable to the Riverside County Clerk in the amount of $2,330.75 (includes $50.00 County Clerk Processing Fee) or the fees that are currently in effect at the time. This will enable the City to file the Notice of Determination.

8. **COPYED CONDITIONS.** Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the owner or designee shall include within the first four pages of the working drawings a list of all conditions of approval imposed by the project’s final approval.

9. **APPROVAL PERIOD – TENTATIVE TRACT MAP.** An approved or conditionally approved tentative tract map shall expire 36 months after such approval unless, within that period of time, a final map shall have been approved and filed with the County Recorder. Prior to the expiration date, the land divider may apply in writing for an extension of time pursuant to Title 7 (Subdivisions). If the tentative map expires before the recordation of the final map, or any phase thereof, no recordation of the final map, or any phase thereof, shall be permitted. The variance conditionally approved in connection with this land division may be used during the same period of time that the land division approval may be used; otherwise the variance shall be null and void.

10. **CONFORMANCE TO APPROVED EXHIBITS.** The project shall be in conformance to the approved plans (listed below) with any changes in accordance to these conditions of approval:

    a. Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 (Sheets 1 and 2): prepared by Proactive Engineering Consultants West, Inc. dated 9/14/16 (Revised 3/2018) and signed by George A. Lenfestey, R.C.E.

    b. Architectural Set of Plans consisting of:

        i. Plan 1.2319:

            1. Elevations (A-Spanish, B-Traditional, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans

        ii. Plan 2.2401:

            1. Elevations (A-Spanish, B-Traditional, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans

        iii. Plan 3.2611:

            1. Elevations (A-Spanish, B-Traditional, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and Roof Plans

        iv. Plan 4.2806:

Conditions of Approval for MA17099 (TTM37211 & CZ17003)
Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01 & Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02
1. Elevations (A-Spanish, B-Traditional, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and
   Roof Plans
   v. Plan 5.3042:
   1. Elevations (A-Spanish, C-Craftsman, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and
      Roof Plans
   vi. Plan 6.3124:
   1. Elevations (A-Spanish, C-Craftsman, D-Tuscan); Floor Plans and
      Roof Plans

   c. Conceptual Landscape Plans (Wall/Fence and Maintenance Plan included) dated
      April 2017 (Revised March 2018)
   d. Development Plan workbook (dated 5-24-18)

11. ON-SITE LANDSCAPING. Prior to the issuance of any Building permit, the
    applicant shall submit a “Professional Services (PROS)” application (with current fees)
    and the following items for Planning Director review and approval:

    a. The total cost estimate of landscaping, irrigation, and one-year of maintenance.
    b. Completed City Faithful Performance Bond for Landscape Improvements form
       with original signatures after the City provides the applicant with the required
       amount of bond.
    c. Completed City Landscape Agreement with original signatures after the City
       has reviewed the submitted cost estimate.
    d. Final landscape, maintenance, planting, and irrigation plans and digital copies
       (CD format). The plans shall include the following:
       i. Compliance with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program,
          Biological Resources Mitigation Measure BIO-6-Tree Preservation and
          Replacement.
       ii. Compliance with approved Development Plan.
       iii. Compliance with Title 9 (Planning and Zoning) landscaping
            requirements.
    e. STREET TREES. Street trees and related security and agreements are
       required pursuant to Chapter 7.55 of Title 7 (Subdivisions). Tree size, specimen
       and installation shall be under the direction of the Engineering Department if
       they are within the public right-of-way.

Prior to the final inspection of any Building permit, the Landscape Architect of
Record shall conduct an inspection and submit a letter to the City of Jurupa Valley once
s/he has deemed the installation is in conformance to the approved plans. Following the
inspection of the Landscape Architect of Record, the applicant shall schedule a City
inspection with the City's landscape architect.

12. MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF SOLID FENCING AND WALLS WITHIN THE FRONT
    SETBACK. No solid fencing or wall shall exceed 42 inches in height within the front
    setback. For Lots 2, 19 and 22, no SOLID walls EXCEEDING 42-INCHES IN HEIGHT
    shall be placed within 30 feet of the front yard area.
13. **BLOCK WALL FOR INTERIOR AND SIDE LOT LINES.** Block walls shall be used for interior side lot lines. Decorative wrought iron gates shall be used on all side gates at individual parcels.

**Prior to the issuance of a building permit,** the applicant shall submit a Wall and Fence plan that is consistent with this condition to the Planning Department for review and approval.

14. **GRAFFITI PROTECTION FOR WALLS.** **Prior to the issuance of any building permit,** the applicant shall submit a wall plan that includes anti-graffiti coating or protection for the exterior side of all perimeter walls for City review and approval. The applicant shall remove any graffiti on the property as soon as possible. In addition, if the applicant was notified by the City, the applicant shall remove the graffiti within seven (7) days of the City’s notice.

15. **TWO-CAR GARAGE PER DWELLING UNIT.** All residential units shall have a minimum two-car garage with automatic sectional roll-up doors. No garage conversions are permitted and units must maintain two-car covered spaces at all times.

16. **JURUPA AREA RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT.** **Prior to the issuance of any building permit,** the applicant shall submit proof of satisfying any fees, dedications, or requirements by the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District to the Building Official.

17. **MULTIPLE SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN MITIGATION FEE (ORD. NO. 810).** The applicant shall pay any owed fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 810. In order for the agency to determine that the project qualifies for any exemptions for any of the subject fees, the applicant needs to submit sufficient evidence to the City to demonstrate that it qualifies for the exemption.

18. **SALE OF INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS.** No structure constructed on Project site may be sold until the subject Project on which the structure is located is divided and a final map recorded in accordance with the City’s subdivision regulations such that the structure is located on a separate legally divided parcel.

19. **PROVIDE SOUND WALL ALONG THE SR-60 FREEWAY.**

   a. Applicant shall construct an approximate thirteen (13) foot high sound wall along the State Route 60 Freeway within the Caltrans right-of-way, for the length of the freeway fronting the project site, subject to procedure described below:

   i. Concurrent with City Council public hearing for the project entitlement, the Applicant shall petition the City to enter into an agreement with Caltrans for construction of the sound wall at the sole expense of the Applicant.

   ii. Upon City Council approval of above item (i), Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the City providing for (1) the payment by the Applicant to the City of all costs and expenses related to the sound wall expected to be incurred by the City, including, but not limited to, the price of third party consultants and attorney fees and (2) security for the design and construction of the sound wall by Applicant based on cost estimate for
iii. **Prior to Final Map**, the Applicant shall submit improvement plans for the construction of the sound wall to the City Engineer for approval and to Caltrans for the Caltrans permit.

iv. In the event that (1) the agreements and improvement plans described in subsections i), ii) or iii) are not approved and executed by the required times, or (2) the City Manager otherwise determines, in his sole discretion, that construction of the sound wall is infeasible, Applicant shall instead construct sound walls around all habitable back yard and side yard areas for all lots in accordance with the specifications provided in Exhibit C and Table 2 of the “TTM 37211 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL IMPACT STUDY” dated September 11, 2018.

b. **PRIOR TO FINAL OCCUPANCY OF LOTS 1-4, 17-24 AND 38-48**, the Caltrans permit for the sound wall shall have been issued or the City Manager must determine that construction of the sound wall is infeasible pursuant to subsection iii).

**ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT**

1. **GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (ENGINEERING)**

1.1. The use hereby conditioned is for a Schedule "A" subdivision, Tentative Tract No. 37211: being a subdivision of Lot 5, Block A, Map Book 9, Page 34, of Maps on file in SB West Riverside & Lot 3, Map Book 9, Page 34, of Maps on file in SB West Riverside; more particularly Assessor's Parcels Number APN 177-130-007 & 177-142-018; containing 10.4 acres gross, Lots "A" and "B" will be dedicated to the City of Jurupa Valley, Streets A, B and C will be dedicated to the City of Jurupa Valley for public road and utility purposes. Exhibit titled Tentative Tract No. 37211, prepared by Proactive Engineering Consultants West, INC., dated March 2018, is hereby referenced.

1.2. This land division shall comply with the State of California Subdivision Map Act, the City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Riverside County Ordinance No. 460; as it pertains for Schedule "A" subdivision for residential purposes, unless otherwise modified by the conditions listed herein.

1.3. It is assumed that any easements shown on the referenced exhibits are shown correctly and include all the easements that encumber the subject property. The Project proponent shall secure approval from all easement holders for all grading and improvements which are proposed over the respective easement or provide evidence that the easement has been relocated, quitclaimed, vacated, abandoned, easement holder cannot be found, or is otherwise of no affect. Should such approvals or alternate action regarding the easements not be provided, the Project proponent may be required to amend or revise the permit application.

1.4. Opal Street is a Local Road with a right-of-way width of 60 feet. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on
Opal Street along the project's frontage. The improvements include, but are not limited to, curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaped parkway and signing and striping. The Project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.5. Canal Street is considered a Frontage Road with a right-of-way width of 52 feet. Right-of-way dedication to provide 30 feet half ultimate-width from centerline to the property line is required. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on Canal Street along the project's frontage. The improvements include, but are not limited to, curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway and signing and striping. Improvements shall be constructed per modified Riverside County Road Standard No. 107 and per section shown on the approved Tentative Tract Map, or as approved by the Public Works Director. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.6. Pacific Avenue shall be dedicated as public road and improved as Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 36-foot paved road on a 56-foot right-of-way; curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.7. Street "A" and Street "B" shall be dedicated as public road and improved as Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 36-foot paved road on a 56-foot right-of-way; curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.8. Street "C" shall be dedicated as a public road and improved as a modified Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105 and the approved Tentative Tract Map, or as approved by the Public Works Director. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 33-foot paved road on a 48-foot right-of-way, curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscape parkway, boundary wall, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.9. New street lights are required on Opal Street, Pacific Avenue, Canal Street, Street "A", Street "B", and Street "C". The project proponent shall cause streetlight plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer. Streetlights' maintenance will be through Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) and per the agency requirements.

1.10. In compliance with Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Orders this project is required to comply with the Water Quality Management Plan for Urban Runoff (WQMP). The WQMP addresses post-development water quality impacts.
from new development and redevelopment projects. Guidelines and templates to assist the developer in completing the necessary studies are available on-line at www.floodcontrol.co.riverside.ca.us under Programs and Services, Stormwater Quality.

1.11. Electrical power, telephone, communication, street lighting, and cable television lines shall be placed underground in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance 460 and 461, as adopted by the City. This also applies to existing overhead lines which are 33.6 kilovolts or below within and along the project frontage and between the nearest poles offsite in each direction of the project site. All utility extensions within the subdivision and within individual lots shall be placed underground.

1.12. Owner will be required to form a Community Facilities District (CFD) for landscape maintenance.

1.13. An Environmental Constraint Sheet (ECS) is required to be prepared for this project for filing with the City Engineer at the time of recording the final Parcel Map.

2. PRIOR TO GRADING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

Grading and Drainage

2.1. No grading permit shall be issued until the Tentative Tract Map (TTM), and all other related cases are approved and are in effect, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

2.2. The Developer shall prepare a “rough” grading plan or a combined “rough and precise” grading plan for the entire site. The grading plan shall be prepared under the supervision of a civil engineer licensed in the state of California (Project Civil Engineer) and he/she must sign the plan. The printed name and contact information of the Project Civil Engineer shall be included on the face of the grading plan. The grading plan shall be approved by the City Engineer.

2.2.1. The grading plan shall provide for acceptance and proper disposal of all off-site drainage flowing onto or through the site. Should the quantities of flow exceed the capacity of the conveyance facility, the Project Proponent shall provide adequate drainage facilities and/or appropriate easement(s), if necessary, as approved by the City Engineer.

2.2.2. The grading plan shall provide for protection of downstream properties from damages caused by alteration of the drainage patterns, i.e., concentration or diversion of flow. Protection shall be provided by constructing adequate drainage facilities including enlarging existing facilities and/or by securing a drainage easement(s), if necessary, as approved by the City Engineer.

2.2.3. Temporary erosion control measures shall be implemented immediately following rough grading to prevent transport and deposition of earthen materials onto downstream/downwind properties, public rights-of-way, or other drainage facilities. Erosion Control Plans showing these measures
shall be submitted along with the grading plan for approval by the City Engineer.

2.2.4. Driveway approaches shall be located as shown on the referenced exhibit(s) or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer. The driveway approaches shall be constructed per Riverside County Standard No. 207. Existing driveway approaches, if any, shall be removed and replaced with full height curb and gutter and adjacent sidewalk to match existing, and landscape and irrigation improvements/modifications shall be shown on the street improvement plans.

2.2.5. Grading agreement and securities shall be in place prior to commencement of grading.

2.3. Prior to approval of the grading plan, the Project Proponent shall prepare a geotechnical/soils report for the proposed grading, infrastructure improvements and post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs) for review and approval of the City Engineer. All recommendations of that report shall be incorporated in the grading plan. The title and date of the geotechnical/soils report and the name and contact information of the Project Geotechnical/Soils Engineer shall be included on the face of the grading plan. The geotechnical/soils engineer must sign the grading plan.

2.4. Prior to approval of grading plans, the Project Proponent shall cause a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to be prepared in conformance with the requirements of the City of Jurupa Valley and the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFC&WCD) for approval of the City Engineer.

2.5. Prior to approval of the grading plan for disturbance of one (1) or more acres the landowner shall provide evidence that it has prepared and submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) a Storm Water Pollution Prevention plan (SWPPP). The SWRCB issued WDID number shall be included on the face of the grading plan.

2.6. Any proposed retaining walls will require a separate permit(s). Permits shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any grading permit unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer and Building Official.

2.7. Where grading involves import or export the Project Proponent shall obtain approval for the import/export location, from the Engineering department, if located in the City. If an Environmental Assessment did not previously address the import/export location a Grading Environmental Assessment shall be submitted to the Engineering Department for comment and to the Planning Director for review and approval. If import/export location is outside the City the Project Proponent shall provide evidence that the jurisdictional agency has provided all necessary separate approvals for import/export to/from the site.

2.8. Where grading involves import or export using City streets the Project Proponent shall obtain approval of the haul route and a haul route permit from the Public Works Department.

2.9. Prior to approval of the grading plan the Project Proponent shall prepare a final
Drainage Study, corresponding with the proposed improvements, for approval of the City Engineer. The drainage study and the grading plan shall be signed by a California licensed civil engineer.

2.9.1. All drainage and storm drain improvements shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District's standards. Drainage shall be designed to accommodate 100-year storm flows. Minimum drainage grade shall be 1% except on Portland Cement Concrete where 0.5% shall be the minimum.

2.9.2. Applicant is responsible for obtaining the necessary permits from Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCD) for connection, if any, to their facilities.

2.10. Prior to approval of the grading plan, Landowner shall prepare, or cause to be prepared, a final WQMP in conformance with the requirements of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCD) requirements for processing with and approval of the City Engineer.

2.10.1. The water quality management features and facilities to be constructed shall be shown on the project's site grading plans or separate post-construction BMP improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer.

2.10.2. The property owner shall enter into a Water Quality Management Plan and Stormwater BMP Operation and Maintenance Agreement with the City. The agreement shall be recorded and a certified copy shall be provided to the City Engineer.

2.11. The Project Proponent shall prepare separate landscaping and irrigation plans for areas within the street right-of-way for review and approval by the City Engineer.

2.12. The Project Proponent shall prepare separate street improvement and street lighting plans for review and approval by the City Engineer.

2.13. If grading is required offsite, the Developer shall obtain written notarized letter of permission from the property owner(s) to grade as necessary and provide a copy to the Engineering Department. It shall be the sole responsibility of the Developer to obtain any and all proposed or required easements and/or permissions necessary to perform the grading shown on the site plan, tentative tract map and grading exhibits.

2.14. Where grading involves import to or export of more than 50 cubic yards from the site the Developer shall obtain approval for the import/export location from the Engineering Department if located in the City.

2.15. The Developer shall initiate formation of, or annexation to if one already exists, a Community Facilities District (CFD) for operation and maintenance of post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs).

2.16. Prior to approval of the grading plan for disturbance of one or more acres the Landowner shall provide evidence that it has prepared and submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) a Storm Water Pollution Prevention
Plan (SWPPP). The SWRCB issued WDID number shall be included on the face of the grading plan.

3. PRIOR TO MAP RECORDATION

3.1. No final Map shall be recorded until all related cases are approved and are in effect unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

3.2. No final Map shall be recorded until the formation process for the Community Facilities District (CFD) associated with this project is finalized.

3.2.1. Project Proponent shall prepare Landscape and Irrigation plans for CFD. Plans shall be prepared per Riverside County Ordinance 859 and per the City's submittal guidelines and package.

3.2.2. CFD will include, but is not limited to, the maintenance of the following:
   a) Water Quality Basins;
   b) Tree trimming for trees within the public right-of-way, as identified on the CFD Landscape Plans and approved by the Director of Public Works;
   c) Landscape maintenance;
   d) Entry monuments.

3.2.3. The CFD will not maintain the parkway area in front of homeowner's lots. Property owners will be responsible of the maintenance of the landscape in front of their homes within the public right-of-way. The following exception applies: the CFD will be responsible for the tree trimming of trees along parkways on public right-of-way.

3.3. The Project Proponent shall provide improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer for all public improvements including, but not limited to, street improvements plans showing parkway improvements, road and pavement improvements, streetlights, landscape and irrigation, and water system.

3.4. Rights-of-way for streets and public utilities purposes shall be dedicated and shown on the final Map in accordance with these conditions of approval, the City's Municipal Code, Riverside County Ordinance 460, and Riverside County Ordinance 461. It is understood that the Tentative Tract Map exhibit correctly shows acceptable centerlines, existing easements, traveled ways, and drainage courses, and that the omission or unacceptability may require that the Developer amend or revise the tentative map as may be necessary to allow a finding that the final Map is in substantial conformance with the tentative map.

3.5. Final Map shall show abutter's rights along Opal Street. Lots 1 and 3 through 8 (inclusive) shall have access restriction to Opal Street.

3.6. The Project Proponent shall prepare bridge design plans per Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District's (RCFC&WCD) requirements and
for the City's review, for the crossing of proposed Street "C" over RCFC&WCD's channel.

3.6.1. Applicant shall be responsible for cooperative agreement coordination and any fees involved in the development of the cooperative agreement between the Developer, City of Jurupa Valley, and RCFC&WCD for maintenance responsibilities of improvements.

3.6.2. Agreement shall be executed and recorded prior to final map recording.

3.6.3. Bridge design shall allow for the following:
   a) Concrete barrier with chainlink railing on both sides of the bridge;
   b) Curb and gutter on both sides;
   c) 5-ft sidewalk along the north side.

3.6.4. The Project Proponent is responsible for obtaining all appropriate permits for RCB construction.

3.7. Applicant shall show dedication for Public Utilities purposes on proposed Street C to accommodate final location of RCB.

3.8. The Project Proponent shall prepare improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer:

3.8.1. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Opal Street consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible for the construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:
   a) Ultimate road and pavement conditions;
   b) 28-ft paved section on 60-ft right-of-way, with 30-ft from centerline of road to the easterly right-of-way line;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape, 5-ft sidewalk, and 2-ft landscape adjacent to property line, within a 12-foot parkway along the east side of Opal Street.
   e) Intersection improvements at Opal Street and Canal Street.

3.8.2. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Canal Street consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible of construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:
   a) Ultimate road and pavement conditions;
   b) 34-ft paved section on 52-ft right-of-way, with 30-ft from centerline of road to the southerly right-of-way line;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 4-ft curb adjacent landscape and 6-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway along the south side of Canal Street.
3.8.3. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Pacific Avenue consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible of construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:
   a) Ultimate road and pavement conditions;
   b) 52-ft paved section on 100-ft right-of-way, with 50-ft from centerline of road to the westerly right-of-way line;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 9-ft curb adjacent landscape, 5-ft sidewalk, and 4-ft landscape adjacent to property line, within an 18-foot parkway along the west side of Pacific.
   e) Improvements shall be installed along the project frontage with the following exception: Curb, gutter, and sidewalk installation along the west side of Pacific Avenue shall extend beyond the project frontage to the north to Patricia Drive, and to the south to CalTrans R/W (SR60 crossing). Fair share contribution would be required in the event of improvement installation by others occurring prior to this development. Fair share contribution shall be for the Pacific Avenue improvements and in the amount of $39,992.

3.8.4. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on proposed Street "A" and Street "B" consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible of construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:
   a) Ultimate road and pavement conditions;
   b) 36-ft paved section on 56-ft right-of-way;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway on both sides of the street.

3.8.5. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on proposed Street "C" consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible of construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:
   a) Ultimate road and pavement conditions;
   b) 33-ft paved section on 48-ft right-of-way, with 27-ft from centerline of road to the northerly right-of-way line;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 4-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 9-foot parkway along the north side of Street "C";
   e) Curb adjacent landscaping and tract boundary wall along the south side of Street "C".

3.9. The following intersection improvements shall be included in the plans and
3.9.1. The intersection of Pacific Avenue (NS) and Street "C" (EW) shall be modified to provide curb returns in ultimate location to provide northbound left turn lane and the following geometries:
   a) Northbound: One left turn lane, one through lane;
   b) Southbound: One shared through/right lane;
   c) Eastbound: One shared left/right turn lane;
   d) Westbound: N/A

3.9.2. The intersection of Street "A" (NS) and Street "C" (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on Street "A" and the following:
   a) Northbound: N/A;
   b) Southbound: One shared left/right turn lane;
   c) Eastbound: One shared through/right turn lane;
   d) Westbound: One shared through/right turn lane.

3.9.3. The intersection of Street "B" (NS) and Canada Street (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on Street "B" and the following:
   a) Northbound: One shared left/right lane;
   b) Southbound: N/A;
   c) Eastbound: One shared through/right turn lane;
   d) Westbound: One shared left/through lane.

3.9.4. The intersection of Street "B" (NS) and Street "C" (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on Street "B" and the following:
   a) Northbound: N/A;
   b) Southbound: One shared left/right turn lane;
   c) Eastbound: One shared left/through lane;
   d) Westbound: One shared through/right turn lane.

3.10. The Project Proponent shall prepare Storm Drain Line 'C' plans and submit to RCFC&WCD for review. Storm drain line shall be per RCFC&WCD's requirements.

3.11. The Developer shall be responsible for any match up asphalt concrete (AC) paving, and reconstruction or resurfacing of existing paving as determined by the City Engineer.

3.11.1. Storm drain line shall be per RCFC&WCD's requirements.

3.11.2. City will approve final plans as reviewed and approved by RCFC&WCD to verify compliance with City regulations.

3.11.3. Storm drain line shall convey runoff from Opal Street to the Channel.
3.12. Should this project be within any assessment/benefit district, the Project Proponent shall make application for and pay any reapportionment of the assessment or pay the unit fees in the assessment/benefit district.

3.13. Project proponent shall provide clearance letter from water and sewer utility purveyor, that all and any conditions by the water and sewer utility purveyor (if any) have been satisfied or appropriately initiated to its satisfaction.

3.14. Project proponent shall provide supporting documentation for district formation with Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) for the maintenance of the streetlights proposed with this project.

3.15. Electrical power, telephone, communication, street lighting, and cable television lines shall be designed to be placed underground in accordance with Riverside County Ordinances 460 and 461, as adopted by the City. The Project Proponent is responsible for coordinating the work with the serving utility company. This requirement applies to underground existing overhead electrical lines which are 33.6 kilovolts or below along the project frontage and between the nearest poles offsite in each direction of the project site including services that originate from poles on the far side of the street. A disposition note describing the above shall be reflected on design improvement plans whenever those plans are required. Written proof confirming initiation of the design of utility improvements or relocations, issued by the utility company, shall be submitted to the Engineering Department for verification purposes.

3.16. Project proponent shall obtain approval by water and sewer purveyor for water system and sewer system improvement plans (if any). The plans shall be submitted to and approved by the appropriate service district and the City.

4. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

4.1. The Project geotechnical/soils engineer shall certify to the completion of grading in conformance with the approved grading plans and the recommendations of the Geotechnical/Soils report approved for this project. Minimum street sections and traffic indexes are to be according to Riverside County Standards. Final sections may be greater based on the final R values determined by a Geologist registered in the State of California, and as approved by the City Engineer.

4.2. A licensed land surveyor or civil engineer shall certify to the completion of grading in conformance with the lines and grades shown on the approved grading plans.

4.3. The Project Proponent shall prepare a precise grading plan, if precise grading was not included in a combined "rough and precise" grading plan. The precise grading plan shall be approved by the City Engineer. Grading agreement and securities shall be in place prior to the commencement of grading.

4.4. The site's BMP facilities and features shall be constructed as shown on the project's site grading plans or separate post-construction BMP improvement
plans approved of the City Engineer. Post-construction water quality surface features and facilities such as basins and bio-swales are not required to be landscaped prior to issuance of building permits, but must be otherwise constructed and additional temporary erosion control measures in place as approved by the City Engineer.

4.5. The required domestic water system improvements, including fire hydrants, shall be installed and accepted.

4.6. The bridge design plans must be approved and signed by the City Engineer.

5. PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION (ENGINEERING)

5.1. The Project Proponent is responsible for the completing off all grading and construction of all infrastructure improvements within the public right-of-way in accordance with approved plans, with Riverside County Ordinance 461, as adopted by the City, and with all other applicable requirements, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Applicant shall ensure that streetlights are energized along the streets where Applicant is seeking Building Final Inspection (Occupancy).

5.2. The Project geotechnical/soils engineer shall provide a Final Grading Certification, certifying to the completion of the precise grading in conformance with the approved grading plans, the recommendation of the Geotechnical/Soils report approved for this project and the California Building Code Appendix J.

5.3. A licensed surveyor or civil engineer shall certify to the completion of precise grading in conformance with the lines and grades shown on the approved grading plans.

5.4. The Project Civil Engineer shall provide Record ("As-built") Drawings of grading and all infrastructure improvements.

5.5. The Project Proponent is responsible for completing all utility mainline and service line extensions within and serving the project site, including but not limited to, electrical power, telephone, other communication, street lighting, and cable television underground as herein before required, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer in writing. Utility extensions from the mainline or other points of connection within the public right-of-way require that the Project Proponent obtained an Encroachment Permit from the Engineering Department. Correspondence from the respective utility company approving and accepting utility improvements shall be provided from each respective utility company. The City will make a final inspection of work to verify that any impacts that the work might have had to other City owned infrastructure is restored or repaired to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

5.6. The Project Proponent is responsible for completing all landscaping and irrigation improvements within the public right-of-way as applicable. The Project Proponent shall provide a Landscaping Certificate of Completion to the City Engineer.

5.7. The Project proponent is responsible for the completion of all post-construction water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) facilities and features. These facilities and features will require operation and maintenance in perpetuity by the Property Owner(s).
5.8. The Project Proponent shall complete the formation of, or if one already exists initiate annexation to, a Community Facilities District (CFD) in order to provide funding for City Public Safety Services for each existing and/or new parcel in the proposed development.

6. PRIOR TO CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY (ENGINEERING)

6.1. Street ‘C’ bridge improvements shall be installed and accepted to the City Engineer’s discretion prior to certificate of occupancy for lots requiring secondary access to Pacific Avenue through Street ‘C’, per the City’s Municipal Code and Ordinance 460.

6.2. Improvements on Pacific Avenue shall be installed and accepted to the City Engineer’s discretion prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy for lots on Street ‘C’ east of the Channel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MA17099 - INTERSECTION AND ROADWAY SEGMENT
| IMPROVEMENT AND MITIGATION LIST |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geometric Modification</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERSECTIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-Specific Intersection Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Intersection of Pacific Avenue (NS) and C Street (EW) | Modify geometries to provide:  
• **NB**: one LT lane, one TH lane.  
• **SB**: one shared TH/RT lane.  
• **EB**: one shared LT/RT lane.  
• **WB**: N/A.  
Note: Provide curb returns in ultimate location to provide NB LT lane. |
| Intersection of “A” Street (NS) and “C” Street (EW) | Modify geometries to provide:  
• **NB**: N/A.  
• **SB**: one shared LT/RT lane.  
• **EB**: one shared TH/TH lane.  
• **WB**: one shared TH/RT lane.  
Note: Intersection to be controlled by Yield sign on “A” Street. |
| Intersection of “B” Street (NS) and Canal Street (EW) | Install geometries to provide:  
**NB**: one shared LT/RT lane.  
**SB**: N/A.  
**EB**: one shared TH/RT lane.  
**WB**: one shared LT/TH lane.  
Note: Intersection to be controlled by Stop sign on “B” Street. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection of “B” Street (NS) and “C” Street (EW)</th>
<th>Install geometries to provide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NB:</strong> N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SB:</strong> one shared LT/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EB:</strong> one shared LT/TH lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WB:</strong> one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Intersection to be controlled by Stop sign on “B” Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Applicant hereby agrees that these Conditions of Approval are valid and lawful and binding on the Applicant, and its successors and assigns, and agrees to the Conditions of Approval.

Applicant’s name (Print Form): __________________________________________

Applicant’s name (Signature): ___________________________________________

Date: _______________
EXHIBIT B OF ATTACHMENT 3
Mitigated Negative Declaration with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
ATTACHMENT NO. 4

Ordinance No. 2019-01 (a), denying the Change of Zone
ORDINANCE NO. 2019-01 (a)

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, DENYING AN APPLICATION TO AMEND THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY OFFICIAL ZONING MAP TO CHANGE THE ZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) FROM ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (R-4) ZONE, AND MAKING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Project Procedural Findings. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that:

(a) Sequanata Partners, LP (the “Applicant”) has applied for Change of Zone No. 17003, Exception to Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and a Development Plan (collectively, Master Application No. 17099 or MA No. 17099) to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) in the One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone and designated Medium Density Residential (MDR).

(b) All of the components of Master Application No. 17099 shall collectively be known as the “Project.” Change of Zone Application No. 17003 is the subject of this Ordinance.

(c) The Applicant is seeking approval of Change of Zone No. 17003 to rezone 10.4 combined gross acres located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) Zone.

(d) Section 9.285.020.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the owner of real property, or a person authorized by the owner, may request that the City consider a change in the zoning classification that has been applied to the owner’s property.

(e) Section 9.285.020.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that applications for change of zone must be made to the Planning Commission on forms provided by the Planning Department, must supply all required information, and must be accompanied by the filing fee set forth in Chapter 3.65.
Section 9.285.020.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that an application for a change of zone may not be set for a public hearing until (1) all procedures required by the Jurupa Valley Rules Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) to hear a matter have been completed; and (2) the requested change of zone is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan.

Sections 9.285.040.(1) and (2) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provide that the Planning Commission shall hold a noticed public hearing on a proposed amendment to Title 9 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code that proposes to change property from one zone to another.

Section 9.285.040.(3) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that, after closing the public hearing, the Planning Commission must render its decision within a reasonable time and transmit it to the City Council in the form of a written recommendation, which shall contain the reasons for the recommendation and the relationship of the proposed amendment to 2017 General Plan. A copy of the Planning Commission’s recommendation must be mailed to the applicant and proof thereof must be shown on the original transmitted to the City Council.

Section 9.285.040.(4)(a) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that upon receipt of a recommendation for approval by the Planning Commission, the City Clerk shall set the matter for public hearing before the City Council at the earliest convenient day, and give notice of the time and place of the hearing in the same manner as notice was given of the hearing before the Planning Commission.

Section 9.285.040.(5) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after closing the public hearing the City Council must render its decision within a reasonable time and may approve, modify, or disapprove the recommendation of the Planning Commission; provided, however, that any proposed modification of the Planning Commission's recommendation not previously considered by the Planning Commission must first be referred back to the Planning Commission for a report and recommendation.

The Project was processed including, but not limited to a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

On October 24, 2018, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 17099, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing. At the conclusion of the Planning Commission hearing and after due consideration of the testimony, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01, recommending that the City Council adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approve Change of Zone No. 17003 to change the zoning classification of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres of real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) Zone. Additionally, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution
No. 2018-10-24-02, approving an exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and Tentative Tract Map No. 37211.

(m) On October 26, 2018, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 with the City Clerk and a copy of the notice was mailed to the Applicant, the Applicant’s authorized agent, and all interested parties requesting a copy.

(n) On November 15, 2018, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 with the City Council, which notice was placed on the City Council’s regular meeting agenda on that date.

(o) On November 15, 2018, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the proposed Change of Zone No. 17003, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing and voted to deny the proposed Change of Zone No. 17003.

(p) On November 20, 2018, Mayor Goodland filed a timely appeal of the Planning Commission’s approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, which includes an appeal of the Planning Commission’s approval of the exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and the Development Plan (the “Appeal”). The Appeal set aside the Planning Commission’s action and made the Council the approving body.

(q) On December 6, 2018, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley adopted a motion to reconsider the introduction of this Ordinance (which would, if adopted, approve Change of Zone No. 17003), and then set the public hearing on the introduction of this Ordinance and the Appeal for the City Council’s regular meeting on January 17, 2019.

(r) On January 17, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the introduction of this Ordinance and the Appeal, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council continued the public hearing to a date uncertain.

(s) On March 21, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a continued public hearing on the introduction of this Ordinance and the Appeal, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing.

(t) All legal preconditions to the adoption of this Ordinance have occurred.

Section 2. California Environmental Quality Act Findings. The City Council hereby makes the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the denial of Change of Zone No. 17003:

§15000 et seq.), City staff prepared an Initial Study of the potential environmental effects of the approval of the Project. Based upon the findings contained in that Study, City staff determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there was no substantial evidence that the Project could have a significant effect on the environment and a Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND") was prepared by the City in full compliance with CEQA.

(b) Thereafter, City staff provided public notice of the public comment period and of the intent to adopt the MND as required by law. The public comment period commenced on July 5, 2018, and expired on August 3, 2018. Copies of the documents have been available for public review and inspection at City Hall, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509. The City received did not receive any comments during the public review period.

(c) On October 24, 2018, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Project and the MND, reviewed the staff report, accepted and considered public testimony. After due consideration, the Planning Commission found that agencies and interested members of the public were afforded ample notice and opportunity to comment on the MND and the Project and approved Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01 recommending that City Council adopt the MND, adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and approve the proposed Change of Zone No. 17003.

(d) On November 15, 2018, January 17, 2019, and March 21, 2019, the City Council conducted duly noticed public hearings to consider the Project and the MND, reviewed the staff reports, and accepted and considered public testimony. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearings, including the staff reports and oral testimonies, the City Council, by separate Resolution No. 2019-02, adopted the MND and a MMRP for the Project as set forth in Exhibit “A” to City Council Resolution No. 2019-02.

(e) All actions taken by City have been duly taken in accordance with all applicable legal requirements, including the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code, § 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA"), and all other requirements for notice, public hearings, findings, votes and other procedural matters.

(f) The custodian of records for the MND, MMRP, and all other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City Council’s decision was based, including, without limitation, the staff reports for Master Application No. 17099, all of the materials that comprise and support the MND and all of the materials that support the staff reports for Master Application No. 17099, is the Planning Department of the City of Jurupa Valley. Those documents are available for public examination during normal business hours at the City of Jurupa Valley, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509.

Section 3. Denial of Zone Change. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby denies the application to rezone approximately 10.4 combined gross acres of real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) Zone.
Section 4. Severability. If any sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions of this Ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this Ordinance and each sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or otherwise invalid.

Section 5. Effect of Ordinance. This Ordinance is intended to supersede any ordinance or resolution of the County of Riverside incorporated by the City of Jurupa Valley that may in conflict with the terms of this Ordinance.

Section 6. Certification. The City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley shall certify to the passage and adoption of this Ordinance and shall cause the same to be published or posted in the manner required by law.

Section 7. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall take effect on the date provided in Government Code Section 36937.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 4th day of April, 2019.

______________________________
Brian Berkson
Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  )
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  ) ss.
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY  )

I, Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance No. 2019-01 (a) was regularly introduced at a regular meeting of the City Council held on the 21st day of March, 2019 and thereafter at a regular meeting held on the 4th day of April, 2019 it was duly passed and adopted by the following vote of the City Council:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, this 4th day of April, 2019

__________________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
ATTACHMENT NO. 5

Resolution No. 2019-03(a), denying the 48-lot TTM, denying the Development Plan, approving the Exception, and approving the 41-Lot TTM
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-03 (a)


THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Project. Sequanata Partners, LP (the “Applicant”) has applied for Change of Zone No. 17003, Exception to Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and a Development Plan (collectively, Master Application No. 17099 or MA No. 17099) to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) in the One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone and designated Medium Density Residential (MDR) (the “Project”). The Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and the Development Plan are the subject of this Resolution.

Section 2. Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(a) Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code states: “Lots less than two (2) acres in gross area shall not have double
street frontage except that in hillside areas where the topography requires, lots may abut two (2) or more streets provided that the frontage and vehicular access is from only one (1) such street.”

(b) The Applicant is seeking approval of an exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code to permit double street frontage for Lots 3-9 on Opal Street and Canal Street and proposed “A” Street.

(c) Section 7.10.010.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that exceptions from the requirements of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code relating to the design or improvement of land divisions may granted by the 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. 37211, a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018).

(b) On March 5, 2019, the Applicant submitted a modified Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-one (41) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018).

(c) Section 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.

(d) 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.

(e) 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.

(f) 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.

(g) 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.

(h) Section 7.15.150 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that, upon the filing of the appeal, the City Clerk must set the matter for public hearing on a date within thirty (30) days after the date of the filing of the appeal and must give notice of the public
hearing in the same manner as was given for the original hearing. The City Council must render its decision on the appeal within ten (10) days of the closing of the hearing.

Section 4. **Development Plan.**

(a) Section 9.100.050 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that before any structure is erected or use established in the R-4 Zone, there shall be a subdivision map recorded and a development plan approved as set forth in Section 9.100.060 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(b) The Applicant is seeking approval of a Development Plan for a proposed Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018).

(c) Section 9.100.060.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that a development plan conforming to the requirements of Chapter 9.100 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and containing the minimum information set forth in Section 9.100.060.B.(1)-(4) may be approved by the Planning Commission.

Section 5. **Procedural Findings.** The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that:

(a) The application for MA No. 17099 was processed including, but not limited to, a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

(b) On October 24, 2018, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 17099, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing. At the conclusion of the Planning Commission hearing and after due consideration of the testimony, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01, recommending that the City Council adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approve Change of Zone No. 17003 to change the zoning classification of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres of real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone to Planned Residential (R-4) Zone. Additionally, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02, adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approving an exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and a Development Plan to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres of real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets (APNs: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) into forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots.

(c) On October 26, 2018, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 with the City Clerk.
and a copy of the notice was mailed to the Applicant, the Applicant’s authorized agent, and all interested parties requesting a copy.

(d) On November 15, 2018, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 with the City Council, which notice was placed on the City Council’s regular meeting agenda on that date.

(e) On November 15, 2018, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the proposed Change of Zone No. 17003, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing and voted to deny the proposed Change of Zone No. 17003.

(f) On November 20, 2018, Mayor Goodland filed a timely appeal of the Planning Commission’s approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, which includes an appeal of the Planning Commission’s approval of the exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and the Development Plan (the “Appeal”). The Appeal set aside the Planning Commission’s action and made the Council the approving body.

(g) On December 6, 2018, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley adopted a motion to reconsider the introduction of Ordinance No. 2018-13 (which would, if adopted, approve Change of Zone No. 17003), and then set the public hearing on the introduction of Ordinance No. 2018-13 and the Appeal for the City Council’s regular meeting on January 17, 2019.

(h) On January 17, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the introduction of this Ordinance and the Appeal, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council continued the public hearing to a date uncertain.

(i) On March 21, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a continued public hearing on the introduction of this Ordinance and the Appeal, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing.

(j) All legal preconditions to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

Section 6. **California Environmental Quality Act Findings for Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration.** The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby make the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Project:

(a) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Cal. Pub. Res. Code §21000 et seq.) and the State Guidelines (the “Guidelines”) (14 Cal. Code Regs. §15000 et seq.), City staff prepared an Initial Study of the potential environmental effects of the approval of the Project as described in the Initial Study. Based upon the findings contained in that Study, City staff determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there was
no substantial evidence that the Project could have a significant effect on the environment and a Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND") was prepared by the City in full compliance with CEQA.

(b) Thereafter, City staff provided public notice of the public comment period and of the intent to adopt the MND as required by law. The public comment period commenced on July 5, 2018, and expired on August 3, 2018. Copies of the documents have been available for public review and inspection at City Hall, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509. The City received did not receive any comments during the public review period.

(c) On October 24, 2018, the Planning Commission reviewed the MND and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") and found that (1) the MND was prepared in compliance with CEQA, (2) with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment, and (3) the MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Planning Commission. Based on those findings, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02, adopting the MND and MMRP for the Project, and approving the Exception to Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and the Development Plan.

(d) Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing, including the staff report and oral testimony, the City Council hereby sustains the Planning Commission’s adoption of the MND and MMRP for the Project, attached as Exhibit “B” to Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02.

Section 7. **Findings for Approval of Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.** The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the Planning Commission’s approval of an exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, should be sustained because:

(a) There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property, including, but not limited to, size, shape, or topographical conditions, or existing road alignment and width, in that Lots 3-9 have only one vehicular access from the interior street of the proposed subdivision by design (as illustrated on the modified Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 and the Conceptual Landscape Plan, which includes the Wall Plan);

(b) The granting of the modification will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare in that a community perimeter wall is proposed to be located on the rear lot lines of interior lots, thereby preventing multiple vehicular access points onto the Lots 3-9 and creating a lot design and layout similar to the proposed interior lots; and

(c) The granting of the modification will not be damaging to other property in the vicinity in that the proposed modified Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 creates a unified and cohesive community and the proposed Conceptual Landscape Plan creates a desirable streetscape along Opal Street.

Section 8. **Findings for Approval of Modified Tentative Tract Map No. 37211.** The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the
Planning Commission’s approval of the proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 should be sustained, with modifications, because:

(a) The proposed land division, as modified, is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan. The proposed modified Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 is consistent with the requirements of the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation, which permits up to five (5) dwelling units per acre. The proposed modified Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 will facilitate the construction of forty-one (41) single family homes at a density of 3.9 dwelling units per acre, which is below the maximum allowable density for the MDR land use designation;

(b) The design or improvement of the proposed modified land division is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan in that the proposed layout of the forty-one (41) parcels is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan;

(c) The site of the proposed modified land division is physically suitable for the type of development in that it is a relatively flat, undeveloped, vacant lot located adjacent to other single-family residential land uses, with adequate water and sewer connections and public services are available to the site;

(d) The site of the proposed modified land division is physically suitable for the proposed density of the development in that it proposes forty-one (41) single-family residential dwelling units at a density of 3.9 dwelling units per acre, which is below the maximum allowable density under the MDR land use designation;

(e) The design of the proposed modified land division or proposed modified improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat in that the subject site is highly disturbed and occupied by ruderal flora and bare ground. Because of the existing degraded site condition, the absence of special-status plant communities, and overall low potential for most special-status species to utilize or reside on-site, the design of the proposed modified land division and the proposed modified improvements are not expected to directly impact federal or state-listed threatened or endangered species;

(f) The design of the proposed modified land division or the type of improvements are not likely to cause serious public health problems. An Initial Study was prepared that evaluated potential effects with respect to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The MND determined that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because mitigation measures have been required or revisions in the Project have been made or agreed to by the Applicant. Furthermore a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) report prepared for the proposed Project did not reveal evidence of a recognized environmental condition in connection with the subject site. The Initial Study determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence
that the proposed Project may have a significant effect on the environment. As such, the proposed Project will not cause serious public health problems; and

(g) The design of the proposed modified land division or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed modified land division in that there are no on-site easements within the subject site, the proposed modified Project will connect to existing water and sewer lines located on Canal Street, Opal Street, and Pacific Avenue, and all proposed utilities are required to be undergrounded.

Section 9. Findings for Denial of Development Plan. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the Appeal of Appellant concerning the Planning Commission’s approval of the proposed Development Plan should be sustained and the Development Plan should be denied because:

(a) The proposed 4.6 dwelling unit per acre density and reduced average lot widths are incompatible with the surrounding R-1 zoned parcels. Furthermore, the City Council finds that since the Development Plan is only permitted within the R-4 zone, that by denying the R-4 zone change request, the Development Plan is no longer valid within the existing R-1 zone.

Section 10. Approval of Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 with Conditions. Based on the foregoing, the City Council hereby sustains the Planning Commission’s approval of an Exception to Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, with modifications, to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 10.4 combined gross acres into forty-one (41) (not forty-eight (48)) single-family residential lots, two (2) water quality basin lots, and three (3) lettered street lots on real property located at the intersection of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60, and east of Pacific Avenue, subject to the recommended conditions of approval attached hereto as Exhibit “A”, and denies the Appeal of the Appellant concerning the Exception to Subsection G. of Section 7.10.080 of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and Tentative Tract Map No. 37211. The Planning Commission’s approval of the Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 is conditioned upon the City Council’s adoption of an ordinance denying Change of Zone No. 17033, and the Commission’s approval shall not take effect until the effective date of the ordinance denying Change of Zone No. 17003.

Section 11. Denial of Development Plan. Based on the foregoing, the City Council hereby sustains the Appeal of Appellant concerning the Development Plan and denies the application for the Development Plan.

Section 12. 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 21st 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. 2019-03 (a) was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 21st 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 21st day of March, 2019.

___________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
EXHIBIT “A”

Conditions of Approval
EXHIBIT A OF ATTACHMENT 5

Recommended Conditions of Approval
EXHIBIT “A”

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR MA17099 (TTM37211)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. **PROJECT PERMITTED.** Master Application (MA) No. 17099: Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211 and Exception to Section 7.10.080 (G) is for the approval to subdivide a combined 10.4 property into 41 single-family residential lots with two (2) water quality basin lots (Lot A & B) and three (3) lettered street lots (A-C). An exception to Section 7.10.080 (G) of Title 7 (Subdivisions) for double frontage lots on Lots 3-9 is also included. The property is located at the SEC of Canal and Opal Streets, north of State Route 60 Fwy and east of Pacific Avenue, APNS: 177-130-007 & 177-142-018.

2. **INDEMNIFY CITY.** The applicant, the property owner or other holder of the right to the development entitlement(s) or permit(s) approved by the City for the project, if different from the applicant (herein, collectively, the “Indemnitor”), shall indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the City of Jurupa Valley and its elected city council, its appointed boards, commissions, and committees, and its officials, employees, and agents (herein, collectively, the “Indemnitees”) from and against any and all claims, liabilities, losses, fines, penalties, and expenses, including without limitation litigation expenses and attorney’s fees, arising out of either (i) the City’s approval of the project, including without limitation any judicial or administrative proceeding initiated or maintained by any person or entity challenging the validity or enforceability of any City permit or approval relating to the project, any condition of approval imposed by City on such permit or approval, and any finding or determination made and any other action taken by any of the Indemnitees in conjunction with such permit or approval, including without limitation any action taken pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), or (ii) the acts, omissions, or operations of the Indemnitor and the directors, officers, members, partners, employees, agents, contractors, and subcontractors of each person or entity comprising the Indemnitor with respect to the ownership, planning, design, construction, and maintenance of the project and the property for which the project is being approved. The City shall notify the Indemnitor of any claim, lawsuit, or other judicial or administrative proceeding (herein, an “Action”) within the scope of this indemnity obligation and request that the Indemnitor defend such Action with legal counsel reasonably satisfactory to the City. If the Indemnitor fails to so defend the Action, the City shall have the right but not the obligation to do so and, if it does, the Indemnitor shall promptly pay the City’s full cost thereof. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the indemnity obligation under clause (ii) of the first sentence of this condition shall not apply to the extent the claim arises out of the willful misconduct or the sole active negligence of the City.

3. **CONSENT TO CONDITIONS.** Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to the required conditions of approval to the Planning Director or designee.

4. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM.** Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the owner or designee shall submit written consent to having received a copy of the “Applicant’s Acknowledgement of Comments and Code Information from
Internal/External Agencies”. The receipt form shall be given to the Planning Director or designee.

5. **MITIGATION MEASURES.** This project shall be subject to the mitigation measures adopted with the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) prepared for the project and included with these conditions of approval.

6. **FEES.** The approval of MA17099 (TTM37211) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

7. **CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA).** This project is approved subject to the provisions of a Mitigated Negative Declaration. Within forty-eight (48) hours of final approval for this project, the owner or designee shall deliver to the Planning Department a check payable to the Riverside County Clerk in the amount of $2,330.75 (includes $50.00 County Clerk Processing Fee) or the fees that are currently in effect at the time. This will enable the City to file the Notice of Determination.

8. **COPIED CONDITIONS.** Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the owner or designee shall include within the first four pages of the working drawings a list of all conditions of approval imposed by the project’s final approval.

9. **APPROVAL PERIOD – TENTATIVE TRACT MAP.** An approved or conditionally approved tentative tract map shall expire 36 months after such approval unless, within that period of time, a final map shall have been approved and filed with the County Recorder. Prior to the expiration date, the land divider may apply in writing for an extension of time pursuant to Title 7 (Subdivisions). If the tentative map expires before the recordation of the final map, or any phase thereof, no recordation of the final map, or any phase thereof, shall be permitted. The variance conditionally approved in connection with this land division may be used during the same period of time that the land division approval may be used; otherwise the variance shall be null and void.

10. **CONFORMANCE TO APPROVED EXHIBITS.** The project shall be in conformance to the approved plans (listed below) with any changes in accordance to these conditions of approval:

    a. Tentative Tract Map No. 37211: prepared by Proactive Engineering Consultants West, Inc. dated 9/14/16 (Revised 3/5/19) and signed by George A. Lenfestey, R.C.E.

    b. Conceptual Landscape Plans (Wall/Fence and Maintenance Plan included) dated April 2017 (Revised March 2019)

11. **ON-SITE LANDSCAPING.** Prior to the issuance of any Building permit, the applicant shall submit a "Professional Services (PROS)" application (with current fees) and the following items for Planning Director review and approval:

    a. The total cost estimate of landscaping, irrigation, and one-year of maintenance.

    b. Completed City Faithful Performance Bond for Landscape Improvements form with original signatures after the City provides the applicant with the required amount of bond.

    c. Completed City Landscape Agreement with original signatures after the City has reviewed the submitted cost estimate.
d. Final landscape, maintenance, planting, and irrigation plans and digital copies (CD format). The plans shall include the following:
   i. Compliance with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Biological Resources Mitigation Measure BIO-6-Tree Preservation and Replacement.
   ii. Compliance with approved Development Plan.
   iii. Compliance with Title 9 (Planning and Zoning) landscaping requirements.

e. STREET TREES. Street trees and related security and agreements are required pursuant to Chapter 7.55 of Title 7 (Subdivisions). Tree size, specimen and installation shall be under the direction of the Engineering Department if they are within the public right-of-way.

Prior to the final inspection of any Building permit, the Landscape Architect of Record shall conduct an inspection and submit a letter to the City of Jurupa Valley once s/he has deemed the installation is in conformance to the approved plans. Following the inspection of the Landscape Architect of Record, the applicant shall schedule a City inspection with the City’s landscape architect.

12. MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF SOLID FENCING AND WALLS WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK. No solid fencing or wall shall exceed 42 inches in height within the front setback. For Lots 2, 16 and 18, no SOLID walls EXCEEDING 42-INCHES IN HEIGHT shall be placed within 30 feet of the front yard area.

13. BLOCK WALL FOR INTERIOR AND SIDE LOT LINES. Block walls shall be used for interior side lot lines. Decorative wrought iron gates shall be used on all side gates at individual parcels.

Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a Wall and Fence plan that is consistent with this condition to the Planning Department for review and approval.

14. GRAFFITI PROTECTION FOR WALLS. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit a wall plan that includes anti-graffiti coating or protection for the exterior side of all perimeter walls for City review and approval. The applicant shall remove any graffiti on the property as soon as possible. In addition, if the applicant was notified by the City, the applicant shall remove the graffiti within seven (7) days of the City’s notice.

15. TWO-CAR GARAGE PER DWELLING UNIT. All residential units shall have a minimum two-car garage with automatic sectional roll-up doors. No garage conversions are permitted and units must maintain two-car covered spaces at all times.

16. JURUPA AREA RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit proof of satisfying any fees, dedications, or requirements by the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District to the Building Official.

17. MULTIPLE SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN MITIGATION FEE (ORD. NO. 810). The applicant shall pay any owed fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 810. In order for the agency to determine that the project qualifies for any exemptions for any of
the subject fees, the applicant needs to submit sufficient evidence to the City to
demonstrate that it qualifies for the exemption.

18. SALE OF INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS. No structure constructed on Project site may be
sold until the subject Project on which the structure is located is divided and a final map
recorded in accordance with the City's subdivision regulations such that the structure is
located on a separate legally divided parcel.

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

1. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (ENGINEERING)

1.1. The use hereby conditioned is for a Schedule "A" subdivision, Tentative Tract
No. 37211; being a subdivision of Lot 5, Block A, Map Book 9, Page 34, of Maps
on file in SB West Riverside & Lot 3, Map Book 9, Page 34, of Maps on file in SB
West Riverside; more particularly Assessor’s Parcels Number APN 177-130-007
& 177-142-018; containing 10.4 acres gross, Lots "A" and "B" will be dedicated to
the City of Jurupa Valley, Streets A, B and C will be dedicated to the City of
Jurupa Valley for public road and utility purposes. Exhibit titled Tentative Tract
No. 37211, prepared by Proactive Engineering Consultants West, INC., dated
March 2018, is hereby referenced.

1.2. This land division shall comply with the State of California Subdivision Map Act,
the City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Riverside County Ordinance No.
460; as it pertains for Schedule "A" subdivision for residential purposes, unless
otherwise modified by the conditions listed herein.

1.3. It is assumed that any easements shown on the referenced exhibits are shown
correctly and include all the easements that encumber the subject property. The
Project proponent shall secure approval from all easement holders for all grading
and improvements which are proposed over the respective easement or provide
evidence that the easement has been relocated, quitclaimed, vacated,
abandoned, easement holder cannot be found, or is otherwise of no affect. Should
such approvals or alternate action regarding the easements not be
provided, the Project proponent may be required to amend or revise the permit
application.

1.4. Opal Street is a Local Road with a right-of-way width of 60 feet. The applicant will
be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on
Opal Street along the project's frontage. The improvements include, but are not
limited to, curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaped parkway and signing and
striping. The Project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared
and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.5. Canal Street is considered a Frontage Road with a right-of-way width of 52 feet.
Right-of-way dedication to provide 30 feet half ultimate-width from centerline to
the property line is required. The applicant will be required to prepare street
improvement plans and construct improvements on Canal Street along the
project's frontage. The improvements include, but are not limited to, curb and
gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway and signing and striping.
Improvements shall be constructed per modified Riverside County Road
Standard No. 107 and per section shown on the approved Tentative Tract Map,
or as approved by the Public Works Director. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.6. Pacific Avenue shall be dedicated as public road and improved as Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 36-foot paved road on a 56-foot right-of-way; curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.7. Street "A" and Street "B" shall be dedicated as public road and improved as Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 36-foot paved road on a 56-foot right-of-way; curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.8. Street "C" shall be dedicated as a public road and improved as a modified Local Road per Riverside County Standard 105 and the approved Tentative Tract Map, or as approved by the Public Works Director. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 33-foot paved road on a 48-foot right-of-way, curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscape parkway, boundary wall, and signing and striping. The project proponent shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.9. New street lights are required on Opal Street, Pacific Avenue, Canal Street, Street "A", Street "B", and Street "C". The project proponent shall cause streetlight plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer. Streetlights’ maintenance will be through Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) and per the agency requirements.

1.10. In compliance with Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Orders this project is required to comply with the Water Quality Management Plan for Urban Runoff (WQMP). The WQMP addresses post-development water quality impacts from new development and redevelopment projects. Guidelines and templates to assist the developer in completing the necessary studies are available on-line at www.floodcontrol.co.riverside.ca.us under Programs and Services, Stormwater Quality.

1.11. Electrical power, telephone, communication, street lighting, and cable television lines shall be placed underground in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance 460 and 461, as adopted by the City. This also applies to existing overhead lines which are 33.6 kilovolts or below within and along the project frontage and between the nearest poles offsite in each direction of the project site. All utility extensions within the subdivision and within individual lots shall be placed underground.
1.12. Owner will be required to form a Community Facilities District (CFD) for landscape maintenance.

1.13. An Environmental Constraint Sheet (ECS) is required to be prepared for this project for filing with the City Engineer at the time of recording the final Parcel Map.

2. PRIOR TO GRADING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

Grading and Drainage

2.1. No grading permit shall be issued until the Tentative Tract Map (TTM), and all other related cases are approved and are in effect, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

2.2. The Developer shall prepare a “rough” grading plan or a combined “rough and precise” grading plan for the entire site. The grading plan shall be prepared under the supervision of a civil engineer licensed in the state of California (Project Civil Engineer) and he/she must sign the plan. The printed name and contact information of the Project Civil Engineer shall be included on the face of the grading plan. The grading plan shall be approved by the City Engineer.

2.2.1. The grading plan shall provide for acceptance and proper disposal of all off-site drainage flowing onto or through the site. Should the quantities of flow exceed the capacity of the conveyance facility, the Project Proponent shall provide adequate drainage facilities and/or appropriate easement(s), if necessary, as approved by the City Engineer.

2.2.2. The grading plan shall provide for protection of downstream properties from damages caused by alteration of the drainage patters, i.e., concentration or diversion of flow. Protection shall be provided by constructing adequate drainage facilities including enlarging existing facilities and/or by securing a drainage easement(s), if necessary, as approved by the City Engineer.

2.2.3. Temporary erosion control measures shall be implemented immediately following rough grading to prevent transport and deposition of earthen materials onto downstream/downwind properties, public rights-of-way, or other drainage facilities. Erosion Control Plans showing these measures shall be submitted along with the grading plan for approval by the City Engineer.

2.2.4. Driveway approaches shall be located as shown on the referenced exhibit(s) or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer. The driveway approaches shall be constructed per Riverside County Standard No. 207. Existing driveway approaches, if any, shall be removed and replaced with full height curb and gutter and adjacent sidewalk to match existing, and landscape and irrigation improvements/modifications shall be shown on the street improvement plans.

2.2.5. Grading agreement and securities shall be in place prior to
2.3. Prior to approval of the grading plan, the Project Proponent shall prepare a geotechnical/soils report for the proposed grading, infrastructure improvements and post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs) for review and approval of the City Engineer. All recommendations of that report shall be incorporated in the grading plan. The title and date of the geotechnical/soils report and the name and contact information of the Project Geotechnical/Soils Engineer shall be included on the face of the grading plan. The geotechnical/soils engineer must sign the grading plan.

2.4. Prior to approval of grading plans, the Project Proponent shall cause a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to be prepared in conformance with the requirements of the City of Jurupa Valley and the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFC&WCD) for approval of the City Engineer.

2.5. Prior to approval of the grading plan for disturbance of one (1) or more acres the landowner shall provide evidence that it has prepared and submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) a Storm Water Pollution Prevention plan (SWPPP). The SWRCB issued WDID number shall be included on the face of the grading plan.

2.6. Any proposed retaining walls will require a separate permit(s). Permits shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any grading permit unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer and Building Official.

2.7. Where grading involves import or export the Project Proponent shall obtain approval for the import/export location, from the Engineering department, if located in the City. If an Environmental Assessment did not previously address the import/export location a Grading Environmental Assessment shall be submitted to the Engineering Department for comment and to the Planning Director for review and approval. If import/export location is outside the City the Project Proponent shall provide evidence that the jurisdictional agency has provided all necessary separate approvals for import/export to/from the site.

2.8. Where grading involves import or export using City streets the Project Proponent shall obtain approval of the haul route and a haul route permit from the Public Works Department.

2.9. Prior to approval of the grading plan the Project Proponent shall prepare a final Drainage Study, corresponding with the proposed improvements, for approval of the City Engineer. The drainage study and the grading plan shall be signed by a California licensed civil engineer.

2.9.1. All drainage and storm drain improvements shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District's standards. Drainage shall be designed to accommodate 100-year storm flows. Minimum drainage grade shall be 1% except on Portland Cement Concrete where 0.5% shall be the minimum.

2.9.2. Applicant is responsible for obtaining the necessary permits from Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
Conditions of Approval for MA17099 (TTM37211) (RCFCD) for connection, if any, to their facilities.

2.10. Prior to approval of the grading plan, Landowner shall prepare, or cause to be prepared, a final WQMP in conformance with the requirements of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCD) requirements for processing with and approval of the City Engineer.

2.10.1. The water quality management features and facilities to be constructed shall be shown on the project’s site grading plans or separate post-construction BMP improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer.

2.10.2. The property owner shall enter into a Water Quality Management Plan and Stormwater BMP Operation and Maintenance Agreement with the City. The agreement shall be recorded and a certified copy shall be provided to the City Engineer.

2.11. The Project Proponent shall prepare separate landscaping and irrigation plans for areas within the street right-of-way for review and approval by the City Engineer.

2.12. The Project Proponent shall prepare separate street improvement and street lighting plans for review and approval by the City Engineer.

2.13. If grading is required offsite, the Developer shall obtain written notarized letter of permission from the property owner(s) to grade as necessary and provide a copy to the Engineering Department. It shall be the sole responsibility of the Developer to obtain any and all proposed or required easements and/or permissions necessary to perform the grading shown on the site plan, tentative tract map and grading exhibits.

2.14. Where grading involves import to or export of more than 50 cubic yards from the site the Developer shall obtain approval for the import/export location from the Engineering Department if located in the City.

2.15. The Developer shall initiate formation of, or annexation to if one already exists, a Community Facilities District (CFD) for operation and maintenance of post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs).

2.16. Prior to approval of the grading plan for disturbance of one or more acres the Landowner shall provide evidence that it has prepared and submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWRCB issued WDID number shall be included on the face of the grading plan.

3. PRIOR TO MAP RECORDATION

3.1. No final Map shall be recorded until all related cases are approved and are in effect unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

3.2. No final Map shall be recorded until the formation process for the Community Facilities District (CFD) associated with this project is finalized.
3.2.1. Project Proponent shall prepare Landscape and Irrigation plans for CFD. Plans shall be prepared per Riverside County Ordinance 859 and per the City’s submittal guidelines and package.

3.2.2. CFD will include, but is not limited to, the maintenance of the following:
   a) Water Quality Basins;
   b) Tree trimming for trees within the public right-of-way, as identified on the CFD Landscape Plans and approved by the Director of Public Works;
   c) Landscape maintenance;
   d) Entry monuments.

3.2.3. The CFD will not maintain the parkway area in front of homeowner's lots. Property owners will be responsible for the maintenance of the landscape in front of their homes within the public right-of-way. The following exception applies: the CFD will be responsible for the tree trimming of trees along parkways on public right-of-way.

3.3. The Project Proponent shall provide improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer for all public improvements including, but not limited to, street improvements plans showing parkway improvements, road and pavement improvements, streetlights, landscape and irrigation, and water system.

3.4. Rights-of-way for streets and public utilities purposes shall be dedicated and shown on the final Map in accordance with these conditions of approval, the City’s Municipal Code, Riverside County Ordinance 460, and Riverside County Ordinance 461. It is understood that the Tentative Tract Map exhibit correctly shows acceptable centerlines, existing easements, traveled ways, and drainage courses, and that the omission or unacceptability may require that the Developer amend or revise the tentative map as may be necessary to allow a finding that the final Map is in substantial conformance with the tentative map.

3.5. Final Map shall show abutter’s rights along Opal Street. Lots 1 and 3 through 8 (inclusive) shall have access restriction to Opal Street.

3.6. The Project Proponent shall prepare bridge design plans per Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District’s (RCFC&WCD) requirements and for the City’s review, for the crossing of proposed Street “C” over RCFC&WCD’s channel.

   3.6.1. Applicant shall be responsible for cooperative agreement coordination and any fees involved in the development of the cooperative agreement between the Developer, City of Jurupa Valley, and RCFC&WCD for maintenance responsibilities of improvements.

   3.6.2. Agreement shall be executed and recorded prior to final map recording.
3.6.3. Bridge design shall allow for the following:
   a) Concrete barrier with chainlink railing on both sides of the bridge;
   b) Curb and gutter on both sides;
   c) 5-ft sidewalk along the north side.

3.6.4. The Project Proponent is responsible for obtaining all appropriate permits for RCB construction.

3.7. Applicant shall show dedication for Public Utilities purposes on proposed Street C to accommodate final location of RCB.

3.8. The Project Proponent shall prepare improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer:

3.8.1. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Opal Street consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible for the construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:
   a) Ultimate road and pavement conditions;
   b) 28-ft paved section on 60-ft right-of-way, with 30-ft from centerline of road to the easterly right-of-way line;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape, 5-ft sidewalk, and 2-ft landscape adjacent to property line, within a 12-foot parkway along the east side of Opal Street.
   e) Intersection improvements at Opal Street and Canal Street.

3.8.2. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Canal Street consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible of construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:
   a) Ultimate road and pavement conditions;
   b) 34-ft paved section on 52-ft right-of-way, with 30-ft from centerline of road to the southerly right-of-way line;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 4-ft curb adjacent landscape and 6-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway along the south side of Canal Street.

3.8.3. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on Pacific Avenue consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible of construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:
   a) Ultimate road and pavement conditions;
   b) 52-ft paved section on 100-ft right-of-way, with 50-ft from centerline of road to the westerly right-of-way line;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
d) 9-ft curb adjacent landscape, 5-ft sidewalk, and 4-ft landscape adjacent to property line, within an 18-foot parkway along the west side of Pacific.

e) Improvements shall be installed along the project frontage with the following exception: Curb, gutter, and sidewalk installation along the west side of Pacific Avenue shall extend beyond the project frontage to the north to Patricia Drive, and to the south to CalTrans R/W (SR60 crossing). Fair share contribution would be required in the event of improvement installation by others occurring prior to this development. Fair share contribution shall be for the Pacific Avenue improvements and in the amount of $39,992.

3.8.4. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on proposed Street "A" and Street "B" consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible of construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:
   a) Ultimate road and pavement conditions;
   b) 36-ft paved section on 56-ft right-of-way;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway on both sides of the street.

3.8.5. Project Proponent shall prepare plans for improvements on proposed Street "C" consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible of construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:
   a) Ultimate road and pavement conditions;
   b) 33-ft paved section on 48-ft right-of-way, with 27-ft from centerline of road to the northerly right-of-way line;
   c) Curb and Gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report;
   d) 4-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 9-foot parkway along the north side of Street "C";
   e) Curb adjacent landscaping and tract boundary wall along the south side of Street "C".

3.9. The following intersection improvements shall be included in the plans and installed upon approval:

3.9.1. The intersection of Pacific Avenue (NS) and Street "C" (EW) shall be modified to provide curb returns in ultimate location to provide northbound left turn lane and the following geometries:
   a) Northbound: One left turn lane, one through lane;
   b) Southbound: One shared through/right lane;
   c) Eastbound: One shared left/right turn lane;
   d) Westbound: N/A
3.9.2. The intersection of Street "A" (NS) and Street "C" (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on Street "A" and the following:
   a) Northbound: N/A;
   b) Southbound: One shared left/right turn lane;
   c) Eastbound: One shared through/right turn lane;
   d) Westbound: One shared through/right turn lane.

3.9.3. The intersection of Street "B" (NS) and Canada Street (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on Street "B" and the following:
   a) Northbound: One shared left/right lane;
   b) Southbound: N/A;
   c) Eastbound: One shared through/right turn lane;
   d) Westbound: One shared left/through lane.

3.9.4. The intersection of Street "B" (NS) and Street "C" (EW) shall be modified to provide a stop sign controlled intersection on Street "B" and the following:
   a) Northbound: N/A;
   b) Southbound: One shared left/right turn lane;
   c) Eastbound: One shared left/through lane;
   d) Westbound: One shared through/right turn lane.

3.10. The Project Proponent shall prepare Storm Drain Line 'C' plans and submit to RCFC&WCD for review. Storm drain line shall be per RCFC&WCD's requirements.

3.11. The Developer shall be responsible for any match up asphalt concrete (AC) paving, and reconstruction or resurfacing of existing paving as determined by the City Engineer.

   3.11.1. Storm drain line shall be per RCFC&WCD's requirements.

   3.11.2. City will approve final plans as reviewed and approved by RCFC&WCD to verify compliance with City regulations.

   3.11.3. Storm drain line shall convey runoff from Opal Street to the Channel.

3.12. Should this project be within any assessment/benefit district, the Project Proponent shall make application for and pay any reapportionment of the assessment or pay the unit fees in the assessment/benefit district.

3.13. Project proponent shall provide clearance letter from water and sewer utility purveyor, that all and any conditions by the water and sewer utility purveyor (if any) have been satisfied or appropriately initiated to its satisfaction.
3.14. Project proponent shall provide supporting documentation for district formation with Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) for the maintenance of the streetlights proposed with this project.

3.15. Electrical power, telephone, communication, street lighting, and cable television lines shall be designed to be placed underground in accordance with Riverside County Ordinances 460 and 461, as adopted by the City. The Project Proponent is responsible for coordinating the work with the serving utility company. This requirement applies to underground existing overhead electrical lines which are 33.6 kilovolts or below along the project frontage and between the nearest poles offsite in each direction of the project site including services that originate from poles on the far side of the street. A disposition note describing the above shall be reflected on design improvement plans whenever those plans are required. Written proof confirming initiation of the design of utility improvements or relocations, issued by the utility company, shall be submitted to the Engineering Department for verification purposes.

3.16. Project proponent shall obtain approval by water and sewer purveyor for water system and sewer system improvement plans (if any). The plans shall be submitted to and approved by the appropriate service district and the City.

4. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

4.1. The Project geotechnical/soils engineer shall certify to the completion of grading in conformance with the approved grading plans and the recommendations of the Geotechnical/Soils report approved for this project. Minimum street sections and traffic indexes are to be according to Riverside County Standards. Final sections may be greater based on the final R values determined by a Geologist registered in the State of California, and as approved by the City Engineer.

4.2. A licensed land surveyor or civil engineer shall certify to the completion of grading in conformance with the lines and grades shown on the approved grading plans.

4.3. The Project Proponent shall prepare a precise grading plan, if precise grading was not included in a combined "rough and precise" grading plan. The precise grading plan shall be approved by the City Engineer. Grading agreement and securities shall be in place prior to the commencement of grading.

4.4. The site's BMP facilities and features shall be constructed as shown on the project's site grading plans or separate post-construction BMP improvement plans approved of the City Engineer. Post-construction water quality surface features and facilities such as basins and bio-swales are not required to be landscaped prior to issuance of building permits, but must be otherwise constructed and additional temporary erosion control measures in place as approved by the City Engineer.

4.5. The required domestic water system improvements, including fire hydrants, shall be installed and accepted.
4.6. The bridge design plans must be approved and signed by the City Engineer.

5. PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION (ENGINEERING)

5.1. The Project Proponent is responsible for the completing off all grading and construction of all infrastructure improvements within the public right-of-way in accordance with approved plans, with Riverside County Ordinance 461, as adopted by the City, and with all other applicable requirements, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Applicant shall ensure that streetlights are energized along the streets where Applicant is seeking Building Final Inspection (Occupancy).

5.2. The Project geotechnical/soils engineer shall provide a Final Grading Certification, certifying to the completion of the precise grading in conformance with the approved grading plans, the recommendation of the Geotechnical/Soils report approved for this project and the California Building Code Appendix J.

5.3. A licensed surveyor or civil engineer shall certify to the completion of precise grading in conformance with the lines and grades shown on the approved grading plans.

5.4. The Project Civil Engineer shall provide Record ("As-built") Drawings of grading and all infrastructure improvements.

5.5. The Project Proponent is responsible for completing all utility mainline and service line extensions within and serving the project site, including but not limited to, electrical power, telephone, other communication, street lighting, and cable television underground as herein before required, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer in writing. Utility extensions from the mainline or other points of connection within the public right-of-way require that the Project Proponent obtained an Encroachment Permit from the Engineering Department. Correspondence from the respective utility company approving and accepting utility improvements shall be provided from each respective utility company. The City will make a final inspection of work to verify that any impacts that the work might have had to other City owned infrastructure is restored or repaired to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

5.6. The Project Proponent is responsible for completing all landscaping and irrigation improvements within the public right-of-way as applicable. The Project Proponent shall provide a Landscaping Certificate of Completion to the City Engineer.

5.7. The Project proponent is responsible for the completion of all post-construction water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) facilities and features. These facilities and features will require operation and maintenance in perpetuity by the Property Owner(s).

5.8. The Project Proponent shall complete the formation of, or if one already exists initiate annexation to, a Community Facilities District (CFD) in order to provide funding for City Public Safety Services for each existing and/or new parcel in the proposed development.

6. PRIOR TO CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY (ENGINEERING)

6.1. Street ‘C’ bridge improvements shall be installed and accepted to the City
Engineer’s discretion prior to certificate of occupancy for lots requiring secondary access to Pacific Avenue through Street ‘C’, per the City’s Municipal Code and Ordinance 460.

6.2. Improvements on Pacific Avenue shall be installed and accepted to the City Engineer’s discretion prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy for lots on Street ‘C’ east of the Channel.

### TABLE A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geometric Modification</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERSECTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-Specific Intersection Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of Pacific Avenue (NS) and C Street (EW)</td>
<td>Modify geometries to provide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>NB</strong>: one LT lane, one TH lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>SB</strong>: one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>EB</strong>: one shared LT/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>WB</strong>: N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Provide curb returns in ultimate location to provide NB LT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of “A” Street (NS) and “C” Street (EW)</td>
<td>Modify geometries to provide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>NB</strong>: N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>SB</strong>: one shared LT/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>EB</strong>: one shared TH/TH lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>WB</strong>: one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Intersection to be controlled by Yield sign on “A” Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of “B” Street (NS) and Canal Street (EW)</td>
<td>Install geometries to provide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NB</strong>: one shared LT/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SB</strong>: N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EB</strong>: one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WB</strong>: one shared LT/TH lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Intersection to be controlled by Stop sign on “B” Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of “B” Street (NS) and “C” Street (EW)</td>
<td>Install geometries to provide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NB</strong>: N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SB</strong>: one shared LT/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EB</strong>: one shared LT/TH lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WB</strong>: one shared TH/RT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Intersection to be controlled by Stop sign on “B” Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Applicant hereby agrees that these Conditions of Approval are valid and lawful and binding on the Applicant, and its successors and assigns, and agrees to the Conditions of Approval.

Applicant’s name (Print Form): ________________________________

Applicant’s name (Signature): ________________________________

Date: ________________
EXHIBIT B OF ATTACHMENT 5

Mitigated Negative Declaration with Mitigation
Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
DATE: JANUARY 17, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

FROM: GARY THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER

BY: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 12.A

PUBLIC HEARING FOR RECONSIDERATION OF MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 17099: CHANGE OF ZONE (CZ) NO. 17003 TO CHANGE THE ZONING CLASSIFICATION OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY FROM R-1 (ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS) TO R-4 (PLANNED RESIDENTIAL) AND TO CONSIDER AN APPEAL OF TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 37211, SUBDIVISION OF SAID PROPERTY INTO 48 LOTS FOR FUTURE SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, THREE LETTERED STREET LOTS, 2 LETTERED LOTS FOR DRAINAGE FACILITIES, AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF ASSOCIATED ON-SITE AND OFF-SITE INFRASTRUCTURE. PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018). APPLICANT: (SEQUANATA PARTNERS, LP)

RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-02, entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR A PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION ("SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS") (48 UNITS) LOCATED ON 10.4 ACRES AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018)

2) That the City Council conduct a first reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2019-01, entitled:
AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY OFFICIAL ZONING MAP CHANGING THE ZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) FROM ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (R-4) ZONE.

3) That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-03, entitled:


BACKGROUND

On November 15, 2018, the City Council held a public hearing to consider a request by the Applicant (“Applicant” or “Sequonota Partners, LP”) for Change of Zone (CZ) No. 17003, changing the zone of a combined 10.4-acre property from R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) and to receive and file the notice of the Planning Commission’s decision to approve Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211, a subdivision of said property into 48 lots for future single-family residential development. The November 15, 2018 City Council staff report is provided as an Attachment to this report.

The City Council heard public testimony, deliberated on the project and expressed concerns with the density of the project and potential conflicts with the proposed second story homes and the adjacent, established single family residential development (see attached November 15, 2018 City Council Minutes). The City Council, on a 3-2 vote, denied the project. With the denial of Change of Zone (CZ) No. 17003, the Planning Commission’s adoption of Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01, became null and void.
Given the Council's concerns expressed at the November 15, 2018 City Council meeting, Mayor Goodland timely filed an appeal of TTM No. 37211 on November 20, 2018, so that all approvals come before the City Council and any changes agreed by the Applicant can be incorporated into TTM No. 37211.

On December 6, 2018, the City Council agreed to reconsider the introduction of Ordinance No. 2018-13, changing the zone of the subject 10.4-acre property from R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) and setting the public hearing for the reconsideration of Ordinance No. 2018-03 and the appeal of the Planning Commission's decision to approve Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211 (at request of Mayor Goodland). The December 6, 2018 staff report and minutes are provided as an Attachment to this report.

The City Council voted unanimously to set the public hearing to reconsider Ordinance No. 2018-03 and the appeal by Mayor Goodland of the Planning Commission's approval of TTM No. 32711 for the January 17, 2019 Council meeting. This report therefore, provides the analysis of the Change of Zone and Tentative Tract Map.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Applicant submitted an application for a Change of Zone from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) and Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37211 to allow the subdivision of a 10.4-acre property into 48 single-family residential lots with minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet; two (2) water quality basin lots (Lot A & B) and three (3) lettered street lots (A-C). The existing General Plan land use designation of MDR (Medium Density Residential) will remain unchanged. The project's community name is Sequanota Heights. The applicant is also requesting an exception to Section 7.10.080 (G) of Title 7 (Subdivisions) for double frontage lots on Lots 3-7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACREAGE OF PROJECT SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING POLICY AREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING ZONING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ZONING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOCATION

As shown on Exhibit 1, the project site is located north of State Route (SR) 60, east of Pacific Avenue, and southeast of Canal and Opal Streets. The property is surrounded by single-family homes to the east and west, State Route (SR) 60 to the south and Union Pacific Railroad to the north. Beyond the railroad tracks are industrial land uses. Exhibit 1 provides an aerial view of the project site. Exhibit 2 provides the existing General Plan Land Use (GPLU) designations and zoning of the site and surrounding parcels.
ANALYSIS

As the property is currently zoned R-1 (One Family Dwellings), the minimum required lot size is 7,200 square feet, with a minimum average lot width of 60 feet and a minimum average lot depth of 100 feet. Since the project proposes 48 single-family residential lots averaging 6,425 square feet, ranging from 6,000 to 11,734 square feet, with a few lots proposed with less than the average lot width and average lot depth, the project will require a Change of Zone from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) to accommodate the lots which do not meet the R-1 zone development standards.

A summary of the existing General Plan land use and existing zoning designations for the project site and surrounding properties is provided in Table 1 and maps are provided under Exhibit 2.

TABLE 1: EXISTING AND SURROUNDING GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>State Route 60 Freeway</td>
<td>State Route 60 Freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 2-5 du/ac and Highest Density Residential (HHDR)</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: City of Jurupa Valley General Plan Land Use and Zoning Map
GENERAL PLAN

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MDR)

The MDR land use designation provides for the development of detached single-family dwellings on parcels typically ranging from 5,500 to 20,000 square feet. The density range is from 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre, with a minimum lot size of 5,500 square feet to encourage clustering.

The project is consistent with applicable policies of the MDR land use and density level, which permits 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre. Under the current land use designation, up to 52 dwelling units are permitted. The project proposes 48 residential lots at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density.

ZONING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

R-1 ZONE (ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS)

The subject property is located within the R-1 zone and is subject to Section 9.55.020 (Development Standards), which states that the lot area of any parcel/lot shall not be less than 7,200 square feet with a minimum average lot width of 60 feet and a minimum average lot depth of 100 feet. The Applicant proposes to subdivide the 10.4-acre parcel into 48 lots as defined in Table 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT NO.</th>
<th>AREA (SF)</th>
<th>AVG. WIDTH</th>
<th>AVG. DEPTH</th>
<th>LOT NO.</th>
<th>AREA (SF)</th>
<th>AVG. WIDTH</th>
<th>AVG. DEPTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>65'</td>
<td>103'</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,170</td>
<td>59'</td>
<td>108'</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,853</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>127'</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,823</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>123'</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,441</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>118'</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,001</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>108'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,127</td>
<td>73'</td>
<td>121'</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6,380</td>
<td>54'</td>
<td>111'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,509</td>
<td>63'</td>
<td>121'</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6,210</td>
<td>62'</td>
<td>102'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7,606</td>
<td>66'</td>
<td>113'</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6,970</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>120'</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11,226</td>
<td>52'</td>
<td>154'</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6,252</td>
<td>52'</td>
<td>111'</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6,520</td>
<td>61'</td>
<td>108'</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7,176</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>118'</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6,949</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>115'</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6,035</td>
<td>59'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7,183</td>
<td>58'</td>
<td>112'</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6,188</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>117'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6,419</td>
<td>54'</td>
<td>98'</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6,340</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>105'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6,035</td>
<td>54'</td>
<td>102'</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6,493</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>108'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6,069</td>
<td>59'</td>
<td>102'</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6,645</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>110'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>59'</td>
<td>109'</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6,225</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>113'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6,158</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>112'</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6,938</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>115'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>110'</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6,849</td>
<td>54'</td>
<td>120'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***A*** 6,625 59' 108'

***B*** 11,724 99' 115'

As the majority of the proposed lots are less than the minimum development standard requirements within the R-1 zone, the applicant is requesting a Change of Zone to change the existing zone classification to R-4 (Planned Residential).

**R-4 ZONE (PLANNED RESIDENTIAL)**

According to Section 9.100.030, the R-4 zone shall not be applied to any area containing less than nine (9) acres. The subject site contains a combined total of 10.4 acres and is therefore qualified to be rezoned to R-4 with an approved Development Plan.

Pursuant to Section 9.100.050 (Subdivision and Development Plan requirements), before any structure is erected or use established in the R-4 Zone, there shall be a subdivision map recorded and a development plan approved as set forth in Section 9.100.060. The Planning Commission approved Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 and the Development Plan via Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02. The applicant intends to record the map and sell the entitled project to a home builder for future development.
LAND USE COMPATIBILITY

The proposed R-4 (Planned Residential) zone will enable the subdivision of a combined 10.4 acre parcel into 48 single-family residential lots ranging in size from 6,000 to 11,734 square feet and averaging 6,425 square feet. While adjacent property is zoned R-1 (One Family Dwellings) with single family residential development, the 7,200 square-foot lot sizes with typical 60 foot-wide lot widths are considered to be compatible with the proposed R-4 (Planned Residential) development standards.

While the R-4 zone minimum lot size requirement is 3,500 square feet, the project proposes lot sizes averaging 6,425 square feet, with lot widths and lot depths very similar to the R-1 zone development standards. As such, driving through the proposed R-4 zoned development project would be very similar to driving through an R-1 zoned project due to the similar lot width and lot depth dimensions.

The development of a 48-lot single-family housing tract, with quality architecture, landscaping and new public right-of-way improvements will serve to increase the overall property values in this neighborhood and create a cohesive and compatible neighborhood. Exhibit 3 depicts the existing and proposed zoning for the subject property:

EXHIBIT 3: EXISTING AND PROPOSED ZONING
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The City of Jurupa Valley has prepared and intends to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Project. The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration is supported by an Initial Study that evaluated potential effects with respect to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forest Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration determines that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made or agreed to by the Applicant. The City's decision to prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration should not be construed as a recommendation of either approval or denial of this Project. Planning Condition No. 5 requires all the mitigation measures of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to be as conditions.

The Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration dated June 27, 2018 (provided as an attachment to this report), contains an analysis of the traffic noise impacts from SR-60 on future residents of the project. Subsequent to the preparation and circulation of the Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration, staff asked the City Attorney if an analysis of SR-60 noise impacts should be required in the CEQA documentation (in light of the CBIA v. Bay Area Air Quality Mgmt. Dist. 62 Cal. 4th 369, 2015). In that case, the California Supreme Court determined that with limited exceptions, CEQA requires only that the lead agency analyze the proposed project's impacts on the environment — not the impacts of the existing environment on potential future users/residents of a proposed project.

As it applies to this project, for the purposes of CEQA, the analysis must focus on the noise added by the project to the noise levels at existing sensitive receptors in the area (e.g., nearby existing residences, schools, etc.). The analysis for CEQA purposes should not analyze the existing environmental noise (i.e. SR-60 Freeway) on the future residents of the project, unless there is substantial evidence that the project will have impacts that would actually exacerbate an existing condition. The analysis shows that the project will not exacerbate an existing condition (i.e. adding significant amounts of traffic to SR-60 Freeway thus increasing noise levels).

The noise analysis in the IS/MND is for informational purposes only and Mitigation Measure NOI-2-Sound Walls and Mitigation Measure NOI-3 -Interior Noise Analysis do not apply to the project for CEQA purposes.

It is important to note however, that although not a requirement of CEQA, analyzing the noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway on future residents of the project is an essential factor to protect the health of future residents. As such, staff is recommending a sound wall as discussed in the October 24, 2018 Planning Commission staff report.
Public Review Period

The public review period for the environmental document began on July 5, 2018 and ended on August 3, 2018. The City did not receive any comments.

CONCLUSION

The proposed Change of Zone No. 17003 is in conformance with the General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) and is compatible with the surrounding single-family land use development within the R-1 (One Family Dwellings) zone. The project will not be a detriment to the public health, safety and welfare and is compatible with the present and future logical development of the area, with recommended conditions of approval. Furthermore, the addition of 48 residential units promotes the City’s achievement for meeting its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) inventory as established in the City’s Housing Element.

The new neighborhood will serve to revitalize the underutilized parcel, visually improve the surrounding neighborhood, as well as foster an increase in property values and help the City attain its RHNA.

All required findings for approval have been affirmatively determined and staff therefore recommends that the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-02 and conduct a first reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2019-01 and adopt Resolution No. 2019-03, approving a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, (2) approving an exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Title 7 (Subdivisions) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, (3) approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 and (4) approving a Development Plan to Permit a Planned Residential Development consisting of a 48-lot subdivision on a combined 10.4 gross acre site.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

There are no financial impacts associated with the notice of decision or the Change of Zone as the Applicant has covered all associated costs for processing.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the project, taking the following actions:

   a) Adopt Resolution No. 2019-02, entitled:

   A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR A PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION (“SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS”) (48 UNITS) LOCATED ON 10.4 ACRES AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018)

   b) Conduct a first reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2019-01, entitled:
AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY OFFICIAL ZONING MAP CHANGING THE ZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) FROM ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE TO PLANNED RESIDENTIAL (R-4) ZONE

c) Adopt Resolution No. 2019-03, entitled:


2. Deny the CZ, which will deny the tract map by default.

3. Provide alternative direction to staff.

Prepared by:

[Signature]

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director

Submitted by:

[Signature]

Gary Thompson
City Manager
ATTACHMENTS

Added Attachment: Letter from Applicant (Received January 10, 2019)
1. Resolution No. 2019-02
   a) Exhibit A: Mitigated Negative Declaration with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
2. Ordinance No. 2019-01
   a) Exhibit A: Change of Zone Exhibit
3. Resolution No. 2019-03
   a) Exhibit A: Recommended Conditions of Approval
   b) Exhibit B: Mitigated Negative Declaration with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
4. November 15, 2018 City Council Staff Report (without Attachments)
5. Excerpt of the November 15, 2018 City Council Minutes
6. December 6, 2018 City Council Staff Report (without Attachments)
7. Excerpt of the Draft December 6, 2018 City Council Minutes
   a) Exhibit A: Conditions of Approval (located at end of both PC Resos)
   b) Exhibit B: Initial Study Checklist / Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (same as Attachment No. 1a)
9. October 24, 2018 Planning Commission Staff Report (without exhibits)
10. Radius Map showing 1,000 foot radius from project boundaries
11. Development Plan workbook
12. Tentative Tract Map No. 32711 and Development Plan (Sheets 1-2)
13. Architectural Set of Plans
14. Conceptual Landscape Plans (Wall/Fence and Maintenance Plan included)
ATTACHMENT NO. 7

Excerpt of the January 17, 2019 City Council Minutes
EXCERPT OF THE JANUARY 17, 2019 MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE JURUPA VALLEY CITY COUNCIL

12. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. PUBLIC HEARING FOR RECONSIDERATION OF MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 17099: CHANGE OF ZONE (CZ) NO. 17003 TO CHANGE THE ZONING CLASSIFICATION OF APPROXIMATELY 10.4 COMBINED GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY FROM R-1 (ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS) TO R-4 (PLANNED RESIDENTIAL) AND TO CONSIDER AN APPEAL OF TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 37211, SUBDIVISION OF SAID PROPERTY INTO 48 LOTS FOR FUTURE SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, THREE LETTERED STREET LOTS, 2 LETTERED LOTS FOR DRAINAGE FACILITIES, AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF ASSOCIATED ON-SITE AND OFF-SITE INFRASTRUCTURE. PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE (APNS: 177-130-007, 177-142-018) (APPLICANT: SEQUANATA PARTNERS, LP)

Rocio Lopez, Senior Planner, presented the staff report.

Mayor Berkson opened the public hearing and called for any public comments.

Paul Onufer, representing Sequanota Partners, LP, (applicant), spoke in support of the project. He outlined the project’s infrastructure improvements which include an improvement to the existing storm drain channel and the existing sewer and water lines. He added that the perimeter roads along Canal and Opal will also be improved with curb and sidewalk. He offered to answer any questions.

Laura Shultz stated that she was opposed to changing the zone as the increased density will provide a burden to the city and its residents. She encouraged the Council to abide by the General Plan and not approve the zone change.

Tamara Paul stated that she lives just north of this project. She voiced concern that Canal Street is so narrow that two cars cannot pass safely. She noted the existing traffic, stating that the infrastructure does not exist to add additional homes. She stated that there is not enough law enforcement in this area to support the existing residents.

Paul Onufer, representing Sequanota Partners, LP (applicant) responded to the previous speaker’s comments. He stated that this project allows for smaller lots, however, they are not proposing smaller lots as most of the lots are 6,000 square feet. He noted that most of the lots have a width of 65 feet with a depth of 100 feet. He stated that the overall density difference between an R-1 and an R-4 project is six lots. He stated that they are asking for a marginal increase in units to help offset the infrastructure improvements to the project such as the crossing at the Sunnyslope Channel to provide secondary access and the sound wall.

Further discussion followed.

A motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Anthony Kelly, Jr., seconded by Council Member Chris Barajas, to continue the public hearing to a later date.

Ayes: C. Barajas, L. Barajas, B. Berkson, M. Goodland, A. Kelly / Noes: None / Absent: None
ATTACHMENT NO. 8

October 24, 2018 Planning Commission Staff Report (without exhibits)
STAFF REPORT

DATE: OCTOBER 24, 2018
TO: CHAIR HOFFERBER AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR
BY: ROCIO LOPEZ, SENIOR PLANNER
SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO.
MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 17099: TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 37211, CHANGE OF ZONE (CZ) NO. 17003 AND EXCEPTION TO SECTION 7.10.080 (G)
PROPOSAL: PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION ON 10.4 ACRES (48 UNITS)
LOCATION: SEC OF CANAL AND OPAL STREETS, NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60 FWY AND EAST OF PACIFIC AVENUE
APNS: 177-130-007 & 177-142-018
APPLICANT: SEQUANATA PARTNERS, LP

RECOMMENDATION

By motion:

(1) Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-10-24-01, recommending that the City Council (1) adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and (2) approve Change of Zone No. 17003; and

(2) Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02, (1) adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, (2) approving an Exception to Section 7.10.080.G. of Title 7 (Subdivisions) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, (3) approving Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, and (4) approving a Development Plan to permit a planned residential development consisting of a 48-lot subdivision on a combined 10.4 gross acre site.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Applicant (“Applicant” or “Sequanota Partners, LP”), has submitted an application for a Change of Zone from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) and Tentative Tract Map to allow the subdivision of combined 10.4 property into 48 single-family residential lots with minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet; two (2) water quality basin lots (Lot A & B) and three (3) lettered street lots (A-C). The existing General Plan land use designation of MDR (Medium Density Residential) will remain unchanged. The project's community name is Sequanota Heights. The applicant is also requesting an exception to Section 7.10.080 (G) of Title 7 (Subdivisions) for double frontage lots on Lots 3-7.
TABLE 1: GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

| TOTAL ACREAGE OF PROJECT SITE  | 10.4 combined gross acres |
| EXISTING GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION | MDR (Medium Density Residential): 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre |
| EXISTING POLICY AREA | None |
| EXISTING ZONING | R-1 (One Family Dwellings) |
| PROPOSED ZONING | R-4 (Planned Residential) |

LOCATION

As shown on Exhibit 1, the project site is located north of State Route (SR) 60, east of Pacific Avenue, and southeast of Canal and Opal Streets. The property is surrounded by single-family homes to the east and west, State Route (SR) 60 to the south and Union Pacific Railroad to the north. Beyond the railroad tracks are industrial land uses. Exhibit 1 provides an aerial view of the project site. Exhibit 2 provides the existing General Plan Land Use (GPLU) designations and zoning of the site and surrounding parcels.

EXHIBIT 1: SITE LOCATION MAP
REQUIRED ENTITLEMENTS

Subdivisions are regulated by Title 7 (Subdivisions) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. This project is a Schedule “A” subdivision per Section 7.30.040, defined as: “Any division of land into 5 or more parcels, where any parcel is less than 18,000 square feet in net area.” Additionally, the action of the Planning Commission on a tentative Schedule “A” map shall be final unless appealed by the Applicant or any interested party.

As the property is currently zoned R-1 (One Family Dwellings), the minimum required lot size is 7,200 square feet, with a minimum average lot width of 60 feet and a minimum average lot depth of 100 feet. Since the project proposes lot sizes ranging from 6,000 to 11,734 square feet, with a few lots proposed with less than the average lot width and average lot depth, the project will require a Change of Zone from R-1 (One Family Dwellings) to R-4 (Planned Residential) to accommodate the lots which do not meet the R-1 zone development standards.

Additionally, Title 7 (Subdivisions) Section 7.10.080 (G) stipulates that “Lots less than two (2) acres in gross area shall not have double street frontage except that in hillside areas where the topography requires, lots may abut two (2) or more streets provided that the frontage and vehicular access is from only one (1) such street.” See Section for discussion of the proposed exception.

ANALYSIS

GENERAL PLAN

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MDR)

The MDR land use designation provides for the development of detached single-family dwellings on parcels typically ranging from 5,500 to 20,000 square feet. The density range is from 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre, with a minimum lot size of 5,500 square feet to encourage clustering.
The project is consistent with applicable policies of the MDR land use and density level, which permits 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre. Under the current land use designation, up to 52 dwelling units are permitted. The project proposes 48 residential lots at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density.

**ZONING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS**

**R-1 ZONE (ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS)**

The subject property is located within the R-1 zone and is subject to Section 9.55.020 (Development Standards), which states that the lot area of any parcel/lot shall not be less than 7,200 square feet with a minimum average lot width of 60 feet and a minimum average lot depth of 100 feet.

The Applicant proposes to subdivide the 10.4-acre parcel into 48 lots as defined in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3: LOT SUMMARY TABLE (NET AREA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOT NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the majority of the proposed lots are less than the minimum development standard requirements within the R-1 zone, the applicant is requesting a Change of Zone to change the existing zone classification to R-4 (Planned Residential), see Attachment 3.
R-4 ZONE (PLANNED RESIDENTIAL)

According to Section 9.100.030, the R-4 zone shall not be applied to any area containing less than nine (9) acres. The subject site contains a combined 10.4 acres and is therefore qualified to be rezoned to R-4 with an approved Development Plan.

Pursuant to Section 9.100.050 (Subdivision and development plan requirements), before any structure is erected or use established in the R-4 Zone, there shall be a subdivision map recorded and a development plan approved as set forth in Section 9.100.060. This project includes both Tentative Tract Map No. 37211 and a Development Plan, see Attachment 8. The applicant intends to record the map and sell the entitled project to a home builder for future development.

Planned Residential Development. A Planned Residential Development is a residential development that allows "permitted reduced lot area, width and depth requirements, and building setback requirements by integrating into the overall development open space and outdoor recreational facilities."

This project is being processed as a Planned Residential Development to accommodate the project’s reduced lot area, reduced lot with and reduced lot depths. The Development Plan provides ample front and rear yard open space as well as decorative neighborhood entry monumentation along Canal Street and Pacific Avenue, perimeter landscaping and decorative perimeter walls, see Development Plan and Attachment 10 (Conceptual Landscape Plan).

The development plan also conforms to Section 9.100.040 (Land Use Regulations), which requires:

A. The minimum overall area for each dwelling unit, exclusive of the area used for set aside for street rights-of-way, but including recreation and service areas shall be six thousand (6,000) square feet; and

B. The minimum lot area for the individual lots used as a residential building site shall be three thousand, five hundred (3,500) square feet. The minimum width of each lot shall be forty (40) feet and the minimum depth shall be eighty (80) feet.

Additionally, the proposed development plan meets the R-4 zone’s minimum yard setback requirements of five (5) foot interior side yard; 10-foot corner and reversed corner lots; and 10-foot rear yard setback. The subdivision proposes 48 lots with minimum lot area of 6,000 square feet, lot widths ranging from 51 to 99 feet and lot depths ranging from 90 to 120 feet.

While the front yard setback requirement is a minimum of 20 feet, Lots 4, 23, 30, 37 and 44 show a 19 foot front yard setback to the front porches. Per Section 9.240.180, a one (1) foot encroachment into required yards is permitted for structures not adding additional floor space. The remaining lots comply with the 20 foot minimum front yard setback area.

The R-4 zone is the appropriate zoning for this project as the zone is consistent with proposed MDR land use designation and allows for Planned Residential Developments with reduced lot square footages and reduced minimum lot widths and depths. The Change of Zone exhibit is shown on Figure 1-2 and Figure 1-3 of the Development Plan and Attachment 3. With the Change of Zone, the proposed Development Plan complies with the conditions of development set forth in Table 4.
### TABLE 4: CONDITIONS OF DEVELOPMENT (SECTION 9.100.060)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Complies?</th>
<th>Supporting Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A subdivision conforming to the standards and conditions of Title 7, as presently worded or hereafter amended, not inconsistent with specific provisions of this section shall be recorded. All lots not to be used for residential purposes shall be given a lot letter instead of a lot number.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Tentative Tract Map No. 37211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A development plan conforming to the requirements of this chapter and containing the following minimum information shall be approved by the Planning Commission.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>A development plan is proposed which conforms with the requirements of zoning code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of each existing and each proposed structure in the development area, the use or uses to be contained therein. Typical plans indicating use on a lot may be used.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Per Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of all pedestrian walks, malls, recreation and other open areas for the use of occupants and members of the public.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Per Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location and height of all walls, fences and screen planting, including a plan for the landscaping of the development, types of surfacing, such as paving, turfing, or other landscaping to be used at various locations.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Per Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans and elevations of typical structures to indicate architectural type and construction standards.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Per Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents setting forth the method of conveying title, the type of estate to be granted, the method of maintaining the open areas and service areas, and the conditions of use of the open or recreation areas shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Commission. The following minimum standards shall be maintained:</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Sheet 9 of 11 of the Landscape Plan and Figure 4-7 of the Development Plan shows the Maintenance Plan for areas outside of private property areas. As such, the homeowner is responsible for maintenance to their private properties and the CFD will maintain all other areas such as street lights, the two water quality basins, parkways, monument entry signs and graffiti abatement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Walls & Fencing

The Wall and Fence plan depicts several types of walls and fences on the tract.

A. **Perimeter Wall.** The City adopted the “County-wide Design Standards and Guidelines” upon incorporation. The “County-wide Design Standards and Guidelines” require the project to have a decorative block wall along the entire perimeter.
On the Wall & Fence Plan (see page 41, Figure 4-6 of the Development Plan and Sheet 10 of the Conceptual Landscape Plan), the Applicant proposes a 6 foot high decorative masonry wall from top of grade along the exterior of perimeter lots 1-8, 19, 21 and 40-48. Staff has conditioned that for Lots 2, 19 and 22, no SOLID walls EXCEEDING 42-INCHES IN HEIGHT shall be placed within 30 feet of the front yard area.

Reviewing potential noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway on the future residents of the project is necessary for analyzing mitigation required for this project. As such, the City is addressing any noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway to the future residents as part of the land use entitlement process and is conditioning the project to address noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway as follows:

1. Staff has conditioned that the Applicant provide a sound wall along the SR-60 freeway as outlined in Condition No. 19 to mitigate noise, fumes and visual impacts from the freeway to future residents.

2. In the event that the agreements and improvement plans related to the freeway sound wall identified in Condition No. 19 are not approved and executed by the required times, or that the City Manager otherwise determines that construction of the sound wall is infeasible, Applicant shall instead construct sound walls around all habitable backyard and sideward areas for all lots in accordance with the specifications provided in Exhibit C, Table 2 of the Noise Impact Study dated September 11, 2018, see Attachment 5.

- **Interior Side Fencing/Wall.** The “County-wide Design Standards and Guidelines” requires decorative block wall for interior side lines. The Applicant proposes 6-foot high block walls for interior lot lines. Staff will condition that interior walls consists of splitface material to comply with the guidelines.

Staff has placed a general condition pertaining to overall walls and fencing as follows: Maximum height of solid fencing and walls within the front setback. No solid fencing or wall shall exceed 42 inches in height within the front setback.

**Plotting of Lots.** The Development Plan indicates the locations of the building footprints and future residential units must comply with the proposed setbacks and layout per the approved plan.

**Landscaping.** Planning Condition No. 11 requires that the Development Plan comply with the requirements of Title 9 (Planning and Zoning) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal code, which includes the Water Efficiency standards. The Engineering Department has conditioned street improvement plans and separate landscaping plans for landscaping within the public right-of-way.

The Conceptual Landscape Plan includes minimum 24-inch box evergreen screen trees planted 30 feet on center along the entire southern side of proposed “C” Street. The trees will be planted adjacent to a proposed six (6) foot high screen wall and are intended to grow rapidly to help buffer the project from the existing SR-60 Freeway. Additionally, the project includes landscaped parkway adjacent to curb and gutter, a variety of shrubs, ground covers and vines.

**Architecture.** The architectural styles are Tuscan, Spanish, Traditional and Craftsman. These styles are synonymous architectural styles of Southern California and the Development Plan includes a rich color palette with a variety of roof, exterior architectural treatments and colors. The Applicant proposes six (6) different plans with three varying exterior elevations and a different floor plan per each of the six (6) plans as depicted within the Development Plan.
Models 1-4 feature two-car garages, while Models 5 & 6 feature two-car garages with additional storage space. No garage conversions are permitted and units must maintain two-car covered spaces at all times.

The proposed architecture and varying floor plan models meet the goals and policies of the “Countywide Design Standards and Guidelines”. The Development Plan will serve as a form of design guidelines to assure quality development when the project is ready to move forward with design of the specific dwelling units for the lots. As such, a Site Development Permit (SDP) would not be required for the construction plans, so long as the project adheres to the approved Development Plan.

Currently, there is no residential development being proposed with the TTM and Development Plan at this time; however, the Applicant intends to process the final map as quickly as possible and intends to sell the entitled parcel once the map has been finalized.

**Section 7.10.080 (G) (Through Lots)**

The purpose of Section 7.10.080 (G) is to prevent the creation of through lots with more than one vehicular access: "Lots less than 2 acres in gross area shall not have double street frontage except that in hillside areas where the topography requires, lots may abut two or more streets provided that the frontage and vehicular access is from only one such street."

The project area is not in a hillside area. Therefore, the provision is applicable to this project. Lots 3-7 within the project are considered through lots per this section as these lots have double frontage on both Opal Street and the proposed “A” Street.

Sequanota Heights meets the intent of Section 7.10.080 (G) for the following reasons:

- Lots 3-7 have only one vehicular access from the interior street of this tract by design (as illustrated on Tentative Tract Map No. 37211, the Development Plan and the Conceptual Landscape Plan, which includes the Wall Plan).
- The community perimeter wall is proposed to be located on the rear lot lines of interior lots, thereby preventing multiple vehicular access points onto the lots. It also creates a lot design and layout similar to interior lots.

Even though the project meets the intent of the provision, the applicant has submitted an application to request for an exception to Section 7.10.080 (G) since the provision is applicable, see Attachment 4. Section 7.10.010 (C) allows for applicants to submit a request for exceptions to any provision of Title 7 (Subdivisions):

"Exceptions from the requirements of this title relating to the design or improvement of land divisions shall be granted by the appropriate advisory agency or appeal board only when it is determined that there are special circumstances applicable to the property, such as, but not limited to, size, shape or topographical conditions, or existing road alignment and width, and that the granting of the modification will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare or be damaging to other property in the vicinity."

Opal Street borders the western edge of the tract. If the tract was designed to comply with Section 7.10.080 (G) by not creating any through lots, the tract's design would provide a neighborhood frontage street along Opal Street creating double street frontage on “A” Street, whereby the perimeter wall would be facing an interior tract street, furthermore negatively impacting six (6) lots (Lots 13-18) along “A” Street.
A condition has been imposed that prior to map recordation, lot access for the through lots shall be restricted along the public right-of-way, and on the final map, the applicant shall dedicate abutter’s right of access along Opal Street.

The proposed development plan creates a sense of community and produces a desirable streetscape along Opal Street as demonstrated in the Conceptual Landscape Plan. The current tract design creates a unified and cohesive community.

**TENTATIVE TRACT MAP**

Subdivisions are regulated by Title 7 (Subdivisions) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. This project is a Schedule “A” subdivision per Section 7.30.040, defined as: “Any division of land into 5 or more parcels, where any parcel is less than 18,000 square feet in net area.”

The proposed subdivision is consistent with the requirements of Title 7 (Subdivisions) – Chapter 7.15. - Tentative Maps. With the approval of Change of Zone No. 17003 and approval of exception to Section 7.10.080 (G), the project complies with all applicable development standards. The General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) permits up to five (5) dwelling units per acre. The project proposes 48 residential dwelling units at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density.

While lot sizes immediately adjacent to the subject parcel average 7,200 square feet, the project is consistent with the proposed R-4 zone and with other recently approved single family subdivisions, such as Highland Park, a 398 single family residential subdivision, with an approved R-4 Development Plan located to the north of Canal Street and east of Sierra Avenue.

**Secondary Access**

Per Section 7.10.020, General Street Design, of Title 7 (Subdivisions), “In order to assure adequate evacuation times, whenever lots of a proposed land division are located more than one thousand, three hundred and twenty (1,320) feet, or six hundred and sixty (660) feet in a high fire hazard area, from a publicly maintained circulatory road, alternate or secondary access shall be provided.

TTM37211 and the proposed Development Plan have been designed to show access to a secondary circulatory road (Pacific Avenue). C Street now connects Lots 1-39 to Lots 40-48 and out to Pacific Avenue via a proposed bridge over the Riverside County Flood Control channel (Sunnyslope Channel).

**Dedication and Public Right-Of-Way Improvements**

Opal Street is a Local Road with a right-of-way width of 60 feet and Canal Street is considered a Frontage Road with a right-of-way width of 52 feet. Right-of-way dedication will be required along Canal Street to provide 30 feet half ultimate-width from centerline to the property line.

Pacific Avenue shall be dedicated as public road and improved as Local Road. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 36-foot paved road on a 56-foot right-of-way; curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping.

The Applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements along the streets fronting the project. The improvements include, but are not limited to, curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaped parkway and signing and striping.

The project will be conditioned to annex into a Community Facilities District (CFD) in order to collect fees for the continual maintenance of the landscaping and lighting services within the tract, as well as maintenance to Lots A and B. The parkway will also be developed per Title 7 (Subdivisions) and underground utilities will be provided within the dedicated right-of-way.
Lots "A" and "B" will be dedicated to the City for maintenance and streets A, B and C will also be dedicated to the City for public road and utility purposes, see Exhibit 3.

**EXHIBIT 3 –PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY SECTIONS**

**On-Site Utility and Drainage Improvements**

Water and sewer service to the project site will be provided by the Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD). New water and sewer lines will connect to existing facilities and street, utility and drainage improvements will connect to existing systems located adjacent to the project boundaries within Canal Street, Opal Street and Pacific Avenue. The County Department of Environmental Health (DEH) has prepared the required SANS 53 clearance letter which states that RCSD will provide water and sewer service to the proposed subdivision, see Attachment 6.
Onsite runoff will be conveyed in the street and collected at catch basins provided at critical points. Offsite flows from the northwest end of the project will be intercepted and conveyed with a proposed Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District Master Drainage Plan storm drain pipe to the existing Sunnyslope Channel. Existing runoff on the westerly side of Opal Street will continue to be conveyed by the street towards an existing drainage swale that runs adjacent to project site and the State Route 60 Freeway. From there, the runoff will be collected by the existing drainage inlet and outlets to the Sunnyslope Channel. Treatment of first flush waters from the development will be accomplished by routing them through the proposed on-site water quality basins.

**Map Distribution**

The Subdivision Map Act requires a local agency to circulate proposed subdivision maps to the service providers (Fire, Sheriff, School District, etc.) and utility companies. This allows each entity the opportunity to review the proposal and determine the impacts of the subdivision relative to their services. Staff circulated the TTM to abovementioned agencies and internal departments such as Engineering, Building and Safety, Public Works and Code Enforcement. Staff received comments and recommended conditions from several external and internal agencies. Comments from these agencies have been considered and incorporated as modifications and/or conditions to this project as deemed necessary by Planning staff.

**FINDINGS FOR TENTATIVE LAND DIVISION MAPS (SECTION 7.15.180)**

Pursuant to Title 7 (Subdivisions) – Chapter 7.15. - Tentative Maps, Section 7.15.180, a tentative tract map shall be denied if it does not meet all requirements of this title, or if any of the following findings are made:

A. That the proposed land division is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans.

   The proposed map is consistent with the requirements of the General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) which permits up to five (5) dwelling units per acre. The map will facilitate the future construction of 48 single family homes at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density. Furthermore, the map complies with Title 7 (Subdivisions) and Title 9 (Planning and Zoning), with the approval of Change of Zone No. 17003 and approval of exception to Section 7.10.080 (G).

B. That the design or improvement of the proposed land division is not consistent with applicable General and Specific Plans.

   The proposed layout of the 48 parcels is consistent with the City’s General Plan and, with the approval of Change of Zone No. 17003 and approval of exception to Section 7.10.080 (G), all proposed parcels meet the following development standards: 1) minimum 6,000 square foot lot size; 2) minimum lot width of 40 feet; and, 3) minimum lot depth of 80 feet. Additionally, the Development Plan meets the criteria within the R-4 zone.

C. That the site of the proposed land division is not physically suitable for the type of development.

   The combined 10.4 acre site is physically suitable as it is a relatively flat, undeveloped, vacant lot adjacent to other single-family residential land uses. The site is physically suitable to accommodate the subdivision and future development of 48 single family residential homes as there is adequate water and sewer connections and public services are available to the site.
D. That the site of the proposed land division is not physically suitable for the proposed density of the development.

The project is physically suitable for the proposed density of the development in that it proposes 48 single family residential dwelling units at a density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density under the General Plan designation.

E. That the design of the proposed land division or proposed improvements are likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.

The project is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially injure fish or wildlife of their habitat, in that the site is highly disturbed and occupied by ruderal flora and bare ground. Because of the existing degraded site condition, the absence of special-status plant communities, and overall low potential for most special-status species to utilize or reside on-site, the proposed project would not be expected to directly impact federal or state-listed threatened or endangered species.

F. That the design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements are likely to cause serious public health problems.

An Initial Study was prepared that evaluated potential effects with respect to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because mitigation measures have been required or revisions in the Project have been made or agreed to by the Applicant.

Furthermore a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) report prepared for this project did not reveal evidence of a recognized environmental condition in connection with this project site. The Initial Study determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. As such, the project will not cause serious public health problems.

G. That the design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements will conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed land division. A land division may be approved if it is found that alternate easements for access or for use will be provided and that they will be substantially equivalent to ones previously acquired by the public.

There are no on-site easements within the subject site and therefore the project does not conflict with any on-site easements. The project will connect to existing water and sewer lines located on Canal Street, Opal Street and Pacific Avenue and all proposed utilities will be required to be undergrounded.

Staff has found the subdivision to be in conformance with above findings and in conformance with the City’s Zoning Code, General Plan Land Use designation and Title 7 (Subdivisions), with the approval of Change of Zone No. 17003 and approval of exception to Section 7.10.080 (G). The land division is physically suitable for the type of the development and the proposed density. The design of the project will not cause substantial environmental damage, harm any wildlife, nor cause serious public health problems.
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The City of Jurupa Valley has prepared and intends to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Project. The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration is supported by an Initial Study that evaluated potential effects with respect to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forest Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration determines that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made or agreed to by the Applicant. The City’s decision to prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration should not be construed as a recommendation of either approval or denial of this Project. Planning Condition No. 5 requires all the mitigation measures of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to be as conditions.

The Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration dated June 27, 2018, Attachment 2 (b), contains an analysis of the traffic noise impacts from SR-60 on future residents of the project. Subsequent to the preparation and circulation of the Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration, staff inquired of the City Attorney if it was required to include such an analysis in the CEQA documentation in light of the CBIA v. Bay Area Air Quality Mgmt. Dist. 62 Cal. 4th 369 (2015). In that case, the California Supreme Court determined that with limited exceptions, CEQA requires only that the lead agency analyze the proposed project’s impacts on the environment – not the impacts of the existing environment on potential future users/residents of a proposed project. As it applies to this project, for the purposes of CEQA, the analysis must focus on the noise added by the project to the noise levels at existing sensitive receptors in the area (e.g., nearby existing residences, schools, etc.). The analysis for CEQA purposes should not analyze the existing environmental noise (i.e. SR-60 Freeway) on the future residents of the project, unless there is substantial evidence that the project will have impacts that would actually exacerbate an existing condition. The analysis shows that the project will not exacerbate an existing condition (i.e. adding significant amounts of traffic to SR-60 Freeway thus increasing noise levels). Therefore, the noise analysis with respect to the noise impacts form the SR-60 Freeway in the Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration is to be considered for informational purposes only under CEQA and Mitigation Measure NOI-2-Sound Walls and Mitigation Measure NOI-3 -Interior Noise Analysis do not apply to the project for CEQA purposes.

However, analyzing the noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway on the future residents of the project is necessary for the land use approvals required for the project. As such, the City is addressing the noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway to the future residents as part of the land use entitlement process and is conditioning the project to address noise impacts from the SR-60 Freeway accordingly. Please refer to the Walls and Fencing section of this report.

Public Review Period

The public review period for the environmental document began on July 5, 2018 and ended on August 3, 2018. The City did not receive any comments.

CONCLUSION

The proposed subdivision is in conformance with the General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) and the Zoning Code (with approval of Change of Zone No. 17003 and approval of exception to Section 7.10.080 (G). The project also conforms to
Schedule “A” map requirements of Title 7 (Subdivisions) and with other applicable provisions of the Subdivision Map Act. The project will not be a detriment to the public health, safety and welfare and is conditionally compatible with the present and future logical development of the area. Furthermore, the addition of 48 residential units complies with the City’s Housing Element Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) inventory.

The new single family residential development will serve to revitalize the underutilized parcel and visually improve the surrounding neighborhood, and provide much needed housing to the community as well as foster an increase in property values.

All required findings for approval have been affirmatively determined and staff therefore recommends that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 2018-10-24-01 and Resolution No. 2018-10-24-02.
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Letter from Applicant (January 4, 2019)
Sequanota Partners, LP

January 4, 2019

Mayor Brian Berkson & City Council Members
City of Jurupa Valley
8930 Limonite Ave.
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509

Re: MA 17099, TTM 37211

Dear Mayor Berkson & City Council Members,

I wanted to thank you for voting to re-considering MA 17099, TTM 37211, Change of Zone No. 17003.

I thought it important to point out a few salient facts regarding TTM 37211.

The proposed minimum lot size is 6,000 sq. ft. for TTM 37211. Eighty Seven percent (87%) of our lots have a minimum lot width of 55’. As a point of reference the residential lots that are adjacent to our site, off of Opal, Canal Street and Patricia Drive are 7,200 sq. ft. lots with minimum lot dimensions of 60x120’ (See attached Exhibit A). So from the street view it would be very difficult to notice any difference in the lot sizes.

The existing perimeter roads (Canal & Opal Street) will be with improved with curb, sidewalk and pavement adjacent to TTM 37211. In addition TTM 37211 plan updates the road circulation for the entire area.

Sewer and water upgrades. Currently, water service to the existing homes in the area is through a 2” water main. TTM 37211 will bring an 8” water main to the area. The homes located off of Patricia, Canal and Opal are currently on septic. Sewer will serve TTM 32711 and the adjacent properties will have the ability to tie into the sewer mains.

For the past seven months we have been working on a Public/Private partnership with the Riverside County Flood Control District (RCFCD) on the design of their master plan facility line C which is more fully described on Exhibit B (attached). Our draft agreement with RCFCD is that we fund the design cost of the facilities, process and pay for all environmental permits and RCFCD will fund and build the improvements. These storm drain improvement will eliminate seasonal flooding that occurs at the homes south of Canal Street, west of Opal Street. The facilities include inlet structures at the intersection of Canal and Opal Street then a 36 inch storm drain that continues south to the intersection of Street C and Opal. At this intersection there will be an additional inlet structure and then the storm drain line will transition west and increase to a 42” storm drain. The storm drain will continue in Street C until its terminus at the Sunnyslope
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channel. The facilities also include a box culvert crossing and additional improvements to the Sunnyslope channel. The estimated cost of the improvements are $1,200,000.

Finally, as a condition of approval we are to work with the City of Jurupa Valley and CALTRANS to design and pay for the construction of a 13’ sound wall along the north side of the 60 freeway. This will reduce the freeway noise to the existing 45 homes on Patricia Drive, Canal and Opal, as well as the proposed 48 homes in TTM 37211.

Thank you for your consideration and I hope you will conclude that the benefits of TTM 37211 will improve the quality of life for a number of existing families in the City of Jurupa Valley while also providing an additional 48 homes to future residents of Jurupa Valley.

Sincerely,
Sequana Partners, LP
By: JPMB Investments, LLC
It’s: General Partner

[Signature]

Paul Onufer
it: Manager

Enclosures
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Development Plan workbook
Sequanota Heights
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Development Plan
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Developed by:
Sequanota Partners, LP
556 S. Fair Oaks Ave.
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Prepared by:
JPMB Investments, LLC
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May 24, 2018
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Proactive Engineering Consultants West
Civil Engineer
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Architect
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I. INTRODUCTION

A. DOCUMENT PURPOSE

Pursuant to the City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code (JVMC), Title 9 (Zoning), Chapter 9.100, Section 9.100.060, (R-4 Zone Conditions of Development), in order to apply the R-4 (Planned Residential) designation to a property, a Development Plan must be prepared that contains the following information:

1. Location of each existing and each proposed structure in the development area, the use or uses contained therein. Typical plans indicating use on a lot may be used.

2. Location of all pedestrian walks, malls, recreation and other open areas for the use of occupants and members of the public.

3. Location and Height of all walls, fences and screen planting, including a plan for the landscaping of the development, types of surfacing, such as paving, turf areas, or other landscaping to be used at various locations.

4. Plans and Elevations of the typical structure to indicate architectural type and construction standards.

This document is intended to serve as the Development Plan for Tentative Tract Map 37211 (TTM 37211) with the temporary marketing name “SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS”, which shall be enforced by the City of Jurupa Valley per the final conditions of approval for TTM 37211. The development in the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community is required to substantially conform to the physical characteristics and design concepts set forth in this document. The City has the discretion to determine if implementing actions substantially conform to this Development Plan. If an implementing action does not substantially conform, a formal modification to this Development Plan may be required, which shall require approval by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to the procedures outlined in Section 9.240.440, Applications for Modifications to Approved Permits, of JVMC.

The Site Planning and Design Standards (Section II) set forth minimum requirements that must be adhered to when plotting a home on a residential lot. The Architectural Design Guidelines (Section III) and Landscape Design Guideline (Section IV) set forth the community’s design theme and contain photographs, illustrated sketches and other graphic representations that are to be used as visual aids to achieve the intent of SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS design theme and its key implementing elements.
B. PROJECT LOCATION

SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community is located on a 10.4 acres site (Assessor’s Parcel No. 177-130-007 and 177-142-018), at the south east corner of Canal Street and Opal Street, in the City of Jurupa Valley, Riverside County California. See SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS Vicinity Map, for Figure 1-1 and Figure 1-2 (Zoning Exhibit) on the following page.

C. SUMMARY OF CHANGE OF ZONE (CZ 17003)

Approvals granted by the City of Jurupa Valley to implement the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS project included, but were not limited to, Change of Zone (CZ17003), and Tentative Tract Map (TTM37211). CZ17003 changed the property’s zoning designation to Planned Residential (R-4), refer to Figure 1-2 & 1-3, zoning exhibits. This Development Plan is required as a condition of the R-4 zone designation. TTM 37211 subdivided the property into 48 single family residential lots, two infiltration basins as well as roadways and other supporting infrastructure.

D. COMMUNITY THEME

SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS is a pedestrian orientated residential neighborhood. Broad sidewalks connect the homes within the community.

SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS residential neighborhood features a cohesive mix of architectural styles that complement the community’s location and reflect the rural, agricultural roots of City of Jurupa Valley. The Landscape concept for SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS creates a sense of nature utilizing informal masses of deciduous shade trees, drought tolerant plant materials and accent design features such as slate stone.
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II. SITE PLANNING AND DESIGN

This section includes site planning and design standards that will be enforced to avoid monotonous, repetitive appearances and to encourage a pleasant, pedestrian orientated neighborhood environment.

A. DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

In order to facilitate the City development policy that new residential subdivisions be designed to function as neighborhoods, encourage local social interaction, and promote walking and health activity and incorporate best practices in sustainable development planning, this development plan provides for an application of the following R4 development standards to accomplish these goals:

I. The only permitted use of each lot shall be a single family dwelling, including permitted accessory structures.

II. Variation of setbacks is encouraged along the residential street frontages such that the front setbacks along any street average not less than 15 feet, but in no event shall any habitable structure be located less than 15 feet from the property line.

III. A minimum setback of 20 feet shall be required between a front garage and the front property line.

These and other Standards are summarized in the following table.
Table 2-1 Development Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Requirements</th>
<th>Yard Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area</td>
<td>Minimum Front Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 feet to garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 feet to living area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width</td>
<td>Minimum Side Yard (Interior &amp; Through Lots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Depth</td>
<td>Minimum Side Yard (Corner &amp; Reversed Corner Lots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>Rear Yard (Through Lots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Maximum Building Height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum Building Height (Other Structures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pursuant to Section 9.100.040 of the JVMC, a minimum of 6,000 square feet of land be provided for each residential unit, inclusive of the individual residential lot area and recreation areas but exclusive of areas set aside for street rights-of-way. The SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community provides 7.08 acres or residential and recreational land uses, which corresponds to approximately 6425 square feet per residential unit. Pursuant to Section 9.100.030, the R-4 zone shall not be applied to any area containing less than nine (9) acres. The subject site contains a combined 10.4 acres and is therefore consistent with this section. As such, SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS complies with Section 9.100.030 & 9.100.040 of the JVMC.

B. Plotting Standards

Detached single-family homes within SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS shall creatively use varied setbacks, architectural designs, outdoor spaces, varied garage treatments, landscaping and other innovative neighborhood design techniques to create a visually interesting street scene and identifiable character. Varying front yard setbacks will break up stretches of linear massing and when combined with private outdoor spaces and front yards will result in a welcoming street scene. The homes within SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community shall comply with the following plotting requirements:
1. Neither the same floor plan nor the same elevation style shall be plotted next to itself or directly across the street from itself. “Directly across the street” shall be defined as more than half of the narrower lot overlapping with the wider lot across the street.

2. Front yard setbacks to living spaces shall vary (where possible) by minimum of two (2) feet between adjacent homes. All setbacks shall meet the minimum requirements listed in Table 2-1, Development Standards.

3. Repetitive patterns of garage placement shall be avoided where possible. Unless a street incline prevents otherwise a left or right sided garage may not be plotted more than three (3) times in a row.

4. Single Story architectural elements shall be incorporated into the elevations of homes on corner lots. Examples of single story architectural elements include architectural projections, bay windows, porches, one – story living spaces and or a one story garage element.

5. A landscaped parkway shall be provided between the curb and sidewalk along the interior neighborhood streets. The landscaped parkway shall include a minimum of one (1) street tree per residential lot. Additional landscape requirements for residential front yards can be found in Section IV of this Development Plan.
III. ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN GUIDELINES

A. ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN

These guidelines convey the architectural design theme for the SEQUANOA HEIGHTS community. It is not the intent of these Design Guidelines to mandate that all of the identified design components and elements described herein be incorporated into the actual building designs. Rather, these guidelines serve as a “palette” of character-defining exterior elements that should be used in home design. It is expected that builders and their architects will prepare architectural building plans that substantially conform to these Guidelines, while also applying creativity and innovation in response to housing design trends, homebuyer expectations and other market conditions.

Six floors plans are proposed in SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS, as shown on Figures 3-1 through 3-6. All floor plans are designed for minimum 6,000 square foot lots. Plan 1, as shown on Figure 3-1, has 4 bedrooms, entertainment room and 2 baths, with an optional 5th bedroom and 3rd bath in lieu of the entertainment room with a two car garage, with 2,319 square feet of living space. Plan 2, as shown on Figure 3-2, has 4 bedrooms, loft and 3 baths, with an optional 5th bedroom or an optional flex room and a 4th bath in lieu of the loft with a two car garage, with 2,401 square feet of living space. Plan 3, as shown on Figure 3-3, has 5 bedrooms, teen room and 3 baths, with an optional 6th bedroom or optional den in lieu of the teen room with a two car garage, with 2,611 square feet of living space. Plan 4, as shown on Figure 3-4, has 4 bedrooms, entertainment room and 3.5 baths, with an optional grand dining room in lieu of the entertainment room with a two car garage, with 2,806 square feet of living space. Plan 5, as shown on Figure 3-5, has 3 bedrooms, Great Room/Den/Loft and 2.5 baths, with an optional 4th bedroom with 3rd bath in lieu of the den or an optional 5th bedroom in lieu of the loft with a two car garage and extra storage, with 3,042 square feet of living space. Plan 6, as shown on Figure 3-6, has 4 bedrooms, great/suite/loft and 3 baths, with an optional 5th bedroom in lieu of the loft with a two car tandem garage, with 3,134 square feet of living space.

1. Design Principles

While these Design Guidelines do not expressly limit architectural styles, the styles employed in SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS should be complementary and compatible with the styles described in this document. The defining features of the implemented architectural styles must be consistently implemented across the product offering to visually identify and differentiate the style. These guidelines allow for both traditional and contemporary styles, so long as the styles defining features can be visually identified, consistently applied and differentiated from the character – defining features of other styles implemented in the community.
Plan 1.2319
2319 SF
4 Bdrm/Entertainment/2 Ba.
2 Car Garage
9' Plate
Plan 4.2806
2,006 SF
4 Bdrm./Dining/3.5 Ba/Entertainment Room
Opt. Grand Dining
2 Car Garage
9' Plate
Plan 6.3124
1,334 SF
4 Bdrm/Great Room/Loft/3 Ba
Opt. Bdrm. 5
2 Car Garage/Tandem
8' / 9' Ceilings

Upper Floor - 1,368 SF

Lower Floor - 1,266 SF w/ Home Share
Lower Floor - 1,272 SF w/o Home Share
Home Share - 594 SF
The selection of architectural styles should be compatible with the massing of their floor plans; as such a certain style should not be forced onto every floor plan if it is not compatible. By emphasizing the use of distinct and identifiable styles, these guidelines discourage sameness and monotony. The multi-style street scene should be diverse as to form, massing, features, front doors, garage doors, materials and colors.

To some extent, resource efficiency also should influence the final selection of architectural styles. The concept of resource efficiency includes reduction of wasteful elements in the design and construction of the home as well as conservation of energy and water during occupancy of the home.

2. Form and Massing

Building mass and scale are two primary design components that affect how a building is perceived. The creative use of design articulation of the building’s visible facades, variation of rooflines, balance of roof forms and changes in vertical and horizontal planes reduces the perceived mass of the building. Even if the front elevation for adjacent homes is the same, variations in massing can provide an abundance of visual interest.

It is important to provide variation in front elevation massing along every street in SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS to provide diversity and avoid monotonous pattern along the streetscape. Examples of design features that can reduce a home’s perceived visual mass include covered front porches, window and door articulation, balconies, extended overhangs and decorative building edge treatment (cornice, eave quoins, etc.) and one-story living spaces. Design elements shall also be included on the rear facades and sides that are visible from public street or adjacent open spaces.

i. Home shall be arranged in a manner that creates a harmonious, varied appearance of building heights and setbacks.

ii. The front sides of a two story house must have one plane break at the first and or second story to avoid monolithic elevations. A plane break must be offset by at least two feet (2’).

iii. The front sides of a single story house must have one plane break. A plane break must be offset by at least two feet (2’).
3. **Roofs**

The roofline is a dominant visual element of a home. A roof’s composition should allow for a clean interface with the building and the building façade. A roof’s form and composition should reflect the appropriate roof pitch, characteristics and materials that are consistent and true to the selected architectural style and shall not be overbearing nor give the appearance of being disjointed.

i. Rooflines of adjacent homes should vary to create a variety of silhouettes and ridge heights, were possible.

ii. Roof pitches should complement the building’s architectural style. Secondary roof pitches can vary from primary roof pitches only if such variation is consistent with the architectural style.

iii. Roof materials and colors selected for an architectural style must reflect the elements that are typically used in that style.

iv. Roofing materials shall be non-combustible

v. Solar panels, if used should be integrated into the roof design as an unobtrusive element, were possible.

4. **Garage Location and Design**

To achieve attractive street scenes throughout the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community, particular attention must be given to the design and placement of garages.

i. Garage door style, color and design shall reflect the architectural character of the home and vary between adjacent homes, when appropriate. Acceptable garage door styles include, but are not limited to raised panel, recessed panel and flush panel.

ii. Windows shall be incorporated into the garage door design for at least 20% of all the garages. Where provided, garage doors windows styles shall correspond to the architectural style of the house.
iii. Architectural features, such as varied rooflines and second story setbacks, shall be incorporated into the garage design to reduce building mass and scale and create a visually interesting street scene, when appropriate for the selected architectural style.

iv. Landscaped vines and trees wells should be introduced to soften the visual impact of the garage door and accent the garage façade.

Adherence to the following shall be required in all homes:

v. Front facing garage widths limited to 65% of the house width.

vi. A 220 volt outlet shall be plumbed in the garage as a standard feature on all homes to accommodate charging of electric vehicles.

vii. A minimum 3 foot wide landscape area shall be located on both sides of a driveway.

5. Windows and Doors

Window and door details are architectural components that carry a strong visual impact through their placement and design.

i. Front door details shall be consistent with the architectural style.

ii. Feature window shapes shall be consistent with the architectural style.

iii. Accent shutters are not required, however, when used, shutter size shall be proportional to the window and shall reflect the architectural style.

iv. Window trim details with silver and gold frames or reflective glass are prohibited.

6. Building Materials and Colors

A complementary mixture of colors, textures and building materials is encouraged throughout the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community. Building material and color selection are integral components in the definition of a specific architectural style and also provide a varied streetscape design. Material breaks, transitions and terminations should produce complementary and clear definitions of separation while maintaining a prescribed color and materials palette. A variety of
exterior accent materials (e.g. brick, stone, siding, pre-cast concrete, timber) should be used as an integral feature in home construction to convey the selected architectural style.

A Color Sample is provided as part of this Planned Development documents as Attachment A.

i. Color schemes shall be simple, tasteful and consistent with architectural styles.

ii. A scheme of color values on all exterior elements shall be distinct from one house to the next with deeper tones encouraged to promote variations. This avoid monotonous appearance of multiple buildings of the same colors and tones.

iii. Material breaks and transitions and termination shall produce complimentary and clear definitions of separation, while maintaining a prescribed color and materials theme. This especially important in changing from stucco and or siding to masonry veneers.

iv. Stucco finishes on exterior walls shall be accompanied by at least one other accent material appropriate to the architectural style.

7. Outdoor Lighting

Lighting standards throughout SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS shall be similar in style, color and materials embracing a natural and minimal lighting approach.

i. All outdoor lighting shall incorporate, to the extent feasible and permissible under City standards, measures to aid in reducing light pollution. Such measures include; wattage reduction, directing lighting downward, shielding lights (or using “cut-off” lights that only illuminate the side or underside of a fixture, rather than shining skyward) and lowering the height of light poles to reduce the illumination radius.

ii. All outdoor lighting fixtures shall be focused, directed and arranged to minimize glare and illumination on public streets and adjoining property.

8. Mechanical Equipment

Mechanical equipment such as air conditioners, heaters, evaporative coolers and other such devices shall not be mounted on any roof and must be located behind privacy walls or landscaping. Solar panels are permitted, but not required, on roofs.
B. ARCHITECTURAL STYLES

The residential architecture of SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS shall include a complementary palette of architectural styles that are authentic to southern California landscape. The architectural styles expected in the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community, and their character-defining elements, are described below. The list of styles contained herein is not intended to be exhaustive or limiting. Rather, it is intended to demonstrate that acceptable styles shall have some historical authenticity to southern California, defined by a unique set of design characteristics. Contemporary interpretations of historical styles are appropriate.

The following is a list of architectural styles appropriate for the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community along with defining characteristics of those styles. The list of characteristics provides guidance for implementing the style, but not every listed design element is required to be applied on every home. The characteristics are only representative because an authentic style can have several interpretations. The only requirement is that definable architectural styles be utilized so that elevations are easily identifiable and the street scene is diverse.

Architectural styles include:

- Tuscan
- Spanish
- Traditional
- Craftsman
Use of stone, simple gable-ended architecture and, on occasion, hipped roofs. Narrow and tall windows openings and shutters with periodical use of arches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Features</th>
<th>Windows</th>
<th>Roofs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Heavy Use of Stone</td>
<td>▪ Deep Set (4” minimum) on front elevations</td>
<td>▪ Simple gable and hipped roofs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Plaster</td>
<td>▪ Narrow and tall</td>
<td>▪ Terra Cotta concrete tiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Minimal Overhangs</td>
<td>▪ Shutters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Symmetrical fenestration</td>
<td>▪ Awning shutters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Vertical forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>▪ Earth tones</th>
<th>▪ Vibrant accents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Accent Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>▪ Stucco</th>
<th>▪ Stone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## Spanish

Use of stucco, low pitched clay colored roof, shutters, periodical use of arches, small porches and decorative ornaments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Design Features</strong></th>
<th><strong>Windows</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Arched entries</td>
<td>- Narrow and tall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Symmetrical fenestration</td>
<td>- Shutters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minimal overhangs</td>
<td>- Wood or stucco accents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Small porches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Colors</strong></th>
<th><strong>Roofs</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- White</td>
<td>- Low pitched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Light browns</td>
<td>- Shingle or tile-barrel, “S” or red clay or concrete tiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dark accents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Accent Materials</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Wood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Occasional use of decorative ornaments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Traditional

Mix of architectural styles with simple roof lines, covered entries, symmetrical fenestration, periodic use of roof gables, small porches, evenly spaced shuttered windows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Features</th>
<th>Windows</th>
<th>Roofs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Symmetrical fenestration</td>
<td>▪ Symmetrical</td>
<td>▪ Simple gables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Minimal overhangs</td>
<td>▪ Shutters</td>
<td>▪ Concrete tiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Small porches</td>
<td>▪ Wood or stucco accents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Straight or curved columns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Pediment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Light browns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Dark accents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accent Materials</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Stucco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Columns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Craftsman movement was a comprehensive design and art movement that was born at the turn of the century in Southern California. The basis of Craftsman architecture is originality, simplicity of form and visibility of handicraft.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craftsman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Craftsman movement was a comprehensive design and art movement that was born at the turn of the century in Southern California. The basis of Craftsman architecture is originality, simplicity of form and visibility of handicraft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Tapered posts and columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Porches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Straight or curved columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pediment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Rich Earth tones, especially browns and greens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bright contrasting colors are often used to highlight architectural features.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accent Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Stucco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Occasional use of brick, concrete, wooden paneling/siding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Windows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Use of wide single dormers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wood or stucco accents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roofs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Flat tile roofs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Low pitched gabled roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wide, enclosed overhangs with extensive decorative supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Roof rafters usually exposed with decorative beams/braces added underneath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Elevation B - Tuscan

Elevation B - Traditional

Plan 1.2319
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Elevation B - Traditional
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Elevation A - Spanish

Elevation B - Tuscan

Elevation C - Craftsman
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IV. LANDSCAPE DESIGN GUIDELINES

These Landscape Design Guidelines articulate the various landscape design components of SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS thematic identity. SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS is a pedestrian orientated, single family community.

As demonstrated by Figure 4-1, Conceptual Landscape Plan, the landscape concept is intended to create a sense of community. The recommend plant palette and hardscape materials are designed to reinforce and emphasize the community’s landscape theme at major focal points.

Although a great deal of specific design information is provided in these Landscape Design Guidelines these Guidelines are not intended to establish a set of rigid landscaping requirements for the SEEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community. Rather, these Guidelines provide landscape principles and standards to ensure that plant materials, community walls, fences and compatible with the community’s design concept. As such, there will be at times be a need for an interpretation of the guidelines in keeping with the spirit of the community’s landscape concept. Regardless, it is important that the general landscape concept described herein be implemented to ensure a cohesive and unified community-wide landscape concept.

A. PLANT PALETTE

The plant palette for SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS complements and enhances the community’s natural setting, while also reducing irrigation needs and conserving water resources. The plant palette includes colorful plant materials all with evergreen and deciduous trees appropriate for the property’s climatic conditions. The plant palette also accentuates other design elements in the community, such as the recommended architectural styles, monumentation, walls and fences etc. Many of the plant materials are water efficient species native to southern California or naturalized to the arid southern California climate.

Table 4-2, Plant Palette, provides a list of plant materials approved for use in the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community. The utilization of some materials, depending on their site location, exposure and relationship to other influential factors may not be appropriate in all locations of the community. The plant palette listed in Table is provided as a base palette for the community’s landscape design. Other similar plant materials may be substituted provide the selected plan materials are water efficient and complement the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community theme. Plant selection for specific areas of the community shall have similar watering requirements so the irrigation systems can be designed to minimize water use and plant materials can thrive under optimal conditions.
Sequanota Heights Concept Statement

Sequanota Heights is a residential development that is located in eastern Jurupa Valley directly north of the 60 freeway between Pacific Ave. and Oak St. The area surrounding the site completely lacks any character with regards to landscaping. Streetscapes are absent, there are no sidewalks, and the residences lack any sense of design. With Sequanota, we aim to establish a character for this and future developments in the area.

The landscape concept for Sequanota Heights is derived from the local Jurupa Valley landscape. North-western Riverside County is primarily occupied by the California sage scrub (CSS) plant community; a community that is dominated by shrubs and groundcovers. The adjacent plant community, the oak woodland, has also been incorporated as the perimeter planting as it would naturally border the CSS. The plant palette for both the CSS and oak woodland will be kept simple. Where the two communities meet, an ecotone condition occurs. Ecotones contain the most diversity in plant and wildlife in nature. In these ecotone areas, additional plant material will be added to diversity textures and colors. The plants that have been selected for reach of these three typologies are either California natives or California adapted species that contain similar visual characteristics as those found in both the CSS and oak woodland. Plant material requiring low water will be used throughout the community.

- OAK WOODLAND PLANTING
- CALIFORNIA SAGE SCRUB PLANTING
- ECOTONE PLANTING
## PLANTING LEGEND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>O.C. SPACING</th>
<th>WUCOLS: REGION 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STREET TREES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROSOPIS X 'PHOENIX'</td>
<td>PHOENIX MESQUITE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>24&quot; BOX MIN.</td>
<td>PER PLAN</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QUERCUS AGRIFOLIA</td>
<td>COAST LIVE OAK</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QUERCUS SUBER</td>
<td>CORK OAK</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GROUND COVER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BACCHARIS PILULARIS 'PIGEON POINT'</td>
<td>DWARF COYOTE BRUSH</td>
<td>11,880</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>1' - 6&quot; TO 3' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAREX TUMULICOLA</td>
<td>BERKELEY SEDGE</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MYOPORUM PARVIFOLIUM</td>
<td>PROSTRATE MYOPORUM</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROSMARINUS OFFICINALIS 'PROSTRATUS'</td>
<td>PROSTRATE ROSEMARY</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA SAGE SCRUB PLANT PALETTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARBUTUS 'MARINA'</td>
<td>NCN</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>24&quot; BOX MIN.</td>
<td>PER PLAN</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLEDITISIA TRIACANTHOS 'MORaine'</td>
<td>MORaine HONEY LOCUST</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOPHOSTEMON CONFERTUS</td>
<td>BRISBANE BOX</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEANOTHUS GRISSEUS VAR. HOZONTALIS 'YANKEE POINT'</td>
<td>CARMEL CEANOTUS</td>
<td>18,977</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>3' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CISTUS SALVIFOLIUS 'PROSTRATUS'</td>
<td>SAGELEAF ROCKROSE</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DALEA GREGGII</td>
<td>TRAILING INDIGO BUSH</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ZONE 2 BASIN PLANTING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAREX PAREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEYMEUS CONDENSATUS 'CANYON PRINCE'</td>
<td>GIANT WILD RYE</td>
<td>18,370</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>HYDROSEED</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. F. SANGER</td>
<td>DEER GRASS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BACCHARIS PILULARIS 'PIGEON POINT'</td>
<td>DUNE SEDGE</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MYOPORUM PARVIFOLIUM</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA GRAY RUSH</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROSMARINUS OFFICINALIS</td>
<td>GOLDEN EYED GRASS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ZONE 3 BASIN PLANTING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAREX PAREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUNCUS PATENS</td>
<td>SISYRINCHIUM CALIFORNICUM</td>
<td>4,668</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>HYDROSEED</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SESLIERA CAERULEA 'VARIEGATA'</td>
<td>SAGELEAF ROCKROSE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESTRYNCHIUM CALIFORNICUM</td>
<td>TRAILING INDIGO BUSH</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ECOTONE PLANT PALETTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PINUS CANARIENSIS</td>
<td>CANARY ISLAND PINE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>24&quot; BOX MIN.</td>
<td>PER PLAN</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLATANUS X ACERIFOLIA</td>
<td>LONDON PLANE TREE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SHRUBS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BACCHARIS 'CENTENNIAL'</td>
<td>CENTENNIAL BACCHARIS</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>4'-0&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUNIPERUS SABINA 'TAMARISCIFOLIA'</td>
<td>TAM JUNIPER</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MYRUS COMMUNIS 'COMPACTA'</td>
<td>DUNE SEDGE</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WESTRINGIA FRUTICOSA</td>
<td>GIANT WILD RYE</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PERENNIAL GRASSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEYMEUS CONDENSATUS 'CANYON PRINCE'</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA MEADOW SEDGE</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>2'-0&quot; TO 4'-0&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. F. SANGER</td>
<td>DEER GRASS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GROUND COVER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAREX TUMULICOLA</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA GRAY RUSH</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BACCHARIS PILULARIS 'PIGEON POINT'</td>
<td>DUNE SEDGE</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CORPSOMA A KIRKI</td>
<td>SAGELEAF ROCKROSE</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANTANA NEW GOLD</td>
<td>TRAILING INDIGO BUSH</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MISC. PLANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pachysandra</td>
<td>CREEPING FIG</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>15'-0&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MACADENIA UNIGUS-CATI</td>
<td>CATS CLAW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARTHENOCISSUS TRICUSPIDATA</td>
<td>BOSTON IVY</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANTING NOTES:
- PROVIDE 3" LAYER OF MULCH (MIN.) IN SHRUB BEDS AND UNPLANTED AREAS; 2" LAYER OF MULCH IN GROUNDCOVER AREAS; 3" LAYER OF MULCH FOR SLOPES
- TREES SHALL BE STAKED WITH 2-3 STAKES AND 6 TREE TIES PER COUNTY STANDARD DETAILS. USE TRIPLE STAKING WITH 3" DIAMETER STAKES IN HIGH WIND AREAS
- ROOT BARRIERS SHALL BE INSTALLED FOR TREES WITHIN 6' (MIN.) OF HARDSCAPE PER COUNTY STANDARD DETAILS. ROOT BARRIER SHALL NOT ENCIRCLE THE TREE ROOTBALL BUT SHALL BE LOCATED AT THE EDGE OF HARDSCAPE AND EXTEND BEYOND CENTER OF TREE A MINIMUM OF 5' IN EACH DIRECTION
- TREES SHALL HAVE BREATHER TUBES PER COUNTY DETAIL
- PLANT SELF CLINGING VINES 15' O.C. ON ALL STREET FACING PERIMETER WALLS EXCEPT REAR YARD WALLS OF LOTS 40 - 49

### NOTE:
A MINIMUM OF (1) TREES SHALL BE UPGRADED TO 48" BOX AS REPLACEMENTS FOR THE TREES THAT ARE INDICATED TO BE REMOVED BY THE TREE SURVEY.
B. **MONUMENTATION**

Two entry points to the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS are provided from Pacific Ave and Canal Street. The primary entrance to SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS is provided from Pacific Ave. The primary entry includes an entry monument wall with a stucco veneer treatment, stone and precast concrete caps. Landscaping provided at the primary entry includes groundcover, low shrubs, border plants and larger specimen trees.

A secondary entry to SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS is provided from Canal Street at “B” Street. The secondary entry follows the design theme for the primary entry but at a scaled down design.

C. **STREETSCAPES**

Landscaping of the roadway streetscapes within SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS is critical in creating a sense of plan with maintaining a high quality community theme. The scale and proportion of the street scene provides separation of vehicular and pedestrian travel. Varied streetscapes are intended to create a high quality, visual pleasing experience at the pedestrian and vehicular level. Streetscapes throughout the community are planed with a combination of street trees, low shrubs and groundcover. The landscaping plant palette for the streetscapes links the roadways to the rest of the community by providing visual continuity.

1. **Street C.** The landscape treatment along Street C is intended to act as a buffer between the community and the 60 freeway. The south side of street C is planted with evergreen trees 30’ on center.

2. **Opal Street:** Includes a 5-foot landscaped parkway, a 5-foot sidewalk and additional 2-foot landscape setback area between the sidewalk and the community’s perimeter wall.

3. **Local Street:** As shown on Figure 4-3 local streets within SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS feature a 5-foot wide parkway with street trees and turf and a 5-foot sidewalk.

   As shown on Figure 4-4 typical front yard landscape plan, the front yard of each unit shall include a minimum of five (5) 5-gallon shrubs, one (1) 24-inch box tree and one (1) 15 gallon or larger tree. Corner lots shall be required to provide landscaping between the community wall and sidewalk.
Sequanota Partners, LP
Sequanota Heights
Jurupa Valley, CA
Conceptual Landscape Design

Figure 4-3
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ENTRY MONUMENTATION

TYPICAL ENTRY MONUMENT ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 1'-0"

UNDERSTORY PLANTING
STONE VENEER
COMMUNITY SIGNAGE
PLANT PALETTES

OAK WOODLAND PALETTE

24" BOX TREE
- QUERCUS ANGUSTIFOLIA - COAST LIVE OAK

15 GALLON TREE
- PLATANUS RACEMOSA - CALIFORNIA SYCAMORE
- AESCULUS CALIFORNICA - CALIFORNIA BUCKEYE

LARGE SHRUB (2 TO 8 TALL)
- LOPHESTEMON CONFERTUS - BRISBANE BOX
- GLEUROPHYLLUM THUNBERGII
- LOHEA GLANDULOSA - HONEY MESQUITE

MEDIUM SHRUB (2 TO 5 TALL)
- CARPENTERIA CALIFORNICA - BUSH ANEMONE
- CALYCANTHUS OCCIDENTALIS - SPICE BUSH
- MAHONIA AQUIFOLIUM - OREGON GRAPE
- RHAPHIOLEPIS MAJESTIC BEAUTY

LOW SHRUB (1' TO 3' TALL)
- RIBES AUREUM - GOLDEN CURRANT
- ENCELIA CALIFORNICA - BROWN-EYED SUSAN
- TECOMA STANS - YELLOW BELLS

GROUND COVER/LAWN ALTERNATIVE (6" TO 18"
- RHUS INTEGRIFOLIA - LEMONADE BERRY
- SISYRINCHIUM BELLUM - BLUE-EYED GRASS

FLOWERING VINE (5 GALLON MINIMUM)
- MACFADYENA UNGUIS-CATI - CAT'S CLAW

CA SAGE SCRUB PALETTE

24" BOX TREE
- ARBUTUS UNEDO - STRAWBERRY TREE
- OLEA EUROPAEA 'SWAN HILL' - OLIVE

15 GALLON TREE
- QUERCUS AGRIFOLIA - COAST LIVE OAK
- RHAMNUS CALIFORNICA - COFFEEBERRY

LARGE SHRUB (2 TO 8 TALL)
- DENDROMECON HARFORDII - ISLAND BUSH POPPY
- HETEROMELES ARBUTIFOLIA - TOYON
- RHUS INTEGRIFOLIA - LEMONADE BERRY

MEDIUM SHRUB (2 TO 5 TALL)
- ARTEMISIA CALIFORNICA - CALIFORNIA SAGEBRUSH
- CARISSA MACROCARPA - NATAL PLUM
- LEUCOPHYLLUM 'THUNDER CLOUD' - THUNDER CLOUD SILVERLEAF

LOW SHRUB (1' TO 3' TALL)
- CISTUS X PULVERULENTUS 'SUNSET' - MAGENTA ROCK ROSE
- GALVEZIA SPECIOSA - ISLAND BUSH SNAPDRAGON
- SANTOLINA CHAMAECYPARIS - LAVENDER COTTON

GROUND COVER/LAWN ALTERNATIVE (6" TO 18"
- SANTOLINA ROSMARINIFOLIA - NCNN

FLOWERING VINE (5 GALLON MINIMUM)
- GELSEMIUM SEMPERVIRENS - CAROLINA JASMINE
- MACFADYENA UNGUIS-CATI - CAT'S CLAW
D. WALLS AND FENCES

The conceptual Wall and Fence plan for the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community is illustrated on Figure 4-6. As shown, the walls and fences are provided throughout the community to minimize roadway noise, maximize view of scenic resources, and increase privacy within each residential lot and increase safety for pedestrians along primary community roads. Community walls and fences are designed as an integral component and extension of the building design and surrounding landscape. Periphery walls can be integrated into the adjacent structure and extended into the landscape to help integrate the building into its environment. Gates should be complementary color to its fence or wall. Similarly, walls and fences shall be constructed of materials, colors and textures that are similar to and harmonious with the architecture.

The types of wall and fencing within the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community are described below and illustrated on Figure 4-6, Wall and Fence plan.

- **Community Wall.** Community Walls are general located along the exterior of the community and to separate private yards from roadways. Community walls will be constructed with 6-foot split face CMU and pilasters with a 4” precision cap. Color shall be Tan for the CMU Wall and Tan V CMU for the Pilasters. On the street side of the walls facing a street, climbing vines shall be included.

- **Interior Block Wall.** Interior block wall are provided between private yards. Interior Block Walls will be 6-feet tall and be made of Tan Precision CMU.

- **Open View Fence.** Open View Fences will enclose the two retention basins and a small portion along the south side of Street C at the Flood Control Crossing. Open View Fencing will be constructed of 6-foot tubular steel painted black.
E. GENERAL LANDSCAPE STANDARDS

General landscape standards for the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community are provided below and on the following pages:

1. Required Planting and Irrigation Plan

A landscape architect licensed in California shall be retained to prepare the planting and irrigation plans for all public areas. Arrangement of plants should be relatively informal; plants should be placed to allow them to grow to their natural sizes and forms. Sheared hedges should be kept at a minimum.

2. Irrigation

Proper consideration of irrigation system design and installation in the climate extremes of the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community is critical to the landscape investment. In particular, the combined summer elements of heat and wind must be carefully considered in proper irrigation design and equipment selection.

i. All landscaped areas shall be watered with a permanent irrigation system with the goal to minimize water use and runoff.

ii. Irrigation systems that adjoin a separate maintenance responsibility area shall be designated in a manner to ensure complete water coverage between areas.

iii. All irrigation systems shall have automatic controllers designed to properly water plant materials given the site’s soil conditions.

iv. Irrigation systems for all public landscapes shall have automatic rain shut off devices.

v. Southern California native and drought tolerant shrub areas shall be watered using a combination spray and drip or bubbler irrigation to shrubs and trees. In addition, irrigation controllers should be evapotranspiration based and be capable of providing multiple repeat start times.

vi. All irrigation heads adjacent to walks, drives and curbs shall be of the pop-up type.

vii. Irrigation backflow prevention devices and controllers shall be located with minimum public visibility or shall be screened with appropriate plant materials.
viii. Irrigation systems shall be designed per AB 1881 guidelines and comply with the City of Jurupa Valley ordinance.

3. Ownership and Maintenance of Common Areas.

Ownership and maintenance responsibilities for common areas with the SEQUANOTA HEIGHTS community are illustrated on Figure 4-7, Maintenance Plan. Individual homeowners shall be responsible for the maintenance of public street landscape along their property frontage unless otherwise identified within their legal ownership documents. Private homeowners shall also be responsible for all maintenance within their private lot area as well as fences and wall on their internal boundaries. For all other areas of the community maintenance responsibilities shall be through a community facilities district.
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NOTE:
CONTINUES LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE PROVIDED BY
COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT.

HOMEOWNER MAINTAINED
COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT MAINTAINED

MAINTENANCE PLAN
LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE PLAN
TTM 37211 Development Plan
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Architectural Set of Plans
Plan 1.2319
2,119 SF
4 Bdrm./Entertainment/2 Bth
Opt. 1drm. 5 w/ Bath 3/Opt. Den
2 Bay Garage
9' Rate
Elevation A - Spanish

Elevation D - Tuscan

Elevation B - Traditional

Plan 12319
Elevation A - Spanish

Elevation D - Tuscan

Elevation B - Traditional

Plan 12319
Left Elevation A

Front Elevation A - Spanish

Right Elevation A

Rear Elevation A

Plan 1.2319
Left Elevation B

Front Elevation B - Traditional

Right Elevation B

Rear Elevation B

Plan 1.2319
Left Elevation D

Front Elevation D - Tuscan

Right Elevation D

Rear Elevation D

Plan 1.2319
Plan 2.2401

2,412 SF
4 Bdrm./Loft/3 Bath
2 Car Garage
8’/9’ Plates
Left Elevation A

Front Elevation A - Spanish

Right Elevation A

Rear Elevation A

Plan 2.2401
Left Elevation D

Front Elevation D - Tuscan

Right Elevation D

Rear Elevation D

Plan 2.2401
Elevation A - Spanish

Elevation B - Traditional

Elevation D - Tuscan

Plan 3.2611
Elevation A - Spanish

Elevation D - Tuscan

Elevation C - Craftsman

Plan 4.2806
Elevation A - Spanish

Elevation D - Tuscan

Elevation C - Craftsman
Elevation A - Spanish

Elevation B - Tuscan

Elevation C - Craftsman

Plan 53042
Plan 6.3124
3,134 SF
4 Bdrm/Great Rm./Suite/Loft/3 Ba
Opt. Bdrm. 5
2 Bay Garage/Tandem
8' / 9' Plates

Upper Floor - 1,360 SF

Lower Floor - 1,746 SF w/ Home Share
Lower Floor - 1,112 SF w/ Home Share
Home Share - 594 SF
Elevation A - Spanish

Elevation D - Tuscan

Elevation C - Craftsman

Plan 63124
Plan 6.3124
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Conceptual Landscape Plans (Wall/Fence and Maintenance Plan included)
Sequonota Heights Concept Statement

Sequonota Heights is a residential development that is located in western Jurupa Valley, directly north of the 60 freeway between Pacific Ave. and Oak St. The area surrounding the site currently lacks any character with regards to landscaping. Streetscapes are absent, there are no sidewalks, and the residences lack any sense of design. With Sequonota, we aim to establish a character for this and future developments in the area.

The landscape concept for Sequonota Heights is derived from the local Jurupa Valley landscape. Northwestern Riverside County is primarily occupied by the California sage scrub (CSS) plant community, a community that is dominated by shrubs and ground covers. The adjacent plant community, the oak woodland, has also been incorporated as the perimeter planting so it would naturally border the CSS. The plant palette for both the CSS and oak woodland will be kept simple. Where the two communities meet, an ecotone condition occurs. Ecotones contain the most diversity in plant and wildlife in nature. In these ecotone areas, additional plant material will be added to diversify textures and colors. The plants that have been selected for each of these three typologies are either California natives or California-adapted species that contain similar visual characteristics as those found in both the CSS and oak woodlands. Plant material requiring low water will be used throughout the community.
# PLANTING LEGEND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>O.C. SPACING</th>
<th>VEHICLE P.RISSE N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WUCOLS: REGION 4</td>
<td>OAK WOODLAND PLANT PALETTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>QUERCUS AGRIFOLIA</td>
<td>COAST LIVE OAK</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>24&quot; BOX</td>
<td>MIN. PER PLAN L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>QUERCUS SUBER</td>
<td>CORK OAK</td>
<td>11,825</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>3'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>PROSOPIS X 'PHOENIX'</td>
<td>PHOENIX MESQUITE</td>
<td>18,799</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>3 GAL</td>
<td>3'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>MYOPORUM PARVIFOLIUM</td>
<td>BERKLEY SEDGE</td>
<td>18,680</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>1'-6&quot; TO 3'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>ROSMARINUS OFFICINALIS 'PROSTRATUS'</td>
<td>PROSTRATE ROSEMARY</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>3'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND COVER</td>
<td>CAREX TUMULICOLA</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA MEADOW SEDGE</td>
<td>11,680</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>3'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND COVER</td>
<td>BACCHARIS PILULARIS 'PIGEON POINT'</td>
<td>DWARF COYOTE BRUSH</td>
<td>11,237</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>2'-0&quot; TO 4'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND COVER</td>
<td>MYOPORUM PARVIFOLIUM</td>
<td>PROSTRATE MYOPORUM</td>
<td>5,686</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>3'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND COVER</td>
<td>ROSMARINUS OFFICINALIS 'PROSTRATUS'</td>
<td>PROSTRATE ROSEMARY</td>
<td>5,686</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>3'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND COVER</td>
<td>BACCHARIS PILULARIS 'PIGEON POINT'</td>
<td>DWARF COYOTE BRUSH</td>
<td>5,686</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>3'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND COVER</td>
<td>CAREX PANSA</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA SAGE SCRUB</td>
<td>12,057</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>3'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND COVER</td>
<td>CISTUS SALVIIFOLIUS 'PROSTRATUS'</td>
<td>SAGELEAF ROCKROSE</td>
<td>12,057</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>3'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND COVER</td>
<td>CISTUS SALVIIFOLIUS 'PROSTRATUS'</td>
<td>SAGELEAF ROCKROSE</td>
<td>12,057</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>3'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND COVER</td>
<td>DUNE SEDGE</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA GRAY RUSH</td>
<td>4,658</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>HYDROSEED N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND COVER</td>
<td>SEISLERIA CAERULEA 'VARIEGATA'</td>
<td>GOLDEN EYED GRASS</td>
<td>4,658</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>HYDROSEED N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND COVER</td>
<td>JUNCUS PATENS</td>
<td>MOOR GRASS</td>
<td>4,658</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>HYDROSEED N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC. PLANTS</td>
<td>PARTHENOCISSUS TRICUSPIDATA</td>
<td>BOSTON IVY</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>15'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC. PLANTS</td>
<td>PARTHENOCISSUS TRICUSPIDATA</td>
<td>BOSTON IVY</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>15'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**

A minimum of 10 trees shall be upsized to 48" box as replacements for the trees that are indicated to be removed by the tree survey.

---

**PLANT PALETTE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANT PALETTE</th>
<th>SHEET 6 OF 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUCOLS: REGION 4</td>
<td>OAK WOODLAND PLANT PALETTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>QUERCUS AGRIFOLIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>QUERCUS SUBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>PROSOPIS X 'PHOENIX'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>MYOPORUM PARVIFOLIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>ROSMARINUS OFFICINALIS 'PROSTRATUS'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>BACCHARIS PILULARIS 'PIGEON POINT'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>ROSMARINUS OFFICINALIS 'PROSTRATUS'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>BACCHARIS PILULARIS 'PIGEON POINT'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>CAREX PANSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>CISTUS SALVIIFOLIUS 'PROSTRATUS'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>CISTUS SALVIIFOLIUS 'PROSTRATUS'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>DUNE SEDGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>SEISLERIA CAERULEA 'VARIEGATA'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET TREES</td>
<td>JUNCUS PATENS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC. PLANTS</td>
<td>PARTHENOCISSUS TRICUSPIDATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC. PLANTS</td>
<td>PARTHENOCISSUS TRICUSPIDATA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Water Efficient Landscape Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrozone # / Planting Description</th>
<th>Plant Factor (PF)</th>
<th>Irrigation Method</th>
<th>Irrigation Efficiency (IE)</th>
<th>ETAF (PF/IE)</th>
<th>Landscape Area (Sq.Ft.)</th>
<th>ETAF x Area</th>
<th>ETWU (Annual Gallons Required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1 - Low Water Pkwy</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Drip</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>24,750</td>
<td>6,111</td>
<td>212,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2 - Mod Water Pkwy</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Drip</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>23,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3 - Basins</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Spray</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td>12,267</td>
<td>427,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4 - Slopes</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Spray</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>118,470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ETWU Total: 782,484
MAWA Total: 852,981

The following will be noted in the final irrigation design plans and specifications:
- The maximum water use allowance (MAWA) is calculated using the following equation:
  \[ \text{MAWA} = \text{ETWU} \times 0.62 \times \text{ETAF} \times \text{Area} \]

The following will be noted in the final irrigation design plans and specifications:
- The ETWU is calculated using the following equation:
  \[ \text{ETWU} = \text{Eto} \times \text{0.62} \times \text{ETAF} \times \text{Area} \]

ETAF Calculations:
- Regular Landscape Area Totals:
  - Total ETAF x Area: 22,457
  - Total Area: 54,400
  - Average ETAF: 0.41

Over All Landscape Area Totals:
- Sitewide ETAF: 0.41

Maximum Allowed Water Allowance (MAWA) vs. ETWU

LOW WATER USE; DRIP (28,900 S.F.)
LOW WATER USE; SPRAY (4,115 S.F.)
MODERATE WATER USE; DRIP (1,810 S.F.)
MODERATE WATER USE; SPRAY (18,400 S.F.)

PRELIMINARY HYDROZONE PLANS
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Revised Tentative Tract Map No. 32711 (41-lots)
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 21, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER
BY: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 15.C

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 18089 (CZ18001, TTM37470, VAR18004, AND EXCEPTION TO SECTION 7.10.080 (C) OF TITLE 7) FOR 34 SINGLE-FAMILY LOT SUBDIVISION OF A 6.74 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED SOUTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF 30TH STREET AND SIERRA AVENUE, APNS: 177-020-018; 177-020-012; 177-110-005 (APPLICANT: JA BRAY, LLC) (CONTINUED FROM THE FEBRUARY 7, 2019 MEETING)

RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-10, entitled:


2) That the City Council conduct a first reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2019-02, entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY OFFICIAL ZONING MAP CHANGING THE ZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 6.74 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED SOUTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF 30TH STREET AND SIERRA AVENUE (APNS: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) FROM RURAL RESIDENTIAL (R-R) ZONE TO
ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE, AND MAKING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA;

3) That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-18, entitled:


4) That the City Council initiate an amendment to Title 9 of the Zoning Ordinance to remove Sec. 9.100.030 entitled “Minimum area for zone”; and

5) That the City Council initiate a Change of Zone for the real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNS: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) zone to Planned Residential (R-4) zone.

BACKGROUND

On January 9, 2019, the Planning Commission held a public hearing for the project, Highland Park 2, and took the following actions:

1. Subject to the Council’s adoption of the rezoning to R-1, approved the entitlements for a 34-single family lot subdivision, Highland Park 2, and adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting program. The entitlements included a tentative tract map with an exception to Section 7.10.080 (c) of Title 7, and a Variance.

2. Recommended to the City Council to approve the Change of Zone of the project site from R-R to R-1. It should be noted that on 9/1/17, the City Council changed the General Plan land use designation of the subject property from Light industrial to Medium Density Residential with the adoption of the 2017 General Plan.

On February 7, 2019, the City Council held a public hearing on the project. The staff presented the staff report (see Attachment 3) for the proposed Change of Zone No. 18001 and informed the City Council of the Planning Commission’s approval of the TTM37470, VAR18004, and exception to Section 7.10.080 (c) of Title 7.
The City Council discussed their concerns for the proposed Variances and the smaller lot size design. After the hearing, the City Council took the following actions in order to consider the map and variances along with the rezone:

- Continued the public hearing of the Change of Zone No. 18001
- Received and filed the Notice of Planning Commission’s Decision to approve the TTM37470, VAR18004, and exception to Section 7.10.080 (c) of Title 7
- Appealed the Planning Commission's Decision to approve TTM37470, VAR18004, and exception to Section 7.10.080 (c) of Title 7

EXHIBIT A. PROJECT SITE (SOURCE: COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE GIS)

ANALYSIS

The applicant has requested the entitlements presented in Table 1 to allow a 34 single-family residential subdivision of approximately 6.7 acres of vacant land. The proposed project’s average lot size is almost 6,400 square-feet with one lot under 6,000 square-feet and a several lots greater than 7,200 square-feet. The project’s density is 5 units per acre which is consistent with the General Plan. The General Plan Land Use designation is Medium Density Residential which allows for a maximum of 5 units per acre and accommodates both R-1 and R-4 zones. Attachment 3 includes the analysis of the project that was presented on 2/7/19. The findings for the project are included in Attachment 3.
TABLE 1. REQUESTED ENTITLEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change of Zone (CZ)</th>
<th>Change existing zoning classification from R-R (Rural Residential) to R-1 (One-Family Dwelling).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tentative Tract Map (TTM) with Exception to Section 7.10.080 (c) of Title 7</td>
<td>Subdividing approximately 6.74 acres of land into 34 single-family lot with common area lots; Exception to allow five (5) lots to have lot depth greater than 2 ½ times than the lot width.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (VAR)</td>
<td>Section 9.55.020 (2) Lot Area: Reduce 20% of the minimum lot size from 7,200 square-feet to 5,711 square-feet; Section 9.55.020 (3) Average Width &amp; (4) Lot Frontage: Reduce 16% of the minimum average width from 60 feet to 50 feet; and Section 9.55.020 (4) Lot Frontage: Reduce 16% of the minimum frontage of lot from 60 feet to 50 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This project is an addition to the previously approved Highland Park 1 (398 single-family lot subdivision). The applicant had originally requested the project site to be zoned R-4 (same as Highland Park 1) since (a) the project meets all of the requirements (no variance required) and (b) Highland Park 2 is zoned R-4. However, the R-4 zone has a requirement that does not allow any project area that is less than 9 acres to be re-zoned to R-4:

“Sec. 9.100.030 – Minimum area for zone. The R-4 Zone shall not be applied to any area containing less than nine (9) acres.”

Staff recommends the project be approved as originally recommended by the Planning Commission as it complies with the general Plan and is consistent with the originally Highland Park’s R-4 development. Should the City Council wish to eliminate the need for lot size variances, staff recommends taking a concurrent action to initiate a code amendment and rezone to R-4.

**Initiation of a Code Amendment & Rezoning to R-4**

A code amendment is necessary to remove the provision (Sec. 9.100.030 – Minimum area for zone) in order to allow a rezone to R-4 for project sites less than 9 acres.

The City Council had expressed concerns for the Variances to modify the R-1 zone’s lot area, average width, and lot frontage. These concerns can be addressed by allowing the project to proceed as designed, and concurrently initiate a code amendment to remove Sec. 9.100.030 and rezoning to R-4.
Staff is recommending that an amendment to delete Sec. 9.100.030 from the R-4 zone to allow the R-4 zone to be applied to project sites less than 9 acres.

Once the rezone to R-4 is effective, the project is consistent with the R-4 development standards without any variances.

Every code amendment requires environmental documentation, staff analysis and public hearings by the Planning Commission and City Council before it can be adopted. The following considerations apply to the initiation process, which only authorizes the process to begin:

1. Initiation of the code amendment does not entail an evaluation of the merits of the proposed code amendment, but only whether or not to proceed with a formal evaluation process and public hearings.
2. The Council may express their opinions as to whether the City should proceed with the formal evaluation process, but should reserve their opinions regarding the merits or the ultimate action on the code amendment until the evaluation process and public hearings have been completed.
3. The only issue before the Council at this time is whether or not to initiate the code amendment process in order to study the code amendment and obtain public comment. Once the formal evaluation process and public hearings are completed, the City Council will have the opportunity to approve or disapprove or make changes to the proposed code amendment.

In order to allow this project to move forward and avoid additional delay, staff recommends the City Council approve the project as recommended and initiate the code amendment and rezone to be completed subsequently.

CONCLUSION

This project is designed to be a part of the Highland Park 1 community that the City Council approved in 2016. The character and aesthetics of both tracts will be the same as it will have the same architecture and floor plans. Moreover, the lot design is similar. The average lot size for Highland Park 1 is 6,550 square-feet and Highland Park 2 is 6,400 square-feet. The project is small since it adds only 8% to the overall Highland Park project. The proposed project is compatible with the community.

For these reasons, the staff recommends approval of the entitlements, rezone, and initiation of the rezoning as described above.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

There are no financial impacts associated with the applications or the rezoning from R-1 to R-4 (if a code amendment is initiated and subsequent rezoning is approved) as the Applicant has covered all associated costs for processing. The code amendment will be covered by the Planning Department budget.
ALTERNATIVES

1. That the City Council (1) adopt Resolution No. 2019-10 adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for a proposed Schedule “A” subdivision (“Highland Park 2”) of approximately 6.74 gross acres into thirty-four (34) single-family residential lots on real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNS: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005); (2) conduct the first reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2019-02, to allow the Change of Zone No. 18001 from R-R (Rural Residential) to R-1 (One Family Dwellings) for property located south of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue, APNS: 177-020-018; 177-020-012; 177-110-005; (3) adopt Resolution No. 2019-18 sustaining the Planning Commission’s adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approval of Variance No. 18004, an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37052, to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 6.74 gross acres of real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNS: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) into thirty-four single-family residential lots (4) initiates an amendment to Title 9 of the Zoning Ordinance to remove Sec. 9.100.030 entitled “Minimum area for zone”; and (5) initiates a Change of Zone for the real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNS: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) from One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) zone to Planned Residential (R-4) zone. (the recommended action)

2. Deny MA18069 (CZ18001, TTM37470, VAR18004, and exception to Section 7.10.080 (c) of Title 7); (No action, maintaining the status quo)

3. Provide alternative direction to staff.

Prepared by:

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director

Submitted by:

Gary S. Thompson
City Manager

Reviewed by:

Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Reviewed by:

Peter M. Thorson
City Attorney
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ATTACHMENTS
1. Resolution No. 2019-10
   a. Exhibit A. Mitigated Negative Declaration & Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP)
2. Ordinance No. 2019-02
   a. Mitigated Negative Declaration & Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) (same as Exhibit A of Resolution No. 2019-10)
3. Resolution No. 2019-18
   a. Exhibit A. Conditions of Approval
4. City Council staff report for 2/7/19 meeting with no attachments
5. Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 (2 pages)
6. Landscape Plan with Wall & Fence Plan (2 pages)
7. Change of Zone exhibit
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-10


THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Project. JA Bray, LLC (the “Applicant”) has applied for Change of Zone No. 18001, Variance No. 18004, and an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 (collectively, Master Application No. 18089 or MA No. 18089) to change the classification of real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) from Rural Residential (R-R) Zone to One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone, and to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 6.74 gross acres into thirty-four (34) single-family residential lots on real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) (the “Project”).

Section 2. Procedural Findings. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that:

(a) The application for MA No. 18089 was processed including, but not limited to, a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

(b) On January 9, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 18089, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing. At the conclusion of the Planning Commission hearing and after due consideration of the testimony, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2019-01-09-01, recommending that the City Council adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approve Change of Zone No. 18001 to change the zoning classification of approximately 6.74 gross acres of real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) from Rural Residential (R-R) Zone to One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone. Additionally, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2019-01-09-02, approving Variance No. 18004, an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37052 to permit
a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 6.74 gross acres of real property located south of
the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-
005) into thirty-four (34) single-family residential lots.

(c) On February 4, 2019, the Planning Department filed a notice of the
Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 18004 with the City Clerk
and a copy of the notice was mailed to the Applicant, the Applicant’s authorized agent, and all
interested parties requesting a copy.

(d) On February 7, 2019, the Planning Department filed a notice of the
Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 18004 with the City
Council, which notice was placed on the City Council’s regular meeting agenda on that date.

(e) On February 7, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a
public hearing on the proposed Change of Zone No. 18001, at which time all persons interested
in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following
the receipt of public testimony the City Council continued the public hearing.

(f) On February 7, 2019, the City Council filed a timely appeal of the
Planning Commission’s approval of Variance No. 18004, an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of
the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37052 (the “Appeal”). The
Appeal set aside the Planning Commission’s action and made the Council the approving body.

(g) On March 21, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a
continued public hearing on the introduction of Ordinance No. 2019-02 and a public hearing on
the Appeal, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did
address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City
Council closed the public hearings.

(h) All legal preconditions to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

Section 3. California Environmental Quality Act Findings for Adoption of
Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The
City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby makes the following environmental findings
and determinations in connection with the approval of Change of Zone No. 18001:

(a) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Cal.
§15000 et seq.), City staff prepared an Initial Study of the potential environmental effects of the
approval of the Project as described in the Initial Study. Based upon the findings contained in
that Study, City staff determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there was
no substantial evidence that the Project could have a significant effect on the environment and a
Mitigated Negative Declaration (“MND”) was prepared by the City in full compliance with
CEQA.

(b) Thereafter, City staff provided public notice of the public comment period
and of the intent to adopt the MND as required by law. The public comment period commenced
on November 20, 2018, and expired on December 19, 2018. Copies of the documents have been
available for public review and inspection at City Hall, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509. The City received did not receive any comments during the public review period.

(c) On January 9, 2019, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Project and the MND, reviewed the staff report, accepted and considered public testimony. After due consideration, the Planning Commission found that agencies and interested members of the public were afforded ample notice and opportunity to comment on the MND and the Project and approved Resolution No. 2019-01-09-01 recommending that City Council adopt the MND, adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and approve the proposed Change of Zone No. 18001.

(d) The City Council has reviewed the MND and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”), attached as Exhibit “A,” and all comments received regarding the MND and, based on the whole record before it, finds that:

1) The MND was prepared in compliance with CEQA;

2) With the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment; and

3) The MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City Council.

(e) Based on the findings set forth in this Resolution, the City Council hereby adopts the MND and MMRP for the Project.

(f) The Planning Director is authorized and directed to file a Notice of Determination in accordance with CEQA.

Section 4. Certification. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 21st 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. 2019-10 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 21st 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 21st day of March, 2019.

_______________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
EXHIBIT “A”

Mitigated Negative Declaration and

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Initial Study/
Mitigated Negative Declaration

City of Jurupa Valley Master Application No. 18089

Change of Zone No. 18001
Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 with Exception
Variance No. 18004

City of Jurupa Valley
8930 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
Contact: Annette Tam, Senior Planner
(951) 332-6464
atam@jurupavalley.org

Applicant:

JA Bray, LLC c/o
John Schafer
jschafer@richlandcommunities.com
949-383-4127

November 12, 2018
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MASTER APPLICATION NO. 18089 SUMMARY

**Change of Zone (CZ) No. 18001:** Amend the City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map from R-R (Rural Residential) to R-1 (One Family Dwelling).

**Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37470 with an Exception:** Subdivide 6.76 acres of land into 34 single-family residential lots with a minimum lot size of 5,711 square feet. The exception is to allow several lots out of 34 lots to have lot depth greater than 2 ½ times than the lot width.

**Variance (VAR) No. 18004:** The Variance application is to request the change of minimum lot area from 7,200 square-feet to 5,711 square-feet and the minimum average frontage of lot from 60 feet to 50 feet.
1.0. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of an Initial Study

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that before a public agency makes a decision to approve a project that could have one or more adverse effects on the physical environment, the agency must inform itself about the project’s potential environmental impacts, give the public an opportunity to comment on the environmental issues, and take feasible measures to avoid or reduce potential harm to the physical environment.

The purpose of this Initial Study is to provide a preliminary analysis of a proposed action to determine whether a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an Environmental Impact Report should be prepared for a project. An Initial Study also enables an applicant or the City of Jurupa Valley to modify a project, mitigating adverse impacts in lieu of preparing an Environmental Impact Report, thereby potentially enabling the project to qualify for a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

1.2 Purpose of a Mitigated Negative Declaration

A Mitigated Negative Declaration is a written statement by the City of Jurupa Valley that the Initial Study identified potentially significant environmental effects of the Project but the Project is revised or mitigation measures are required to eliminate or mitigate impacts to less than significant levels.

1.3 Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration Document

This document in its entirety is an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including all criteria, standards, and procedures of CEQA (California Public Resource Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Section 15000 et seq.).

1.4 Public Review and Processing of the Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration

This Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Notice of Intent to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration was distributed to the following entities for a 30-day public review period:

1) The State Clearinghouse;

2) Organizations and individuals who have previously requested such notice in writing to the City of Jurupa Valley;

3) Responsible and trustee agencies (public agencies that have a level of discretionary approval over some component of the proposed Project); and

4) The Riverside County Clerk.
The Notice of Intent also was noticed to the general public in the *Riverside Press-Enterprise*, which is a primary newspaper of circulation in the areas affected by the Project.

The Notice of Intent identifies the location(s) where the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and its associated Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program and technical reports are available for public review. During the 30-day public review period, comments on the adequacy of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration document may be submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department.

Following the 30-day public review period, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department will review any comment letters received during to determine whether any substantive comments were provided that may warrant revisions or recirculation to the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration document. If recirculation is not required (as defined by CEQA Guidelines §15073.5(b)), written and/or oral responses will be provided to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission for review as part of their deliberations concerning the Project.

For this Project, the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission has the authority to recommend, conditionally recommend, or not recommend the Project for approval. The Jurupa Valley City Council has exclusive authority to approve, conditionally approve, or deny the Project. Accordingly, public hearings will be held before the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission and City Council to consider the proposed Project and the adequacy of this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. At the conclusion of the public hearing process, the City Council will take action to approve, conditionally approve, or deny the proposed Project. If approved, the City Council will adopt findings relative to the Project's environmental effects as disclosed in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Notice of Determination will be filed with the Riverside County Clerk.

### 1.5 Initial Study /Mitigated Negative Declaration Findings and Conclusions

Section 3.0 of this document contains the Environmental Checklist/Initial Study that was prepared for the proposed Project pursuant to CEQA and City of Jurupa Valley requirements.

The environmental factors marked with an “X” below would be potentially affected by this Project and thus require mitigation to reduce impacts to “less than significant” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

| □ Aesthetics | □ Agriculture and Forestry Resources | □ Air Quality |
| □ Biological Resources | □ Cultural Resources | □ Geology /Soils |
| □ Greenhouse Gas Emissions | □ Hazards & Hazardous Materials | □ Hydrology / Water Quality |
| ☑ Land Use / Planning | □ Mineral Resources | □ Noise |
| □ Population / Housing | □ Public Services | □ Recreation |
| □ Transportation/Traffic | ☑ Tribal Cultural Resources | □ Utilities/Service Systems |
| ☑ Mandatory Findings of Significance | | |
The Initial Study determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the Lead Agency (City of Jurupa Valley), that the Project may have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, based on the findings of the Initial Study Checklist, the City of Jurupa Valley determined that a Mitigated Negative Declaration is the appropriate CEQA determination for the Project pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15070(b).
2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

2.1 Project Location

The City of Jurupa Valley covers approximately 43.5 square miles within the County of Riverside. The City is bordered by the City of Fontana and County of San Bernardino to the north, City of Norco to the south, City of Eastvale to the west, and City of Riverside and County of San Bernardino to the east. Specifically, the Project is located on the south side of intersection of Sierra Avenue & 30th Street. (Refer to Exhibit 1).

The Project site is identified by the following Assessor Parcel Numbers: 177-020-012, 177-020-018, and 177-110-005.

2.2 Project Description

The Project Applicant, JA Bray, LLC, submitted the following applications to the City of Jurupa Valley, which comprise the proposed Project: Change of Zone (CZ) No. 18001, Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37470 with an Exception to Section 7.10.080 (C) of Title 7., and Variance (VAR) No. 18004. The City of Jurupa Valley also refers to these applications as Master Application (MA) No. 18089. The Project's application materials are on file with the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509 and are hereby incorporated by reference.

A. Change of Zone No. 18001: Amend the City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map from R-R (Rural Residential) to R-1 (One-Family Dwellings).

B. Tentative Tract Map No. 37470

Subdivide 6.76 acres of land into 34 single-family residential lots with a minimum lot size of 5,711 square feet and related infrastructure and landscaping improvements.

Street Improvements

The Project proposes the following street improvements:

- 30th Street is proposed to be improved as a Local Street within a half-width right-of-way of 33-feet with 2 travel lanes, a 6-foot wide landscaped parkway, and a 5-foot wide sidewalk adjacent to the Project site.

- Proposed Street A is proposed to be improved as a Local Street within a full-width right-of-way of 56-feet with 2 travel lanes, a 5-foot wide landscaped parkway, and a 5-foot wide sidewalk adjacent to the Project site.

Trails

A 10-foot wide multi-purpose trail easement is proposed along the western and southern boundaries of the Project site.

Drainage Improvements
Drainage will flow in Street A from north to south where it will be captured in the water quality basin at the southern end of the Project site. After first flush treatment, it will be discharged via a storm drain line that will connect to the storm drain line maintained by the Riverside County Flood Control District which borders the western boundary of the Project site.

**Sewer and Water Improvements**

An 8-inch sewer line will be constructed that connects via an easement between Lot 15 and Lot 16 and will connect to the sewer system within Tract 31894 to the east of the Project site.

An 8-inch water line will be constructed in Street A to connect to the water line in 30th Street.

**Construction Duration**

Project construction is anticipated to occur over 13-month period. (Refer to Section 4.3, *Air Quality*, for additional details.

C. **Variance No. 18004.**

The Variance application is to request the change of (1) minimum lot area from 7,200 square-feet to 5,711 square-feet and (2) minimum lot frontage from 60 feet to 50 feet.

D. **De-Annexation of Jurupa Community Services District to Rubidoux Community Services District.**

The Project site is located within the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD). The JCSD Board of Directors approved a “no contest” action that supports the de-annexation of the Project site from JCSD and the annexation of the Project site to the Rubidoux Community Services District. As such, water and sewer service will be provided to the Project site by the Rubidoux Community Services District.

2.3 **Existing Site Conditions/Environmental Setting**

CEQA Guidelines §15125 establishes requirements for defining the environmental setting to which the environmental effects of a proposed project must be compared. The environmental setting is defined as “...the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the Notice of Preparation is published, or if no Notice of Preparation is published, at the time the environmental analysis is commenced...” (CEQA Guidelines §15125[a]). A Notice of Preparation was not required at the time the Initial Study Checklist was commenced. Thus the environmental setting for the Project is the approximate date that the Project’s Initial Study Checklist commenced on April 30, 2018.

The Property is approximately 6.76-acres in size and located on the south side of 30th Street between 30th Street and Canal Street. The Property is currently undeveloped land. The soils and vegetation on the proposed Project site have been disturbed historically by quarry activities, off-highway vehicle activity, illegal dumping, and recreational use. The soils on the proposed Project site are loose sands and sandy loam. The dominant plant community on the Project site is non-
native annual grassland. Elevation at the site varies from approximately 880 to 910 feet above mean sea level. Current access to the Project site is provided by 30th Street to the north which is a paved 2-lane roadway and has no curb, gutter or sidewalk adjacent to the site.

Currently, the Project site is frequently disturbed by off-highway vehicle use, illicit dumping, and several campsites built by vagrant trespassers. The proposed Project site was also used to for staging of equipment, to access the railroad, and for truck access to the home framing storage yard located southwest of the proposed Project site. In the past, the proposed Project site was used for farming and cultivated crops. The fence in the center of the Project site also has an earthen berm along the fence row. An earthen berm was constructed along the railroad easement and Canal Street south of the Project site. The Project site was crisscrossed by many roads over the past 20 years during the construction of Line A and the houses north of 30th Street. The three rail spurs and buildings constructed for the granite rock quarry in 1940 altered the land along the eastern edge of the proposed project. Existing and surrounding land uses are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Vacant land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>30th street with single-family homes further to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Railroad tracks with Canal Street and single-family homes further to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Vacant land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Vacant land with Mt. Rubidoux Nursing Center, single-family residences, and a vehicle storage facility further to the west.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Inspection, April 2018

### 2.4 Existing General Plan Land Use and Zoning Designations

The City Council adopted the City of Jurupa Valley's first locally prepared General Plan on September 7, 2017. The 2017 General Plan is the primary tool to guide the development and character of Jurupa Valley for the next five to ten years.

The Project site's land use designation is Medium Density Residential (MDR) which allows residential development at 2-5 dwelling units per acre. A summary of the existing General Plan land use and zoning designations for the Project site and surrounding properties is provided in Table 2.
Table 2. Existing and Surrounding General Plan Designations and Zoning Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>MDR (Medium Density Residential)</td>
<td>R-R (Rural Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>MDR (Medium Density Residential)</td>
<td>R-1 (Single Family Residential) &amp; R-4 (Planned Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>MDR (Medium Density Residential)</td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R-1 (Single Family Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>MDR (Medium Density Residential)</td>
<td>R-4 (Planned Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>MDR (Medium Density Residential)</td>
<td>R-R (Rural Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: City of Jurupa Valley-General Plan Land Use Map March 2018, City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map March 2018*
3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Evaluation Format

This Initial Study Checklist has been prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The Project is evaluated based on its potential effect on eighteen (18) environmental factors categorized as follows, as well as Mandatory Findings of Significance:

1. Aesthetics
2. Agriculture & Forestry Resources
3. Air Quality
4. Biological Resources
5. Cultural Resources
6. Geology & Soils
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions
8. Hazards & Hazardous Materials
9. Hydrology & Water Quality
10. Land Use & Planning
11. Mineral Resources
12. Noise
13. Population & Housing
14. Public Services
15. Recreation
16. Transportation & Traffic
17. Tribal Cultural Resources
18. Utilities and Service Systems
19. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Each factor is analyzed by responding to a series of questions pertaining to the impact of the Project on the particular factor in the form of a checklist. This Initial Study Checklist provides a manner to analyze the impacts of the Project on each factor in order to determine the severity of the impact and determine if mitigation measures can be implemented to reduce the impact to less than significant without having to prepare an Environmental Impact Report.

CEQA also requires Lead Agencies to evaluate potential environmental effects based to the fullest extent possible on scientific and factual data (CEQA Guidelines §15064[b]). A determination of whether or not a particular environmental impact will be significant must be based on substantial evidence, which includes facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, and expert opinion supported by facts (CEQA Guidelines §15064f[5]).

The effects of the Project are then placed in the following four categories, which are each followed by a summary to substantiate why the Project does not impact the particular factor with or without mitigation. If “Potentially Significant Impacts” that cannot be mitigated are determined, then the Project does not qualify for a Mitigated Negative Declaration and an Environmental Impact Report must be prepared:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially significant impact(s) have been identified or anticipated that cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance. An Environmental Impact Report must therefore be prepared.</td>
<td>Potentially significant impact(s) have been identified or anticipated, but mitigation is possible to reduce impact(s) to a less than significant category. Mitigation measures must then be identified.</td>
<td>No “significant” impact(s) identified or anticipated. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td>No impact(s) identified or anticipated. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the impact analysis in this Initial Study Checklist, reference is made to the following:

- **Plans, Policies, Programs (PPP)** – These include existing regulatory requirements such as plans, policies, or programs applied to the Project based on the basis of federal, state, or local law currently in place which effectively reduce environmental impacts.

- **Project Design Features (PDF)** – These measures include features proposed by the Project that are already incorporated into the Project’s design and are specifically intended to reduce or avoid impacts (e.g., water quality treatment basins).

- **Mitigation Measures (MM)** – These measures include requirements that are imposed where the impact analysis determines that implementation of the proposed Project would result in significant impacts. Mitigation measures are proposed to reduce impacts to less than significant levels in accordance with the requirements of CEQA.

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) and the Project Design Features (PDF) were assumed and accounted for in the assessment of impacts for each issue area if applicable.
Mitigation Measures (MM) were formulated only for those issue areas where the results of the impact analysis identified significant impacts that could be reduced to less than significant levels.

All three types of measures described above may be required to be implemented as part of the Project, and will be included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project.

**Environmental Factors Requiring Mitigation**

The environmental factors marked with an “X” below would be potentially affected by this Project and thus require mitigation to reduce impacts to “less than significant” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture and Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology /Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology / Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use / Planning</td>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population / Housing</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Utilities/Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandatory Findings of Significance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed use COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be recommended for adoption.

I find that although the proposal could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made by or agreed to by the Project Applicant. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be recommended for adoption.

I find that the proposal MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposal MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated.” An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effect (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, pursuant to all applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures are are imposed upon the proposed Project, nothing further is required.

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director
City of Jurupa Valley

Printed Name/Title
Agency

November 12, 2018
Date
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Appendix D. Delineation of Wetlands and Jurisdictional Waters, LSA Associates, October 18, 2018.


3.1 AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

3.1 (a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Sources: General Plan, Google Earth, Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts related to scenic vistas. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.1-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 9.55.020(1) building height shall not exceed three (3) stories, with a maximum height of forty (40) feet.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

The Project site is approximately 6.76 gross acres in size and is located in an area largely characterized by residential development and vacant land. Land uses surrounding to the north are 30th Street with single-family homes further to the north, to the south are railroad tracks with Canal Street and single-family homes further to the south, to the east is vacant land, and to the west is vacant land with Mt. Rubidoux Nursing Center, single-family residences, and a vehicle storage facility further to the west.
According to the General Plan, scenic vistas are points or corridors that are accessible to the public and that provide a view of scenic areas and/or landscapes. According to General Plan Figure 4-23, the Project site is not adjacent to a scenic corridor.

Scenic vistas in the Project vicinity are the Jurupa Hills located approximately 6,000 feet to the northwest of the Project site and the foothills of Rattlesnake Mountain located approximately 3,000 feet to the northeast of the Project site.

As required by PPP 3.1-1 above, the future buildings proposed on the property will be restricted to 30 feet in height. As such, the Project would not block or completely obstruct views from surrounding public vantage points to the Jurupa Hills or Rattlesnake Mountain visible in the horizon under existing conditions.

Based on the analysis above, impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant.

3.1 (b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Determination: No Impact.

Sources: California Department of Transportation “Scenic Highway Program Eligible and Officially Designated Routes,” General Plan, General Plan Figure 4.23, Google Earth.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

California's Scenic Highway Program was created by the Legislature in 1963. Its purpose is to protect and enhance the natural scenic beauty of California highways and adjacent corridors, through special conservation treatment. The state laws governing the Scenic Highway Program are found in the Streets and Highways Code, Sections 260 through 263.

According to the California Department of Transportation, the Project site is not located within a State Scenic Highway. In addition, according to General Plan Figure 4-23, the Project site is not adjacent to a scenic corridor. As such, there is no impact.
3.1 (c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: Project Application Materials, Google Earth.*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

**Construction Impacts**

During the Project's temporary construction period, construction equipment, supplies, and activities would be visible on the subject property from immediately surrounding areas. Construction activities are a common occurrence in the developing inland region of Riverside County and are not considered to substantially degrade the area's visual quality. All construction equipment would be removed from the Project site following completion of the Project's construction activities. For these reasons, the temporary visibility of construction equipment and activities at the Project site would not substantially degrade the visual character of the surrounding area.

**Operational Impacts**

The visual character of the Project site would change from disturbed, vacant land to a 34-lot subdivision for construction of single-family residences. A project is generally considered to have a significant impact on visual character if it substantially changes the character of the project site such that it becomes visually incompatible or visually unexpected when viewed in the context of its surroundings.

The Project site is in an area largely characterized by residential development and vacant land. Land uses surrounding to the north are 30th Street with single-family homes further to the north, to the south are railroad tracks with Canal Street and single-family homes further to the south, to the east is vacant land, and to the west is vacant land with Mt. Rubidoux Nursing Center, single-family residences, and a vehicle storage facility further to the west.

In addition, the Project site currently planned for Medium Density Residential uses by the General Plan (Up to 5 dwelling units per acre). Residential development with single-family residences has been anticipated for the Project site. The introduction of single-family residences will be compatible to the existing development in the surrounding area.

Based on the analysis above, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
3.1 (d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following apply to the Project and would help reduce impacts related to light and glare. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.1-2 As required by General Plan Policy COS 10.1, require outdoor lighting to be shielded and prohibit outdoor lighting that:

1. Operates at unnecessary locations, levels, and times.
2. Spills onto areas off-site or to areas not needing or wanting illumination.
3. Produces glare (intense line-of-site contrast).
4. Includes lighting frequencies (colors) that interfere with astronomical viewing.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

The Project would increase the amount of light in the area above what is being generated by the vacant site by directly adding new sources of illumination including security and decorative lighting for the future residential structures and street lighting. With implementation of PPP 3.1-3, impacts relating to lighting would be less than significant.

The primary exterior of the proposed homes would be constructed of stucco which is not a reflective surface. As such, impacts relating to glare would be less than significant.
### 3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2 (a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

**Determination: No Impact**  
*Sources: California Department of Conservation “Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

The site does not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as mapped by the State Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. As such, the Project has no potential to convert such lands to a non-agricultural use and no impact would occur.

### 3.2 (b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

**Determination: No Impact.**  
*Sources: General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map.*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

**Agricultural Zoning**

The Project site currently has a zoning classification of R-R (Rural Residential). The Project is proposing a change of zone to R-1 (One family Dwellings) which allows single-family detached housing with a minimum lot size of 7,200 square feet. The R-1 Zone is not considered a primary agricultural zone. As such, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use if the change of zone were approved.

**Williamson Act**

Pursuant to the California Land Conservation Act of 1965, a Williamson Act Contract enables private landowners to voluntarily enter into contracts with local governments for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agricultural or related open space use. In return, landowners
receive lower property tax assessments based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. According to the Riverside County Geographic Information System, the site is not under a Williamson Act Contract. As such, there is no impact.

3.2 (c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

Determination: No Impact.
Sources: General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

The Project is proposing a change of zone from R-R (Rural Residential) to R-1 (One Family Dwellings). The Project site does not contain any forest lands, timberland, or timberland zoned as Timberland Production, nor are any forest lands or timberlands located on or nearby the Project site. Because no lands on the Project site are zoned for forestland or timberland, the Project has no potential to impact such zoning. Therefore, no impact would occur.

3.2 (d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Field Survey.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

The Project site and surrounding properties do not contain forest lands, are not zoned for forest lands, nor are they identified as containing forest resources by the General Plan. Because forest land is not present on the Project site or in the immediate vicinity of the Project site, the Project has no potential to result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur.
3.2 (e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: California Department of Conservation, Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis (Appendix B).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program classifies portions of the Project site as Farmland of Local Importance. Farmland of Local Importance is either currently producing, or has the capability of production; but does not meet the criteria of Prime, Statewide or Unique Farmland. The General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element contains policies to encourage the continuation of land that is in active agricultural production. The dominant plant community on the Project site is non-native annual grassland and is considered to be Fallow Agricultural Land. The description of this habitat and vegetation communities is based on the definitions found in MSHCP Section 2.1.3 and A Manual of California Vegetation: Second Edition (Sawyer et al. 2009). Fallow Agricultural Land includes fallow fields that have been recently disked, plowed, or are no longer used to produce crops and are slowly being encroached by non-native herbaceous plant species. In some cases, native annual wildflowers become established in fallow agricultural lands. As such, the Project site is not currently providing active agricultural land of use to the local economy.

In addition, the Project site is approximately 6.76 gross acres in size and is located in an area largely characterized by residential development and vacant land. Land uses surrounding to the north are 30th Street with single-family homes further to the north, to the south are railroad tracks with Canal Street and single-family homes further to the south, to the east is vacant land, and to the west is vacant land with Mt. Rubidoux Nursing Center, single-family residences, and a vehicle storage facility further to the west. In addition, the Project site is planned for residential uses by the General Plan and this type of development has been anticipated for the Project site.

Based on the analysis above, the Project would not result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use and no impacts would occur.
### 3.3 AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinations</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.3 (a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (South Coast Air Quality Management District)?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (Appendix A), SCAQMD Air Quality Handbook.*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

**Federal Air Quality Standards**

Under the Federal Clean Air Act, the Federal Environmental Protection Agency establishes health-based air quality standards that California must achieve. These are called “national (or federal) ambient air quality standards” and they apply to what are called “criteria pollutants.” Ambient (i.e. surrounding) air quality standard establish a concentration above which a criteria pollutant is known to cause adverse health effects to people. The national ambient air quality standards apply to the following criteria pollutants:

- Ozone (8-hour standard)
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM\(_{10}\))
- Fine Particulate Matter (PM\(_{2.5}\))
- Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NO\(_x\))
- Sulphur Dioxide (SO\(_2\)), and
- Lead.

**State Air Quality Standards**

Under the California Clean Air Act, the California Air Resources Board also establishes health-based air quality standards that cities and counties must meet. These are called “state ambient air quality standards” and they apply to the following criteria pollutants:

- Ozone (1-hour standard)
- Ozone (8-hour standard)
- Respirable Particulate Matter (PM\(_{10}\))
- Fine Particulate Matter (PM\(_{2.5}\))
- Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NO\(_x\))
- Sulphur Dioxide (SO\(_2\)), and
- Lead

**Regional Air Quality Standards**

The City of Jurupa Valley is located within the South Coast Air Basin which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The District develops plans and regulations designed to achieve these both the national and state ambient air quality standards described above.

**Attainment Designation**

An “attainment” designation for an area signifies that criteria pollutant concentrations did not exceed the established standard. In contrast to attainment, a “nonattainment” designation indicates that a criteria pollutant concentration has exceeded the established standard.

Table 3 shows the attainment status of criteria pollutants in the South Coast Air Basin.

**Table 3. Attainment Status of Criteria Pollutants in the South Coast Air Basin.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Pollutant</th>
<th>State Designation</th>
<th>Federal Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone – 1 hour standard</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>No Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone – 8 hour standard</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respirable Particulate Matter (PM(_{10}))</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Particulate Matter (PM(_{2.5}))</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Criteria Pollutant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Pollutant</th>
<th>State Designation</th>
<th>Federal Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide (N0x)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: California Air Resources Board, 2015*

### Air Quality Management Plan

The South Coast Air Quality Management District is required to produce air quality management plans directing how the South Coast Air Basin’s air quality will be brought into attainment with the national and state ambient air quality standards. The most recent air quality management plan is the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan and it is applicable to City of Jurupa Valley. The purpose of the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan is to achieve and maintain both the national and state ambient air quality standards described above.

In order to determine if a project is consistent with the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan, the South Coast Air Quality Management District has established consistency criterion which are defined in Chapter 12, Sections 12.2 and 12.3 of the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s CEQA Air Quality Handbook and are discussed below.

**Consistency Criterion No. 1:** The proposed project will not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan.

Consistency Criterion No. 1 refers to violations of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards and National Ambient Air Quality Standards. As evaluated under Issues 3.3 (b), (c), and (d) below, the Project would not exceed regional or localized significance thresholds for any criteria pollutant during construction or during long-term operation. Accordingly, the Project’s regional and localized emissions would not contribute substantially to an existing or potential future air quality violation or delay the attainment of air quality standards.

**Consistency Criterion No. 2:** The proposed project will not exceed the assumptions in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan.

The 2016 Air Quality Management Plan demonstrates that the applicable ambient air quality standards can be achieved within the timeframes required under federal law. Growth projections from local general plans adopted by cities in the district are provided to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), which develops regional growth forecasts, which are then used to develop future air quality forecasts for the AQMP.

The General Plan Land Use Designation currently assigned to the Project is Medium Density Residential (MDR). The future emission forecasts contained in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan are primarily based on demographic and economic growth projections provided by the Southern California Association of Governments. The Project was planned for residential development with a density of up to 5 dwelling units per acre at the time the 2016 Air Quality...
Management Plan adopted. Therefore, the Project will not exceed the growth forecast estimates used in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan.

For the reasons stated above, the Project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan. In addition, the Project would not exceed the growth assumptions in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan. As such, the Project would be consistent with the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan and impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

3.3(b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Source: Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (Appendix A).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts related to air quality violations. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.3-1 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, “Fugitive Dust.” Rule 403 requires implementation of best available dust control measures during construction activities that generate fugitive dust, such as earth moving and stockpiling activities, grading, and equipment travel on unpaved roads. Measures listed below (or equivalent language) shall appear on all Project grading plans, construction specifications and bid documents, and the City shall ensure such language is incorporated prior to issuance of any grading permits:

- “All clearing, grading, earth-moving, or excavation activities shall cease when winds exceed 25 mph per SCAQMD guidelines in order to limit fugitive dust emissions.”

- “The contractor shall ensure that all disturbed unpaved roads and disturbed areas within the Project are watered at least three (3) times daily during dry weather. Watering, with complete coverage of disturbed areas, shall occur at least three times a day, preferably in the mid-morning, afternoon, and after work is done for the day.”

- “The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and Project site areas are reduced to 15 miles per hour or less.”

PPP 3.3-2 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality District Rule 431.2, “Sulphur Content and Liquid Fuels.” The purpose of this rule is to
limit the sulfur content in diesel and other liquid fuels for the purpose of both reducing the formation of sulfur oxides and particulates during combustion and to enable the use of add-on control devices for diesel fueled internal combustion engines.

PPP 3.3-3 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113; “Architectural Coatings” Rule 1113 limits the release of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) into the atmosphere during painting and application of other surface coatings. The measure listed below (or equivalent language) shall appear on all Project grading plans, construction specifications and bid documents, and the City shall ensure such language is incorporated prior to issuance of any building permits:

- “In order to limit the VOC content of architectural coatings used in the SCAB, architectural coatings shall be no more than a low VOC default level of 50 g/L unless otherwise specified in the SCAQMD Table of Standards (pg. 32-33).”

PPP 3.3-4 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1186 “PM\textsubscript{10} Emissions from Paved and Unpaved Roads and Livestock Operations” and Rule 1186.1, “Less-Polluting Street Sweepers.” Adherence to Rule 1186 and Rule 1186.1 reduces the release of criteria pollutant emissions into the atmosphere during construction.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

As shown in Table 3 above, the South Coast Air Basin, in which the Project is located, is considered to be in “non-attainment” status for several criteria pollutants.

The South Coast Air Quality Management District has developed regional and localized significance thresholds for regulated pollutants. Any project in the South Coast Air Basin with daily emissions that exceed any of the indicated regional or localized significance thresholds would be considered to contribute to a projected air quality violation. The Project’s regional and localized air quality impacts are discussed below.

*Regional Impact Analysis*

As with any new development project, the Project has the potential to generate pollutant concentrations during both construction activities and long-term operation. The following provides an analysis based on the applicable regional significance thresholds established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District in order to meet national and state air quality standards which are shown in Table 4 below.
Table 4. South Coast Air Quality Management District Air Quality Regional Significance Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Emissions (Construction) (pounds/day)</th>
<th>Emissions (Operational) (pounds/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOx</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District CEQA Air Quality Significance Thresholds (2009)*

Both construction and operational emissions for the Project were estimated by using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) which is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies to quantify potential criteria pollutant emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. The model can be used for a variety of situations where an air quality analysis is necessary or desirable such as California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents and is authorized for use by the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

*Construction Related Impacts*

Short-term criteria pollutant emissions will occur during site grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating activities. Emissions will occur from use of equipment, worker, vendor, and hauling trips, and disturbance of onsite soils (fugitive dust).

Table 5 describes the type of construction equipment to be used for the Project.

Table 5. Construction Equipment by Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Equipment Unit Amount</th>
<th>Hours Per Day Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>Rubber Tired Dozers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>Excavators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubber Tired Dozers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>Cranes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forklifts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generator Sets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>Equipment Type</td>
<td>Equipment Unit Amount</td>
<td>Hours Per Day Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>Welders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cement and Mortar Mixers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pavers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving Equipment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rollers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>Air Compressors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (Appendix A).*

Table 6 shows the tentative Project construction schedule.

### Table 6. Tentative Construction Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase No.</th>
<th>Phase Name</th>
<th>Phase Start Date</th>
<th>Phase End Date</th>
<th>Number of Days/Weeks</th>
<th>Total Number of Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>2/2/2019</td>
<td>2/8/2019</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>2/9/2019</td>
<td>2/20/2019</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>1/8/2020</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>1/9/2020</td>
<td>2/3/2020</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>2/4/2020</td>
<td>2/27/2020</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (Appendix A).*

The estimated maximum regional daily construction emissions are summarized in Table 7 below.

### Table 7. Maximum Regional Daily Construction Emissions (lbs/day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Total Regional Emissions (lbs/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VOV (ROG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coatings</td>
<td>21.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Daily Emissions</td>
<td>21.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Thresholds</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (Appendix A).*

As shown in Table 7, emissions resulting from the Project construction would not exceed numerical thresholds established by the SCAQMD and therefore no mitigation is required.
**Long-Term Regional Operation Related Impacts**

Long-term criteria air pollutant emissions will result from the operation of the proposed Project. Long-term emissions are categorized as area source emissions, energy demand emissions, and operational emissions. Operational emissions will result from automobile, truck, and other vehicle sources associated with daily trips to and from the Project. Area source emissions are the combination of many small emission sources that include use of outdoor landscape maintenance equipment, use of consumer products such as cleaning products, and periodic repainting of the proposed Project. Energy demand emissions result from use of electricity and natural gas.

The results of the CalEEMod model for summer and winter operation of the Project are summarized in Table 8 below (Maximum Operational Daily Emissions). Based on the results of the model, operational emissions associated with operation the Project will not exceed the thresholds established by SCAQMD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ROG (VOC)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Emissions</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 7, emissions resulting from the Project construction would not exceed numerical thresholds established by the SCAQMD and therefore no mitigation is required.

Based on the analysis above, regional air quality impacts for operational emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

**Localized Impact Analysis**

As part of the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s environmental justice program, attention has been focusing more on the localized effects of air quality. Although the region may be in attainment for a particular criteria pollutant, localized emissions from construction and operational activities coupled with ambient pollutant levels can cause localized increases in criteria pollutant that exceed national and/or State air quality standards. The South Coast Air Quality Management District has established Localized Significance Thresholds (LST) which were developed in response to environmental justice and health concerns raised by the public regarding exposure of individuals to criteria pollutants in local communities.

Localized Significance Thresholds are only applicable to the following criteria pollutants: oxides of nitrogen (NOx), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter less than 10 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM10) and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM2.5). Localized Significance Threshold’s represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable national or state ambient air quality standard, and are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each source receptor area and distance to the nearest sensitive receptor.
Construction-Related Localized Emissions

Construction localized impacts were evaluated pursuant to the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s *Final Localized Significance Thresholds Methodology*. This methodology provides screening tables for one through five-acre project construction scenarios, depending on the amount of site disturbance during a day. Maximum daily oxides of nitrogen (NO$_X$), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$) emissions will occur during construction of the Project, grading of the Project site, and paving of streets and driveways. Table 7 below summarizes on-site emissions as compared to the local screening thresholds established for Source Receptor Area (SRA) 23 (Metropolitan Riverside/Mira Loma).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>NO$_X$</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM$_{10}$</th>
<th>PM$_{2.5}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Emissions</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (Appendix A),*

As shown in Table 9, emissions resulting from the Project construction would not exceed LST numerical thresholds established by the SCAQMD and no mitigation is required.

Operational-Related Localized Emissions

On-site operational activities can result in localized increases in criteria pollutant levels that can cause air quality standards to be exceeded even if standards are not exceeded on a regional level. On-site area and energy sources were evaluated. As shown in Table 10, emissions resulting from the Project operations would not exceed LST numerical thresholds established by the SCAQMD and no mitigation is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>NO$_X$</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM$_{10}$</th>
<th>PM$_{2.5}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Emissions</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Impact Study (Appendix A),*

CO Hot Spots

CO Hot Spots are typically associated with idling vehicles at extremely busy intersections (i.e., intersections with an excess of 100,000 vehicle trips per day). There are no intersections in the vicinity of the Project site which exceed the 100,000 vehicle per day threshold typically associated with CO Hot Spots. In addition, the South Coast Air Basin has been designated as an attainment area for CO since 2007. Therefore, Project-related vehicular emissions would not create a Hot Spot and would not substantially contribute to an existing or projected CO Hot Spot.

Based on the analysis above, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
3.3(c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Source: Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Impact Study (Appendix A), Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts related to a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

(Refer to PPP 3.3.1 through PPP 3.3-4 under Issue 3.3(b) above).

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

According to the SCAQMD, individual projects that do not generate operational or construction emissions that exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily thresholds for project specific impacts would also not cause a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment, and, therefore, would not be considered to have a significant, adverse air quality impact. Alternatively, individual project-related construction and operational emissions that exceed SCAQMD thresholds for project-specific impacts would be considered cumulatively considerable.

As discussed in Issue 3.3(b) above, the Project would not exceed the regional or localized significance thresholds for construction activities. As such, the Project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

Based on the analysis above, impacts would be less than significant.

3.3(d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Sources: Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Impact Study (Appendix A), Health Risk Assessment (Appendix B).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts related to a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

(Refer to PPP 3.3.1 through PPP 3.3-4 under Issue 3.3(b) above).
Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

Sensitive Receptors

Sensitive receptors (i.e., children, senior citizens, and acutely or chronically ill people) are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the general population. Land uses that are considered sensitive receptors typically include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, hospitals, convalescent homes, and retirement homes. The closest sensitive receptors would be the residential homes to the north of the Project site.

Localized Impacts

As shown on Tables 9 and 10 above under the discussion of Issue 3.3 (b), the Project would not exceed any of the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Localized Significance Thresholds during near-term construction or long-term operation. In addition, the Project would not create a CO Hot Spot. Accordingly, Project-related localized emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction or long-term operation and impacts would be less than significant.

Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC)

As determined in the California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (2015) 62 Cal. 4th 369 (CBIA) case the California Supreme Court determined that CEQA does not generally require an analysis of impacts of the existing environmental conditions on the future residents of a proposed project and generally only requires an analysis of the proposed project’s impact on the environment. However, the CBIA case also stated that when a proposed project brings development and people into an area already subject to specific hazards and the new development/people exacerbate the existing hazards, then CEQA requires an analysis of the hazards and the proposed project’s effect in terms of increasing the risks related to those hazards.

In regard to air quality hazards, Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) are defined as substances that may cause or contribute to an increase in deaths or in serious illness or that may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. As such, if a proposed project would not exacerbate pre-existing hazards (e.g., TAC health risks) then an analysis of those hazards and the proposed project’s effect on increasing those hazards is not required. The existing conditions on the project site only include vacant land that does not contain any operational land uses that emit TACs.

During construction, diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions from heavy equipment use and heavy-duty trucks and would temporarily add to the health risk from DPM in the Project area that is primarily a result from heavy-duty trucks operating on State Route 60, near the Project site. Heavy-duty construction equipment is subject to an ARB Airborne Toxics Control Measure for in-use diesel construction equipment to reduce diesel particulate emissions. As described above for the LST analysis, PM_{10} (representative of DPM, which is a TAC) emissions and exposure would be minimal and below the SCAQMD LSTs.

The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project site are residences located approximately 120 feet north of the Project site and the Mt. Rubidoux Nursing Center located approximately 600 feet to the
west of the Project site. According to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, health risks should be based on a 70-year exposure period for the maximally exposed individual resident; however, such assessments should be limited to the period/duration of activities associated with the project. Since the proposed Project involves phased construction activities in many areas across the Project site, the exposure of any proximate individual sensitive receptor to TACs would be limited. Due to the temporary nature of construction (that would only occur over approximately 13 months) exposure at any individual sensitive receptor and minimal particulate emissions generated on the Project site, TACs generated during construction would not be expected to result in concentrations causing significant health risks.

Operation of the proposed Project would not result in any non-permitted direct emissions (e.g., those from a point source such as diesel generators) or result in a substantial increase in diesel vehicles (i.e., delivery trucks). Overall, the proposed Project would not result in exposure of sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site (i.e., the residences to the north of the Project site and the Mt. Rubidoux Nursing Center approximately 600 feet to the west of the Project site) to substantial TAC concentrations and would not exacerbate pre-existing health risk hazards.

Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

3.3 (e) **Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts related to objectionable odors. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program:

**PPP 3.3-5** The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 402 “Nuisance.” Adherence to Rule 402 reduces the release of odorous emissions into the atmosphere.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

According to the South Coast Air Quality Management District CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The Project proposes residential development which is a land use typically not associated with emitting objectionable odors.

Potential odor sources associated with the proposed Project may result from construction equipment exhaust and the application of asphalt and architectural coatings during construction activities. Standard construction requirements would minimize odor impacts from construction. The construction odor emissions would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature and
would cease upon completion of the respective phase of construction and is thus considered less than significant. It is expected that Project-generated refuse would be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with the City’s solid waste regulations. The proposed Project would also be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances. Therefore, odors associated with the proposed Project construction and operations would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.
### 3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.4(a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

*Source: Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis (Appendix B), First Year Focused Delhi Sands Flower Loving Fly Survey (Appendix C).*
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts related to candidate, sensitive, or special status species but not to the degree that impacts would be less than significant. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.4-1 The Project is required to pay mitigation fees pursuant to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MHSCP) as required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.80.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

Existing Conditions

The Project site is adjacent to residential development on the north, vacant land to the east and west, car storage at the southwest corner of the project site, and railroad to the south. The soils and vegetation on the proposed Project site have been disturbed historically by quarry activities, off-highway vehicle activity, illegal dumping, and recreational use. The soils on the proposed Project site are loose sands and sandy loam. The dominant plant community on the Project site is non-native annual grassland.

Plant Species

The dominant vegetation type on site is best described as non-native grassland (NNG). The NNG plant community is approximately 7.22 acres and is dominated by annual grasses (*Bromus* spp.), western ragweed (*Ambrosia psilostachya*), short pod mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*), castor bean (*Ricinus communis*), Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*), and tree tobacco (*Nicotiana glauca*).

- **Brand’s Star Phacelia:** The Project site is located within MSHCP Section 6.1.3 survey area designated for the Brand’s star phacelia. This species is known to occur in sandy soils but mainly in alluvial terraces and sand dunes. This species has been observed in a sandy horse trail in Santa Ana Wilderness Area and was historically collected in Fairmont Park in the City of Riverside. There are discontinuous ephemeral drainages on the Project site and sandy soils remain even with the highly disturbed conditions. The Project site is not likely to support this plant species due to the isolation from the past natural hydrologic connection with the upper watershed and the current disturbed conditions. Focused plant surveys for the Brand’s phacelia are not required because the plant is dependent upon periodic flooding and the site is not part of an alluvial fan or flood terrace; therefore, this habitat is not present.

- **San Diego Ambrosia:** The project site is located within MSHCP Section 6.1.3 survey area designated for the San Diego ambrosia. This species is known to occur in open floodplain terraces with Garretson gravelly fine. The Project site is not likely to support this plant species because these described soils do not occur on the Project site and no playas or pools
occur. Focused plant surveys for San Diego ambrosia are not required because the site is not part of a floodplain and contains only Delhi soil.

- **San Miguel Savory:** The Project site is located within an MSHCP Section 6.1.3 survey area designated for San Miguel savory. This plant is known to occur on rocky, gabbroic, and metavolcanic substrates in oak woodland and chaparral. The project site is sandy and does not support rocky or gabbroic substrates for this plant. No chaparral or oak woodland habitat is present on the Project site, therefore focused surveys for San Miguel savory are not required.

- **Riversidean Sage Scrub:** RSS is considered a sensitive plant community by natural resource agencies because it provides habitat for listed and sensitive plant and wildlife species endemic to southern California. The Project site supports 0.44 acre of RSS dominated by California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), brittlebush (*Encelia farinosa*), California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*), and deerweed (*Lotus scoparius*). The RSS vegetation community has reestablished on the decommissioned quarry and rail yard.

**Conclusion:** The Project does not provide habitat for regional listed plant species or MSHCP plant species of concern in the NEPSSA due to the lack of suitable soil, water, and land use suitability. No further action is required.

**Wildlife Species**

Common wildlife species were observed during the various surveys. The lack of wildlife diversity is likely due to human disturbance and the non-native grassland that has taken over the site’s native vegetation.

- **Coastal California Gnatcatcher:** CAGN, a federal listed as threatened species, was incidentally observed foraging during the 2018 field surveys. Figure 8 of Appendix B shows CAGN from 2006 and the CAGN critical habitat areas. The CAGN observed during the 2018 Highland Park 2 field surveys occurred in the general vicinity of the 2006 observations. The Project site supports approximately 0.44 acre of RSS habitat, which is suitable foraging habitat although this edge of the RSS may not be used for nesting.

- **Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly:** Focused surveys for DSF, a federal listed as endangered species, are required by the USFWS and the MSHCP Section 9.0 Species Conservation Objectives due to the presence of Delhi sands soils on the Project site. The entire Project site comprises mapped soils are Delhi fine sand, 2 to 15 percent slopes, wind-eroded (DaD2), as shown in Figure 2 in Appendix B. Surveys began in July 2018 and will be completed after the summer survey period of July 2019. This species is unlikely to be present due to the high degree of disturbance by the historical quarry operation and the contemporary off-roading and dumping. However, since the July 2019 survey has not been done, the following mitigation measure is required:

**MM-BIO-1: July 2019 Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly Survey.** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly Survey shall be conducted pursuant to the *Interim General Survey Guidelines for the Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly* (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, December 30, 1996) and submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department. In order to issue a grading permit, the results of the survey must be negative for the presence of the Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly.
of the species. In the event, the species is present, the Applicant shall be required to maintain the MSHCP in rough step. Mitigation may include, but is not limited to, the funding or purchase of suitable DSF habitat, purchasing conservation credits from an existing DSF mitigation bank, and/or acquiring and funding of habitat restoration.

- **Burrowing Owl:** The Project site is within the MSHCP burrowing owl focused survey area. Potential habitat for burrowing owl occurs throughout portions of the study area. Focused surveys were conducted in May and June of 2018. The species was found to be absent from the project site. Since burrowing owls can quickly occupy a site, a pre-construction survey is still recommended to confirm absence before ground-disturbing activities commence as required by Mitigation Measure BIO-2 below.

**MM-BIO-2: Pre-Construction Burrowing Owl Survey.** Within 30 calendar days prior to grading, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey of the Project’s proposed impact footprint and make a determination regarding the presence or absence of the burrowing owl. The determination shall be documented in a report and shall be submitted, reviewed, and accepted by the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit and subject to the following provisions:

a. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies no burrowing owls in the impact area, a grading permit may be issued without restriction.

b. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies the presence of burrowing owl, then prior to the issuance of a grading permit and prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities on the property, the qualified biologist shall follow the methods recommended by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW, 2012) and Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP, 2006) for passive or active relocation of burrowing owls. Passive relocation, including the required use of one-way doors to exclude owls from the site and the collapsing of burrows, will occur if the biologist determines that the proximity and availability of alternate habitat is suitable for successful passive relocation. Passive relocation shall follow California Department of Fish and Wildlife relocation protocol. If proximate alternate habitat is not present as determined by the biologist, active relocation shall follow California Department of Fish and Wildlife relocation protocol. The biologist shall provide evidence in writing to the Planning Department that the species has fledged or been relocated prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

The Project site does not fall within a survey area for sensitive amphibian or mammal species covered under the MSHCP, or for any listed as threatened or endangered mammal species. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 and BIO-2, the Project will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

**3.4(b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**
**Determination: No Impact.**  
*Source: Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis (Appendix B).*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

No riparian habitat is present on site. No vernal pool indicator soils or plants occur within the Project site. The Project site is not located within Federal Designated Critical Habitat. No further action is required.

---

### 3.4(c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.**  
*Source: Delineation of Wetlands and Jurisdictional Waters (Appendix D).*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.*

The proposed Project site was surveyed on December 18, 2017. A routine wetland delineation was conducted and areas of potential jurisdiction were evaluated using the *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual* (Environmental Laboratory 1987; hereafter *1987 Manual*), *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region* (USACE 2008; hereafter *Regional Supplement*). Other reference materials included the current wetland indicator plant list (Lichvar and Kartesz 2014), current hydric soils list and criteria (U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA] 2010), *Field Guide to Identification of the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) in the Arid West Region of the Western United States* (USACE 2008; hereafter *2008 OHWM Field Guide*), and the CWA Guidance for implementing *Rapanos* and *Carabell* Cases (USACE 2007). The study area was also delineated for any areas that would be subject to potential CDFW jurisdiction based on current CDFW definitions and guidance.
The land southeast of the project site is part of the adjacent project (Highland Park TTM No. 31894), which was surveyed for potential jurisdictional waters/wetlands on March 16, 2016, and described in the Delineation of Wetlands and Jurisdictional Waters Report for the Highland Park Residential Project dated October 7, 2016. The USACE determined in an Approved Jurisdictional Determination letter, dated May 31, 2017 (File No. SPL-2016-00406), that waters of the United States do not occur on the adjacent project. Therefore, the rills and swales in the Highland Park 2 (TTM No. 37470) Proposed Project above the lower southwest corner of the adjacent project are also not jurisdictional waters of the U.S.

Non-Jurisdictional Waters: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

The rills and swales within the proposed Project site are isolated from any downstream connection to traditional navigable waters (TNWs) and tributaries. The total length and area for all the non-jurisdictional erosion features with bed and bank are 746 linear feet and 0.02 acre within the proposed Project site.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife Jurisdiction

The rills and swales on the proposed Project site are located in disturbed land mostly covered by nonnative annual grassland. No riparian/riverine scrub or woodland habitat is present on the Project site. The CDFW can extend jurisdiction over both disturbed and natural streambeds irrespective of whether there is connectivity to a downstream watercourse. The CDFW may not assert jurisdiction over the 0.02 acre of rills and swales since the contribution of downstream functions and values is negligible, because runoff remains on site, and the historic natural drainage area has been contained within Line A as part of the Sierra Estates residential subdivision north of the proposed Project.

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board

The Applicant will discuss with the RWQCB the request for a waste discharge order because it is expected that the USACE will rely upon the Approved Non-Jurisdictional Determination and decline to assert jurisdiction over these erosion features on the proposed project.

Conclusions

Based on the data collected and analyzed, LSA, the applicants’ biologist, delineated 746 linear feet of streambed totaling 0.02 acre within the proposed Project site. The total quantity comprises a few individual erosional features within a vacant parcel. The USACE may determine that waters of the United States do not occur on the proposed Project site. The CDFW may not require the proposed project to obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA). The RWQCB may issue a waste discharge order for the proposed project, since they issued WDO No. R8-2017-0020 for the adopted Highland Park Project (TTM 31894), the adjacent project) to comply with water quality standards.

However, as noted on page 15 of the Delineation of Wetlands and Jurisdictional Waters (Appendix C)...” The results presented in this report should be considered preliminary until verified by the USACE and CDFW. These agencies will make the final determination on the respective jurisdictional areas.”
Although it appears that the data supports a determination that the features on the Project site are not jurisdictional under USACE, CDFW, and RWQCB criteria, in the absence of a final determination from these regulatory agencies, the following mitigation measures are required to be conservative and to ensure jurisdictional waters are not impacted.

**MM BIO-3. Coordination With Regulatory Agencies.** Prior to the issuance of grading permit, the applicant shall contact the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to positively determine whether or not either agency wishes to exert jurisdiction of the onsite drainage features. If either agency decides to exert jurisdiction, Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and BIO-5 shall be implemented.

**BIO-4. Federal Jurisdiction.** If federal jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-3, the following shall be implemented: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall obtain a Clean Water Act Section 404 Nation-Wide Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) and compensate for the loss of 746 linear feet of streambed totaling 0.02 acre at a ratio of not less than 3:1 onsite or not less than 2:1 for permanent impacts, and a Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification from the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). These permits will address impacts to identified jurisdictional resources on the Project site and appropriate offsite mitigation such as the Santa Ana Watershed Project Area (SAWPA), Prado Basin, or an appropriate nearby downstream established mitigation bank area. The developer shall implement this measure to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department.

No USACE mitigation will be required and this mitigation measure may be waived for the proposed Project, if the applicant provides written evidence to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department that the USACE will rely upon the Highland Park (TTM No. 31893) Approved Jurisdictional Determination. The adjacent project also has a waste discharge order, dated May 1, 2017 (Adoption of Order No. RS-2017-0020). The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) will likely issue a waste discharge order for the proposed project, if the USACE makes a non-jurisdictional determination.

**BIO-5. CDFW Jurisdiction.** If state jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-3, the following shall be implemented: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project applicant shall obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement under Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The following shall be incorporated into the permitting, subject to approval by the regulatory agencies: (a) Replacement and/or restoration of jurisdictional “waters of the State” within the Santa Ana River watershed for 746 linear feet of streambed totaling 0.02 acre at a ratio of not less than 3:1 onsite or not less than 2:1 for permanent impacts; (b) The applicant shall restore any onsite or offsite temporary impact areas to pre-project conditions and revegetate where applicable; and (c) Off-site mitigation may occur on land acquired for the purpose of in-perpetuity preservation, or through the purchase of mitigation credits at an agency approved off-site mitigation bank or within an agency-accepted off-site permittee responsible mitigation area such as the Santa Ana Watershed Project Area (SAWPA), Prado Basin, or an appropriate nearby downstream established mitigation bank area.

No CDFW mitigation will be required and this mitigation measure may be waived for the proposed Project, if the applicant provides written evidence to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department that the CDFW does not respond to the streambed alteration notification, then the proposed Project can proceed 60 days after the CDFW states the application is complete or after receiving a CDFW Operation of Law letter.
With implementation of Mitigations BIO-3 through BIO-5, impacts would be less than significant.

3.4(d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**  
*Source: Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis (Appendix B),*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project related to this issue.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

The Project site is bounded by existing development to the north, south, and west. An adopted specific plan project is planned for the land to the east. Therefore, the Project site in its current condition is an in-fill project. The Project site is not part of a County or statewide regional trail or wildlife corridor plan. The Project site does not provide movement cover, foraging, or shelter and is not suitable as a local wildlife movement corridor. No further action is required.

3.4(e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

**Determination: No Impact.**  
*Source: Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis (Appendix B),*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project related to this issue.

There are no trees located on the Project site.

3.4(f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.**
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to conflicting with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. This measure would be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.4-1  The Project is required to pay mitigation fees pursuant to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MHSCP) as required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.80.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site is located within the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The MSHCP, a regional Habitat Conservation Plan was adopted on June 17, 2003. The intent of the MSHCP is to preserve native vegetation and meet the habitat needs of multiple species, rather than focusing preservation efforts on one species at a time. The MSHCP provides coverage (including take authorization for listed species) for special-status plant and animal species, as well as mitigation for impacts to sensitive species.

Based on the analysis under Issues 3.4 (a) through 3.4 (d) above:

- The Project site is not in an MSHCP survey area for riparian/riverine areas or vernal pools.
- The Project will not impact Narrow Endemic Plant Species.
- The Project site does not contain suitable soils to support the Delhi Sand Flower-Loving Fly.
- The Project site is not required to comply with the Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines.
- Burrowing owl habitat exists on the site. Mitigation Measure BIO-3 (30-day Pre-Construction Survey) is required:

With implementation of PPP 3.4-1 and Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, impacts related to conflicts with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan are less than significant.
3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5(a) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?**

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.
*Source:* Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix E).

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

Historic resources generally consist of buildings, structures, improvements, and remnants associated with a significant historic event or person(s) and/or have a historically significant style, design, or achievement. Damaging or demolition of historic resources is typically considered to be a significant impact. Impacts to historic resources can occur through direct impacts, such as destruction or removal, and indirect impacts, such as a change in the setting of a historic resource.

CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(a) clarifies that historical resources include the following:

1. *A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.*
2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements [of] section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code.

3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California.

Results of the January 12, 2018, records search at the EIC indicate there are no previously recorded resources within the Project site; however, the Project site has never been surveyed. The January 12, 2018, field survey revealed approximately 90 percent of the Project site is obscured and very little of the original surface remains exposed. There was virtually complete obstruction by vegetation, and ground visibility was exceptionally poor at approximately 10 percent.

A concentration of discarded asphalt and a stockpile of imported soil were noted in the northern portion of the site. Building and road debris (brick, concrete block, and asphalt fragments) along with sparse modern refuse (including furniture) were also noted on the surface. The southern end of the Project site has been severely disturbed by earthmoving activities.

The January 2018 review of online historic period aerial photographs and maps and online research indicated there were never any buildings or structures within Project site and agricultural cultivation was not conspicuous.

Based on the analysis above, impacts to above ground historical resources are less than significant.

3.5(b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.
Source: Cultural Resources Study (Appendix E).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Archaeological sites are locations that contain resources associated with former human activities, and may contain such resources as human skeletal remains, waste from tool manufacture, tool concentrations, and/or discoloration or accumulation of soil or food remains.

A cultural resources records search, additional research, and a field survey were conducted for the Project site. Although no cultural resources were previously documented within the Project site by the records search, a quarry was in operation during the historic period on the east side of the Project site. Also, numerous prehistoric resources are documented in the immediately vicinity of
the eastern edge of the quarry. Therefore, due to the proximity of these resources, the Project site retains some potential for subsurface resources and part-time archaeological monitoring is recommended.

**MM- CR-1: Archaeological Monitoring.** A qualified archaeologist (the “Project Archaeologist”) shall be retained by the developer prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Project Archaeologist will be on-call to monitor ground-disturbing activities and excavations on the Project site following identification of potential cultural resources by project personnel. If archaeological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project, ground-disturbing activities will be temporarily redirected from the vicinity of the find. The Project Archaeologist will be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading or excavation activities in the vicinity in order to make an evaluation of the find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure CR-2 shall apply.

**MM- CR-2: Archeological Treatment Plan.** If a significant archaeological resource(s) is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). The archaeological monitor, the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented by the archaeologist to protect the identified archaeological resource(s) from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the archaeological resource(s) in accordance with current professional archaeology standards (typically this sampling level is two (2) to five (5) percent of the volume of the cultural deposit). At the completion of the laboratory analysis, any recovered archaeological resources shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department and the Eastern Information Center.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1 and CR-2, impacts will be less than significant.

### 3.5(c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**

*Source: Paleontological Resources Assessment (Appendix F).*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Paleontological resources are the preserved fossilized remains of plants and animals. Fossils and traces of fossils are preserved in sedimentary rock units, particularly fine to medium grained
marine, lake, and stream deposits, such as limestone, siltstone, sandstone, or shale, and in ancient soils. They are also found in coarse-grained sediments, such as conglomerates or coarse alluvium sediments. Fossils are rarely preserved in igneous or metamorphic rock units. Fossils may occur throughout a sedimentary unit and, in fact, are more likely to be preserved subsurface, where they have not been damaged or destroyed by previous ground disturbance, amateur collecting, or natural causes such as erosion.

No significant paleontological resources were identified directly within the Project site during the field survey. However, the literature review indicates the Project site contains middle to early Pleistocene Old Alluvial Fan Deposits, Unit 1, which has high paleontological sensitivity. As such, development of this Project has the potential to impact scientifically important fossils. The following mitigation measure is required.

**MM-CR-3: Paleontological Monitoring.** A qualified paleontologist (the “Project Paleontologist”) shall be retained by the developer prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Project Paleontologist will be on-call to monitor ground-disturbing activities and excavations on the Project site following identification of potential paleontological resources by project personnel. If paleontological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project, ground-disturbing activities will be temporarily redirected from the vicinity of the find. The Project Paleontologist will be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading or excavation activities in the vicinity in order to make an evaluation of the find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure CR-4 shall apply.

**MM-CR-4: Paleontological Treatment Plan.** If a significant paleontological resource(s) is discovered on the property, in consultation with the Project proponent and the City, the qualified paleontologist shall develop a plan of mitigation which shall include salvage excavation and removal of the find, removal of sediment from around the specimen (in the laboratory), research to identify and categorize the find, curation in the find a local qualified repository, and preparation of a report summarizing the find.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-4 and CR-5, impacts are less than significant.

**3.5(d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to disturbing human remains. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.5-1 The project is required to comply with the applicable provisions of California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 as well as Public Resources Code §5097 et. seq.
There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site does not contain a cemetery and no known formal cemeteries are located within the immediate site vicinity. As noted in the response to Issue 3.5 (a) above, the Project site has been heavily disturbed and the potential for uncovering human remains at the Project site is considered low. Nevertheless, the remote potential exists that human remains may be unearthed during grading and excavation activities associated with Project construction.

In the event that human remains are discovered during Project grading or other ground disturbing activities, the Project would be required to comply with the applicable provisions of California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 as well as Public Resources Code §5097 et. seq. California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made by the Coroner.

If the Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be contacted and the NAHC must then immediately notify the “most likely descendant(s)” of receiving notification of the discovery. The most likely descendant(s) shall then make recommendations within 48 hours, and engage in consultations concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.5-1, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on-site or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 (a) (1) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix G), Riverside County Map My County Website).
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and no known faults underlie the site. Because there are no faults located on the Project site, there is no potential for the Project to expose people or structures to adverse effects related to ground rupture.

3.6 (a) (2) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Strong seismic ground shaking?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Sources: Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix G), Riverside County Map My County Website).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to seismic ground shaking. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.6-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, the Project is required to comply with the most recent edition of the California Building Code to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic hazards.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site is located in a seismically active area of Southern California and is expected to experience moderate to severe ground shaking during the lifetime of the Project. This risk is not considered substantially different than that of other similar properties in the southern California area. As a mandatory condition of Project approval, the Project would be required to construct the proposed structures in accordance with the California Building Code (CBC). The City's Building and Safety Department would review the building plans through building plan checks, issuance of a building permit, and inspection of the building during construction, which would ensure that all required CBC seismic safety measures are incorporated into the building. Compliance with the CBC as verified by the City's review process, would reduce impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.6-1, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
3.6 (a) (3) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix G), Riverside County Map My County Website).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to seismic ground shaking. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program:

PPP 3.6-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, the Project is required to comply with the most recent edition of the California Building Code to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic hazards.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which loose, saturated, relatively cohesion-less soil deposits lose shear strength during strong ground motions. The factors controlling liquefaction are:

• Seismic ground shaking of relatively loose, granular soils that are saturated or submerged can cause soils to liquefy and temporarily behave as a dense fluid. For liquefaction to occur, the following conditions have to occur:
  o Intense seismic shaking;
  o Presence of loose granular soils prone to liquefaction; and
  o Saturation of soils due to shallow groundwater.

Based on information obtained from the County of Riverside Map My County website, the Project site has a “moderate” potential for liquefaction. Groundwater was not encountered during any subsurface exploration as part of the geotechnical investigation conducted for the Project site to a depth of 41.5 feet. Review of California Department of Water Resources, Water Data Library 2018 online database indicates groundwater in the general site area has fluctuated from approximately 81 feet to 85 feet below the existing ground surface (Well ID Station: 34008N1173940W001).

Additionally, detailed design-level geotechnical studies and building plans pursuant to the California Building Code are required prior to approval of construction, as required by PPP 3.6-1. Compliance with the recommendations of the geotechnical study for soils conditions, is a standard practice and would be required by the City Building and Safety Department. Therefore, compliance with the requirements of the California Building Code as identified in a site specific geotechnical design would be reviewed by the City for appropriate inclusion, as part of the building plan check.
and development review process, would reduce the low potential for liquefaction to a less than significant level.

### 3.6 (a) (4) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Landslides?

**Determination:** No Impact.
*Source: Field Inspection.*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

Generally, a landslide is defined as the downward and outward movement of loosened rock or earth down a hillside or slope. Landslides can occur either very suddenly or slowly, and frequently accompany other natural hazards such as earthquakes, floods, or wildfires. Landslides can also be induced by the undercutting of slopes during construction, improper artificial compaction, or saturation from sprinkler systems or broken water pipes.

The site is relatively flat and contains no slopes that may be subject to landslides. Therefore the site is not considered susceptible to seismically induced landslides. As such, there are no impacts.

### 3.6(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.
*Source: City Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.010, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls,*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts related to soil erosion. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP’s 3.91-1 through PPP 3.9-4 in Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality shall apply.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*
Construction

Construction of the Project has the potential to contribute to soil erosion and the loss of topsoil. Grading and excavation activities that would be required for the proposed Project would expose and loosen topsoil, which could be eroded by wind or water.

City Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.010, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, implements the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permit, which establishes minimum stormwater management requirements and controls that are required to be implemented for construction of the proposed Project. To reduce the potential for soil erosion and the loss of topsoil, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required by the City, (as required by PPP 3.9-2). The SWPPP is required to address site-specific conditions related to specific grading and construction activities. The SWPPP would identify potential sources of erosion and sedimentation loss of topsoil during construction, identify erosion control Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce or eliminate the erosion and loss of topsoil, such as use of: silt fencing, fiber rolls, or gravel bags, stabilized construction entrance/exit, hydroseeding.

With compliance with the City Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.010, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements, and the best management practices (BMPs) in the SWPPP, construction impacts related to erosion and loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

Operation

The proposed Project includes installation of landscaping throughout the Project site and areas of loose topsoil that could erode by wind or water would not exist upon operation of the proposed use. In addition, as described in Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, the hydrologic features of the proposed Project have been designed to slow, filter, and retain stormwater on the Project site, which would also reduce the potential for stormwater to erode topsoil. Furthermore, pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.010, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, implementation of the Project requires a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), which would ensure that appropriate operational BMPs would be implemented to minimize or eliminate the potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil to occur during operation of the Project. As a result, potential impacts related to substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.9-2, impacts would be less than significant.

3.6(c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on-or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix G),
Impact Analysis

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to an unstable geologic unit. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.6-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, the Project is required to comply with the most recent edition of the *California Building Code* to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic hazards.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

*Landslide*

As noted in the response to Issue 3.6 (a) (4) above, the site is relatively flat and contains no slopes that may be subject to landslides. Therefore, the site is not considered susceptible to landslides.

*Lateral Spreading*

Lateral spreading is a term referring to landslides that commonly form on gentle slopes and that have rapid fluid-like flow horizontal movement. Most lateral spreading is caused by earthquakes but it is also caused by landslides. As noted in the response to Issue 3.6 (a) (4) above, the site is relatively flat and contains no slopes that may be subject to landslides. Therefore, the site is not considered susceptible to lateral spreading.

*Subsidence*

Subsidence is the downward movement of the ground caused by the underlying soil conditions. Certain soils, such as clay soils are particularly vulnerable since they shrink and swell depending on their moisture content. Subsidence is an issue if buildings or structures sink which causes damage to the building or structure. Subsidence is usually remedied by excavating the soil the depth of the underlying bedrock and then recompacting the soil so that it is able to support buildings and structures.

According to the Riverside County Map My County website, the Project site is considered “susceptible” to subsidence. However, with implementation of PPP 3.6-1, impacts would be less than significant.

*Liquefaction*

As noted in the response to Issue 3.6 (a) (3) above, the potential for exposure to liquefaction is not expected because the depth of groundwater is more than 41.5-feet.
Collapse

Collapse occurs in saturated soils in which the space between individual particles is completely filled with water. This water exerts a pressure on the soil particles that influences how tightly the particles themselves are pressed together. The soils lose their strength beneath buildings and other structures.

As noted in the response to Issue 3.6 (a) (3) above, the Project site’s potential for exposure to collapse is considered “low” because the depth of groundwater is more than 41.5-feet. As such, impacts are less than significant.

3.6(d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact.

Source: Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix G).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to expansive soils. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.6-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, the Project is required to comply with the most recent edition of the California Building Code to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic hazards.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Expansive soils are those that undergo volume changes as moisture content fluctuates; swelling substantially when wet or shrinking when dry. Soil expansion can damage structures by cracking foundations, causing settlement and distorting structural elements. According to the results of the laboratory testing performed, the near-surface older alluvial soils exhibited a “negligible” to “very low” expansion potential when tested in accordance with ASTM D 4829. Design-level geotechnical plans pursuant to the California Building Code are required prior to approval of construction, as required by PPP 3.6-1. Compliance with the California Building Code is a standard practice and would be required by the City Building and Safety Department. Therefore, compliance with the requirements of the California Building Code as identified in a site specific geotechnical design would be reviewed by the City, as part of the building plan check and development review process, would ensure that potential soil stability impacts would be less than significant level.
3.6(e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

**Determination: No Impact.**
*Source: Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*There are no Plans, Policies, Programs, applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

The Project does not propose the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. The Project would install domestic sewer infrastructure and connect to the Rubidoux Community Service District’s existing sewer conveyance and treatment system. As such, there are no impacts.
3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7(a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (Appendix A).*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to greenhouse gas emissions. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

**PPP 3.7-1** As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, *California Energy Code*, prior to issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant shall submit showing that the Project will be constructed in compliance with the most recently adopted edition of the applicable California Building Code Title 24 requirements.

**PPP 3.7-2** As required by Municipal Code Section 9.283.010, *Water Efficient Landscape Design Requirements*, prior to the approval of landscaping plans, the Project proponent shall prepare and submit landscape plans that demonstrate compliance with this section.

**PPP 3.7-3** As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010 (8), the Project proponent shall comply with the *California Green Building Standards*.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

An individual project cannot generate enough greenhouse gas emissions to influence global climate change. The Project participates in this potential impact by its incremental contribution combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of greenhouse gases which when taken together may have a significant impact on global climate change.
A final numerical threshold for determining the significance of greenhouse gas emissions in the South Coast Air Basin has not been established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The City of Jurupa Valley is using the following as interim thresholds for small residential projects:

- Residential projects that emit less stationary source greenhouse gas emissions less than 3,000 MTCO2e per year are not considered a substantial greenhouse gas emitter and the impact is less than significant. Projects that emit in excess of 3,000 MTCO2e per year require additional analysis and mitigation.

A summary of the Project’s projected annual operational greenhouse gas emissions, including amortized construction-related emissions, is provided in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Source</th>
<th>GHG Emissions (metric tons per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Construction Emissions</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(amortized over 30 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>150.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>339.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Usage</td>
<td>14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CO2E (All Sources)</strong></td>
<td><strong>527.98</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance Threshold</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant?</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (Appendix A).

Based on guidance from the SCAQMD, if this type of project would emit GHG emissions less than 3,000 MTCO2e per year, the project is not considered a substantial GHG emitter and the GHG impact is less than significant, requiring no additional analysis and no mitigation.

**3.7(b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**


**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the project relating to this issue.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.
The Climate Change Scoping Plan was first approved by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) in 2008 and must be updated every five years. The First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan was approved by the Board on May 22, 2014. The Climate Change Scoping Plan provides a framework for actions to reduce California’s GHG emissions, and requires CARB and other state agencies to adopt regulations and other initiatives to reduce GHGs. As such, the Climate Change Scoping Plan is not directly applicable to the Projects in many cases. The Project is not in conflict with the Climate Change Scoping Plan because its individual greenhouse gas emissions are below screening thresholds as noted in the response to Issue 3.7 (a) above and the Project will implement such greenhouse reduction measures Water Efficient Landscaping, Title 24 Energy Efficiency Requirements, and recycling and waste reduction requirements.

In addition, the City of Jurupa Valley is a participant in the Western Riverside County Council of Governments Subregional Climate Action Plan (WRCOG Subregional CAP). The specific goals and actions included in the WRCOG Subregional CAP that are applicable to the proposed Project include those pertaining to energy and water use reduction, promotion of green building measures, waste reduction, and reduction in vehicle miles traveled. The proposed Project would also be required to include all mandatory green building measures for new developments under the CALGreen Code, as required by the City Municipal Code Section 8.05.010 (8), which would require that the new buildings reduce water consumption, employ building commissioning to increase building system efficiencies, divert construction waste from landfills, and install low pollutant emitting finish materials. In addition, the City’s requires that all landscaping comply with water efficient landscaping requirements.

The implementation of these stricter building and appliance standards would result in water, energy, and construction waste reductions for the proposed Project. In addition, as described above, the proposed Project would not exceed the GHG thresholds. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases with implementation of PPP 3.7-1 through 3.7-3.
### 3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.8(a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

**3.8(b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**
MA 18089  
Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration  
November 12, 2018

Determination: Less than Significant Impact.  
Source: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Appendix H).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to this issue. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.8-1 As required by General Plan Policy CSSF 1.31-Federal/State Laws. Comply with federal and state laws regarding the management of hazardous waste and materials.

Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Existing Conditions

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the Project site in accordance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E 1527-13 has revealed no evidence of recognized environmental conditions in connection with the Project site.

Construction Activities

Heavy equipment that would be used during construction of the proposed Project would be fueled and maintained by substances such as oil, diesel fuel, gasoline, hydraulic fluid, and other liquid materials that would be considered hazardous if improperly stored or handled. In addition, materials such as paints, roofing materials, solvents, and other substances typically used in building construction would be located on the Project site during construction. Improper use, storage, or transportation of hazardous materials could result in accidental releases or spills, potentially posing health risks to workers, the public, and the environment. The potential for accidental releases and spills of hazardous materials during construction is a standard risk on all construction sites, and there would be no greater risk for improper handling, transportation, or spills associated with future development that would be a reasonably consequence of the proposed Project than would occur on any other similar construction site.

Construction contractors are required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations regarding hazardous materials, including but not limited requirements imposed by the Environmental Protection Agency, California Department of Toxic Substances Control, South Coast Air Quality Management District, and the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. As such, impacts due to construction activities would not cause a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. A less than significant impact would occur.
Operational Activities

The Project site would be developed with residential land uses which is a land use not typically associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Although residential land uses may utilize household products that contain toxic substances, such as cleansers, paints, adhesives, and solvents, these products are usually in low concentration and small in amount and would not pose a significant risk to humans or the environment during transport to/from or use at the Project site.

Pursuant to State law and local regulations, residents would be required to dispose of household hazardous waste (e.g., batteries, used oil, old paint) at a permitted household hazardous waste collection facility. Accordingly, the Project would not expose people or the environment to significant hazards associated with the disposal of hazardous materials at the Project site. Long-term operation of the Project would not expose the public or the environment to significant hazards associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and impacts would be less than significant.

3.8(c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: Project Application Materials, Google Earth.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site is not located within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest school in Nueva Vista Continuation School located approximately 0.50 miles west of the Project site. As discussed in the responses to issues 3.8 (b) and 3.8 (b) above, the all hazardous or potentially hazardous materials would comply with all applicable federal, State, and local agencies and regulations with respect to hazardous materials. As such, impacts are less than significant.

3.8(d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Determination: No Impact.
Sources: DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese List,) Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Appendix H).
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As such, no impact would occur.

3.8(e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site is located approximately 1.5 miles northwest of the Flabob Airport. According to Map FL-1, Flabob Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Project site is not located within a Compatibility Zone of the Flabob Airport Influence Area. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

3.8(f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Google Earth. Site Reconnaissance.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.
The Project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, no impact would occur.

### 3.8(g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Sources: General Plan Safety Element, Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

Access to the Project site is proposed from 30th Street which are paved roadway and would be further improved by the Project. The Project site does not contain any emergency facilities nor does it serve as an emergency evacuation route. During construction and long-term operation, the Project would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles from 30th Street and connecting roadways as required by the City. Furthermore, the Project would not result in a substantial alteration to the design or capacity of any public road that would impair or interfere with the implementation of evacuation procedures. Because the Project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan, impacts are less than significant.

### 3.8(h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Source: General Plan Figure 8-11.*

**Impact Analysis**

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to this issue. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

PPP 3.14-1 The Project applicant shall comply with all applicable Riverside County Fire Department codes, ordinances, and standard conditions regarding fire prevention and suppression measures relating to water improvement plans, fire hydrants, automatic fire extinguishing systems, fire access, access gates, combustible construction, water availability, and fire sprinkler systems.
According to *General Plan Figure 8-11: Wildfire Severity Zones in Jurupa Valley*, the Project site is shown as being in a "Moderate" fire hazard area. The Project would be conditioned by the City to provide a minimum of fire safety and support fire suppression activities, including compliance with State and local fire codes. As such, development of the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires and impacts would be less than significant.
### 3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or offsite?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.9(a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Tentative Tract Map 37470, Preliminary WQMP (Appendix I).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating water quality and waste discharge requirements. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

**PPP 3.9-1** As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, *Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section B (1)*, any person performing construction work in the city shall comply with the provisions of this chapter, and shall control storm water runoff so as to prevent any likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. The City Engineer shall identify the BMPs that may be implemented to prevent such deterioration and shall identify the manner of implementation. Documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 shall be required when requested by the City Engineer.

**PPP 3.9-2** As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, *Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section B (2)*, any person performing construction work in the city shall be regulated by the State Water Resources Control Board in a manner pursuant to and consistent with applicable requirements contained in the General Permit No. CAS000002, State Water Resources Control Board Order Number 2009-0009-DWQ. The city may notify the State Board of any person performing construction work that has a non-compliant construction site per the General Permit.

**PPP 3.9-3** As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, *Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section C*, new development or redevelopment projects shall control storm water runoff so as to prevent any deterioration of water quality that would impair subsequent or competing uses of the water. The City Engineer shall identify the BMPs that may be implemented to prevent such deterioration and shall identify the manner of implementation. Documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 shall be required when requested by the City Engineer. The BMPs may include, but are not limited to, the following and may, among other things, require new developments or redevelopments to do any of the following:

1. Increase permeable areas by leaving highly porous soil and low lying area undisturbed by:
   
   a. Incorporating landscaping, green roofs and open space into the project design,
(b) Using porous materials for or near driveways, drive aisles, parking stalls and low volume roads and walkways; and

(c) Incorporating detention ponds and infiltration pits into the project design.

(2) Direct runoff to permeable areas by orienting it away from impermeable areas to swales, berms, green strip filters, gravel beds, rain gardens, pervious pavement or other approved green infrastructure and French drains by:

(a) Installing rain-gutters oriented towards permeable areas;

(b) Modifying the grade of the property to divert flow to permeable areas and minimize the amount of storm water runoff leaving the property; and

(c) Designing curbs, berms or other structures such that they do not isolate permeable or landscaped areas.

(3) Maximize storm water storage for reuse by using retention structures, subsurface areas, cisterns, or other structures to store storm water runoff for reuse or slow release.

(4) Rain gardens may be proposed in-lieu of a water quality basin when applicable and approved by the City Engineer.

PPP 3.9-4 As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section E, any person or entity that owns or operates a commercial and/or industrial facility(s) shall comply with the provisions of this chapter. All such facilities shall be subject to a regular program of inspection as required by this chapter, any NPDES permit issued by the State Water Resource Control Board, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Wat. Code Section 13000 et seq.), Title 33 U.S.C. Section 1251 et seq. (Clean Water Act), any applicable state or federal regulations promulgated thereto, and any related administrative orders or permits issued in connection therewith.

Project Design Features (PDF)

The following feature proposed by the Project is incorporated into the Project’s design and is intended to reduce or avoid impacts to hydrology and water quality. This feature will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PDF 3.9-1 The Project will provide a water quality basin with a design capture volume (DCV) sufficient retain all stormwater runoff for percolation into the groundwater. The detention basins will provide water quality treatment during percolation.
Construction Impacts

Construction of the Project would involve clearing, grading, paving, utility installation, building construction, and the installation of landscaping, which would result in the generation of potential water quality pollutants such as silt, debris, chemicals, paints, and other solvents with the potential to adversely affect water quality. As such, short-term water quality impacts have the potential to occur during construction of the Project in the absence of any protective or avoidance measures.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City of Jurupa Valley, the Project would be required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Municipal Stormwater Permit for construction activities. The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit is required for all Projects that include construction activities, such as clearing, grading, and/or excavation that disturb at least one acre of total land area.

In addition, the Project would be required to comply with the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program. Compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit and the Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program involves the preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for construction-related activities, including grading. The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan would specify the Best Management Practices that the Project would be required to implement during construction activities to ensure that all potential pollutants of concern are prevented, minimized, and/or otherwise appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the subject property.

Operational Impacts

Storm water pollutants commonly associated with the type of land uses that could occupy the proposed buildings include sediment/turbidity, nutrients, trash and debris, oxygen-demanding substances, organic compounds, bacteria and viruses, oil and grease, and pesticides.

Pursuant to the requirements of the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit, a Water Quality Management Plan is required for managing the quality of storm water or urban runoff that flows from a developed site after construction is completed and the facilities or structures are occupied and/or operational. A Water Quality Management Plan describes the Best Management Practices that will be implemented and maintained throughout the life of a project to prevent and minimize water pollution that can be caused by storm water or urban runoff.

Impervious areas shall be discharged into adjacent landscaped areas, where feasible, and all onsite area is discharged into the onsite bioretention basin before leaving the Project site. Treatment of first flush waters from the development will be accomplished by routing them through the proposed on-site water quality basin.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.9-1 through PPP 3.9-4, impacts would be less than significant.
3.9(b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Sources: Tentative Tract Map 37470, Preliminary WQMP (Appendix I).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site is located within the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD). The JCSD Board of Directors approved a “no contest” action that supports the de-annexation of the Project site from JCSD and the annexation of the Project site to the Rubidoux Community Services District. As such, water service will be provided to the Project site by the Rubidoux Community Services District (“District”).

According to the District’s Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, the sole source of potable water supply for the District and for all water users in the Rubidoux Community is groundwater extracted from the southern portion of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin 1 (also referred to herein as the Riverside Basin) of the Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin. The Basin encompasses the District’s entire service area. The District expects that groundwater extracted from the Basin by six potable and six non-potable (irrigation only) groundwater wells will continue to be its primary (and possibly only) source of water through the year 2040, and possibly beyond.

The Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin is adjudicated, as set forth in Judgment No. 78426 (also referred to herein as the Basin Judgment). According to Section IX(b) of the Basin Judgment, entered April 17, 1969, "over any five-year period, there may be extracted from such Basin Area, without replenishment obligation, an amount equal to five times such annual average for the Basin Area; provided, however, that if extractions in any year exceed such average by more than 20 percent, Western [Western Municipal Water District] shall provide replenishment in the following year equal to the excess extractions over such 20 percent peaking allowance."

In August 2015, DWR released a draft list of 21 groundwater basins and subbasins significantly overdrafted by "excessive" pumping in response to a series of executive orders issued by Governor Brown since January 2014. The Riverside-Arlington Subbasin was not included in this list. DWR published the final list in January 2016, with no changes to the designation of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin.
Development of the Project would increase impervious surface coverage on the site which would in turn reduce the amount of direct infiltration of runoff into the ground. This would have a less than significant impact on groundwater recharge in the areas of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin 1 that are managed for that purpose, since those recharge areas do not encompass the Project site.

According to a review of California Department of Water Resources, Water Data Library 2018 online database indicates groundwater in the general site area has fluctuated from approximately 81 feet to 85 feet below the existing ground surface (Well ID Station: 34008N1173940W001).

Based on the above analysis, impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

3.9(c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite?

3.9(d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on or offsite?

3.9(e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

**Determination:** Less than Significant Impact.
*Sources: Tentative Tract Map 37470, Preliminary WQMP (Appendix I).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

Refer to PPP 3.9-1 through 3.9-4 under Issue 3.9 (a) above.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

Refer to PDF 3.9-1 under Issue 3.9 (a) above.

The Project site currently drains from north to south, and these existing drainage patterns will be conserved. Impervious areas shall be discharged into adjacent landscaped areas, where feasible, and all onsite area will be discharged into the onsite bioretention basin before leaving the Project site.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.9-1 through 3.9-4, impacts would be less than significant with respect to Issues 3.9 (c), 3.9 (d), and 3.9 (e) above and no mitigation measures are required.
3.9(f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: Tentative Tract Map 37470, Preliminary WQMP (Appendix I).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

Refer to PPP 3.9-1 through 3.9-4 under Issue 3.9 (a) above.

Project Design Features (PDF)

Refer to PDF 3.9-1 under Issue 3.9 (a) above.

There are no conditions associated with the proposed Project that could result in the substantial degradation of water quality beyond what is described above in response to Issues 3.9 (a), 3.9(c), and 3.9 (e) above.

3.9(g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: General Plan Figure 8-9.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

According to General Plan Figure 8-9: Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the Project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

3.9(h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: General Plan Figure 8-9.

Impact Analysis
There are no Plans, Policies, Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

According to General Plan Figure 8-9: Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the Project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

**3.9(i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

**Determination: No Impact.**
*Source: General Plan Figure 8-9.*

**Impact Analysis**

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

According to General Plan Figure 8-9: Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the Project site is not located within an area that may be exposed to the failure of a levee or a dam. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

**3.9(j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

**Determination: No Impact.**
*Sources: Project Application Materials, Google Earth.*

**Impact Analysis**

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Pacific Ocean is located more than 30 miles from the Project site; consequently, there is no potential for tsunamis to impact the Project. In addition, no steep hillsides subject to mudflow are located on or near the Project site. The nearest large body of surface water to the site is Lake
Mathews, located approximately 12 miles to the south. Due to the distance of Lake Mathews from the Project site, a seiche in Lake Mathews would have no impact on the Project. Therefore, the Project site would not be subject to inundation by a seiche, mudflow, and/or tsunami. Therefore, no impact would occur.
3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.10(a) Physically divide an established community?

Determination: No Impact.
Sources: Project Application Materials, Google Earth.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)
There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)
There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

An example of a Project that has the potential to divide an established community includes the construction of a new freeway or highway through an established neighborhood. The Project is located in an area largely characterized by residential development and vacant land. Land uses surrounding to the north are 30th Street with single-family homes further to the north, to the south are railroad tracks with Canal Street and single-family homes further to the south, to the east is vacant land, and to the west is vacant land with Mt. Rubidoux Nursing Center, single-family residences, and a vehicle storage facility further to the west. Therefore, no impacts would occur with respect to dividing an established community.
3.10(b) **Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Sources: General Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan, Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program Project Application Materials*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

The applicable plans and policies relating to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect are described in the analysis below.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Although the Project proposes a change of zone form R-R (Rural Residential) to R-1 (One Family Dwellings), the Project is still consistent with the General Plan Land Use Designation of MDR (Medium Density Residential) which allows development on the Project site with a density range of 2-5 dwelling units per acre. The Project is proposed at a density of 5.0 dwelling units per acre.

As demonstrated throughout this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Project would otherwise not conflict with any applicable goals, objectives, and policies of the City of Jurupa General Plan or the City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. Additionally, the Project would not conflict with any applicable policy document, including the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program, the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Air Quality Management Plan, and the Flabob Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The purpose of these plans are to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect.

In conclusion, the Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating adverse environmental effects and impacts are less than significant with implementation of all of the Plans, Policies, and Programs identified in the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

3.10(c) **Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

*Source: Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis (Appendix B)*
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to a conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. This measure would be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.4-1 The Project is required to pay mitigation fees pursuant to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MHSCP) as required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.80.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project is located within the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The MSHCP, a regional Habitat Conservation Plan, was adopted on June 17, 2003. The intent of the MSHCP is to preserve native vegetation and meet the habitat needs of multiple species, rather than focusing preservation efforts on one species at a time. The MSHCP provides coverage (including take authorization for listed species) for special-status plant and animal species, as well as mitigation for impacts to sensitive species.

Based on the analysis under Issues 3.4 (a) through 3.4 (d) (Biological Resources):

- The Project site is not in an MSHCP survey area for riparian/riverine areas or vernal pools.
- The Project will not impact Narrow Endemic Plant Species.
- The Project site does not contain suitable soils to support the Delhi Sand Flower-Loving Fly.
- The Project site is not required to comply with the Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines.
- Burrowing owl habitat exists on the site. Mitigation Measure BIO-3 (30-day Pre-Construction Survey) is required:

With implementation of PPP 3.4-1 and Mitigation Measure BIO-1 and BIO-2, impacts related to conflicts with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan are less than significant.
3.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.11(a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

Determination: No Impact.

Source: General Plan.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

According to General Plan Figure 4-16: Jurupa Valley Mineral Resources, the Project site is mapped within MRZ-3, which is defined as "Areas containing known or inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resources significance." No mineral resource extraction activity is known to have ever occurred on the Project site. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State of California. Therefore, no impact would occur.

3.11(b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Source: General Plan.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.
There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

According to General Plan Figure 4-16: Jurupa Valley Mineral Resources, the Project site is mapped within MRZ-3, which is defined as “Areas containing known or inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resources significance.” However, no mineral resource extraction activity is known to have ever occurred on the Project site. As such, impacts are less than significant.
### 3.12 NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.12(a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.  
*Source: Noise and Vibration Impact Analysis (Appendix J).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to noise but not to the degree that impacts would be less than significant. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.12-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 11.05.020 (9), private construction projects located within one-quarter (¼) of a mile from an inhabited dwelling shall not perform construction between the hours of six (6:00) p.m. and six (6:00) a.m. during
the months of June through September and between the hours of six (6:00) p.m. and seven (7:00) a.m. during the months of October through May.

PPP 3.12-2 As required by Jurupa Valley Municipal Code Section 11.05.040, no person shall create any sound, or allow the creation of any sound, on any property that causes the exterior sound level on any other occupied property to exceed the sound level standards set forth in Table 1 of this section or that violates the special sound source standards set forth in Section 11.05.060.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Existing Ambient Noise Environment

Sources that dominate the existing noise environment include traffic on 30th Street and distant traffic on SR 60, as well as parking lot impacts west of the Project site.

Construction Noise

The proposed Project would require the use of heavy-duty, off-road construction equipment throughout development activities. Since project specific information is not available at this time, potential construction-related noise impacts can only be evaluated based on the typical construction activities associated with industrial development. Potential construction source noise levels were developed based on methodologies, reference noise levels, and equipment usage and other operating factors documented and contained in the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Construction Noise Handbook (FHWA, 2010), Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment document (FTA, 2006), and Caltrans' Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual (Caltrans, 2013).

Project construction activities would include: staging, site preparation (e.g., land clearing), grading, utility trenching, foundation work (e.g., excavation, pouring concrete pads), material deliveries, building construction (e.g., framing, concrete pouring, welding), paving, coating application, and site finishing work. In general, these activities would involve the use of worker vehicles, delivery trucks, dump trucks, and heavy-duty construction equipment such as (but not limited to) backhoes, tractors, loaders, graders, excavators, rollers, cranes, material lifts, generators, and air compressors. Table 12 presents the noise levels associated with typical types of construction equipment that could be used to develop the Project.

With regard to construction noise, site preparation and grading phases typically result in the highest temporary noise levels due to the use of heavy-duty equipment such as dozers, excavators, graders, loaders, scrapers, and trucks. As shown in Table 11, the worst-case Leq and Lmax noise levels associated with the operation of a dozer, excavator, scraper, etc. are predicted to be approximately 82 and 85 dBA, respectively, at a distance of 50 feet from the equipment operating area. At an active construction site, it is not uncommon for two or more pieces of construction equipment to operate at the same time and in close proximity. The concurrent operation of two or more pieces of construction equipment would result in noise levels of approximately 85 to 88 dBA at a distance of 50 feet from equipment operating areas. These maximum noise levels would occur for a short period time; as site preparation and grading is completed and building construction
begins, work activities would occur further from property lines and generate lower construction noise levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Reference Noise Level at 50 feet (Lmax)</th>
<th>Predicted Noise Levels (Leq) at Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 Feet</td>
<td>100 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulldozer</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact Roller</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixer</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraper</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Truck</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Roller</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Caltrans, 2013, FHWA, 2010

dBA: Noise level (or volume) is generally measured in decibels (dB) using the A-weighted sound pressure level (dBA). The A-weighting scale is an adjustment to the actual sound pressure levels to be consistent with that of human hearing response.

Lmax: The RMS (root mean squared) maximum level of a noise source or environment where peak is the maximum level of the raw noise source.

Leq: The method to describe sound levels that vary over time, resulting in a single decibel value which takes into account the total sound energy over the period of time of interest.

Per Section 11.05.020 (9) of the Municipal Code, construction activities occurring between the hours of 6:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of June through September and between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of October through May are exempt from noise standards.

Regardless of the Project’s consistency with the Municipal Code as described above, construction activities on the Project site, especially those involving heavy equipment, would result in noise levels up to 88 dBA during grading which would exceed the exterior noise level for residential uses.
of 55 dBA CNEL. The following mitigation measure is required to reduce construction noise impacts to the maximum extent feasible:

**Mitigation Measure**

*Mitigation Measure NOI-1-Construction Noise Mitigation Plan.* Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the developer is required to submit a construction-related noise mitigation plan to the City Planning Department for review and approval. The plan must depict the location of construction equipment and how the noise from this equipment will be mitigated during construction of this project. In addition, the plan shall require that the following notes are included on grading plans and building plans. Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the notes and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by City of Jurupa Valley staff or its designee to confirm compliance. These notes also shall be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors.

"a) Haul truck deliveries shall be limited to between the hours of 6:00am to 6:00pm during the months of June through September and 7:00am to 6:00pm during the months of October through May.

b) Construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers' standards.

c) All stationary construction equipment shall be placed in such a manner so that emitted noise is directed away from any sensitive receptors adjacent to the Project site.

d) Construction equipment staging areas shall be located the greatest distance between the staging area and the nearest sensitive receptors."

Per Section 11.05.020 (9) of the Municipal Code, construction activities occurring between the hours of 6:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of June through September and between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of October through May are exempt from noise standards.

**Operational Noise**

The Project is proposed to consist of 34 single-family detached residential lots and the only potential for the Project to create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels would be from future traffic generated by the proposed homes. The proposed Project is expected to generate approximately 324 average daily vehicle trips (26 trips in the AM Peak hours and 34 trips in the PM Peak hours) which will not noticeably increase ambient noise levels in the Project area. Typically, a doubling of traffic volumes is required to result in an increase of 3 dBA, which is considered to be a barely audible change. Project generated traffic will not result in a doubling of traffic volumes along any affected roadway segment. As such, the proposed Project traffic would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient roadway noise levels. Off-site transportation-related noise impacts created by the Project would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

**3.12(b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: Noise and Vibration Impact Analysis (Appendix J).*
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Construction Vibration

Under existing conditions, there are no known sources of ground-borne vibration or noise emanating from the Project site. The Project will not employ any pile driving, rock blasting, or rock crushing equipment during construction activities, which are the primary sources of ground-borne noise and vibration during construction.

The City has relied upon vibration standards promulgated by Caltrans in past CEQA documents. (California Department of Transportation, Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. September, 2013). According to Caltrans, the threshold at which there may be a risk of architectural damage to normal houses with plastered walls and ceilings is 0.20 PPV inch/second. Primary sources of vibration during construction would be bulldozers. A large bulldozer could produce up to 0.089 PPV at 25 feet. At a distance of 15 feet a bulldozer would yield a worst-case 0.027 PPV (inch/sec) which is within the threshold of perception and below any risk or architectural damage.

There are single family residences located near the Project site. The level of anticipated vibration does not exceed 0.20 PPV inch/second. As such, vibration would not result in the excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Operational Vibration

Typically, groundborne vibration sources that could potentially affect nearby properties are from rail roads and trucks traveling at higher speeds on freeways and highways. The Project does not have rail access nor is it a major transportation facility or roadway. Therefore, the operational impacts associated with ground-borne vibration would be less than significant at nearby sensitive uses.

3.12(c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.


Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

Refer to PPP 3.12-1 and PPP 3.12-2 under Issue 3.12(a) above.
There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

As discussed above under Issue 3.12(a), with implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1, impacts would be less than significant.

**3.12(d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.**

*Source: Noise and Vibration Impact Analysis (Appendix J).*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

Refer to PPP 3.12-1 and PPP 3.12-2 under Issue 3.12(a) above.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

As discussed above under Issue 3.12(a), the only potential for the Project to create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels is during its construction phase. The analysis presented under Issue 3.12(a) concluded that the Project would result in elevated noise levels during construction but were less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1.

**3.12 (e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?**

**Determination: No Impact.**

*Source: Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission.*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

According to Map FL-3, Noise Compatibility Contours, the Project site is not located within an area that will be significantly impacted by aircraft noise. As such, the Project will not result in excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area.
3.12(f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Google Earth, Field Inspection.

The Project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impacts will occur.
3.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.13(a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact.

Source: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project would not result in substantial population growth because it only will allow up to thirty-four (34) dwelling units. According to the California Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2018* Jurupa Valley has 3.35 persons per household. The increase in population would be 114 persons assuming all the future residents of the houses would come from outside the city limits.

Typically, growth would be considered a significant impact pursuant to CEQA if it directly or indirectly affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public services and requires the expansion or new construction of public facilities and utilities.

New water and sewer lines will connect to the existing facilities in 30th Street.

In addition, the analysis in Section 3.14, Public Services, of this Initial Study Checklist demonstrates that the impacts on public services are less than significant so the public service provider’s ability...
to provide services will not be reduced. Based on the above analysis, impacts are less than significant.

**3.13(b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**Determination: No Impact.**

*Sources: Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

The Project site does not contain any residential housing units. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not displace a substantial number of existing housing, nor would it necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. As such, there would be no impact.

**3.13(c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**Determination: No Impact.**

*Source: Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*There are no Plans, Policies, Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

As described above under the response to Issue 3.13(b), the Project site does not contain residential housing units. Therefore, the Project would not displace substantial numbers of people and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Impacts would be less than significant.
3.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.14(a) Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

FIRE PROTECTION

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Riverside County Fire Department.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to fire protection. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.14-1 The Project applicant shall comply with all applicable Riverside County Fire Department codes, ordinances, and standard conditions regarding fire prevention and suppression measures relating to water improvement plans, fire hydrants,
automatic fire extinguishing systems, fire access, access gates, combustible construction, water availability, and fire sprinkler systems.

PPP 3.14-2 As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 et seq., the Project proponent shall pay a Development Impact Fee (DIF) following protocol for impact fee collection.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Riverside County Fire Department provides fire protection services to the Project area. The Project would be primarily served by the Rubidoux Fire Station No. 38, an existing station located at an existing station located approximately 2.7 roadway miles northwest of the Project site at 5721 Mission Boulevard.

Development of the Project would impact fire protection services by placing an additional demand on existing fire protection resources should its resources not be augmented. To offset the increased demand for fire protection services, the Project would be conditioned by the City to provide a minimum of fire safety and support fire suppression activities, including compliance with State and local fire codes, fire sprinklers, a fire hydrant system, paved access, and secondary access routes. Although the Project would increase the demand for fire protection services, it is not anticipated that it would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities as the Fire Department has reviewed the Project and will provide fire protection services from existing facilities.

Furthermore, the Project would be required to comply with the provisions of Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 which requires payment of the Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing for fire protection services. Payment of the Development Impact Fee would ensure that the Project provides fair share funds for the provision of additional public services, including fire protection services, which may be applied to fire facilities and/or equipment, to offset the incremental increase in the demand for fire protection services that would be created by the Project.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.14-1 and PPP 3.14-2, impacts related to fire protection are less than significant.

POLICE PROTECTION

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: Riverside County Sheriff’s Department “Stations,” Riverside County General Plan, Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to police protection. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:
PPP 3.14-2  As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 et seq., the Project proponent shall pay a Development Impact Fee (DIF) following protocol for impact fee collection.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Riverside County Sheriff's Department provides community policing to the Project area via the Jurupa Valley Station located at 7477 Mission Boulevard, Jurupa Valley, CA. The Project would increase the demand for police protection services. The Project would be required to comply with the provisions of Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 which requires payment of the Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing for public services, including police protection services. Payment of the Development Impact Fee would ensure that the Project provides its fair share of funds for additional police protection services, which may be applied to sheriff facilities and/or equipment, to offset the incremental increase in the demand that would be created by the Project. Although the Project would increase the demand for police protection services, it is not anticipated that it would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities as the Sheriff's Department has reviewed the Project and will provide police protection services from existing facilities. As such, the Project would not result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives.

In addition, consistent with General Plan Policy CSSF 2.1-2, the Project plans were routed to the Sheriff's Department for review and comment to increase public safety and maintain close coordination with the Sheriff's Department and law enforcement programs.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.14-2, impacts related to police protection are less than significant.

SCHOOLS

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: California Senate Bill 50 (Greene), Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to schools. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.14-3  As required by Section 65995 of the Government Code, the Project Applicant shall pay required development impact fees to the applicable school district following protocol for impact fee collection required by that district.
The Project proposes thirty-four (34) dwelling units which could create additional students to be served by the Jurupa Unified School District assuming future students will come from outside the District. However, the Project would be required to contribute fees to the Jurupa Unified School District in accordance with the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (Senate Bill 50). Pursuant to Senate Bill 50, payment of school impact fees constitutes complete mitigation under CEQA for Project-related impacts to school services.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.14-3, impacts related to schools are less than significant.

PARKS

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Project Application Materials

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to parks. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.14-4 Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant shall pay required park development impact fees to the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District pursuant to District Ordinance No. 01-2007 and 02-2008.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

As noted in the response to Issue 3.13 (a) above, the Project proposes thirty-four (34) dwelling units. According to the California Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2018 Jurupa Valley has 3.35 persons per household. The increase in population would be 114 persons assuming all the future residents of the houses would come from outside the city limits. As such, the Project will generate additional need for parkland. The payment of development impact fees will reduce any indirect Project impacts related to parks.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.14-4, impacts related to parks are less than significant.

OTHER PUBLIC FACILITIES

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Project Application Materials.
Impact Analysis

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to other public facilities. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.14-2 above is applicable to the Project.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

As noted in the response to Issue 3.13(a) above, development of the Project could result in a direct increase in the population of the Project area and would not increase the demand for public services, including public health services and library services which would require the construction of new or expanded public facilities.

The Project would be required to comply with the provisions of Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 which requires payment of the Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing public services. Payment of the Development Impact Fee would ensure that the Project provides fair share of funds for additional public services. These funds may be applied to the acquisition and/or construction of public services and/or equipment.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.14-2 above, impacts related to other public facilities are less than significant.
3.15 RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

3.15(a) Would the proposed Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact.
Source: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to other public facilities. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.14-4 Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant shall pay required park development impact fees to the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District pursuant to District Ordinance No. 01-2007 and 02-2008.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project would not result in substantial population growth because it only will allow thirty-four (34) dwelling units. According to the California Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2018 Jurupa Valley has 3.35 persons per household. The increase in population would be 114 persons assuming all the future residents of the houses would come from outside the city limits. As such, the Project would not cause a substantial physical deterioration of any park facilities or would accelerate the physical deterioration of any park facilities because the Project because of the relatively small increase in population. The payment of Development Impact Fees will reduce any indirect Project impacts related to recreational facilities.
Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.14-1, impacts related to recreational facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

**3.15(b) Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment?**

**Determination: Less than Significant Impact.**

_Source: Project Application Materials_

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

_There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue._

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

_There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue._

The Project does not propose any recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment. In addition, no offsite parks or recreational improvements are proposed or required as part of the Project.

Based on the analysis above, impacts related to parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
### 3.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.16(a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Riverside County Transportation Department, Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines.*
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to transportation/traffic. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.16-1 The Project Proponent shall make required per-unit fee payments associated with the Western Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF) pursuant to Chapter 3.70 of the Municipal Code.

PPP 3.16-2 As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75, the Project is required to pay a Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing revenue that the City can use to fund transportation improvements such as roads, bridges, major improvements and traffic signals.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Motor Vehicle Analysis

The City of Jurupa Valley relies upon the Riverside County Transportation Department, Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines to determine if a project requires a traffic impact analysis to be prepared. According to the Guidelines, a traffic impact analysis is generally not required for any use that generates less than 100 vehicle trips during the peak hours. The City's Transportation Manager determined that a traffic impact analysis was not required for this Project and that impacts would be less than significant due to the low volume of traffic (estimated at 324 daily vehicle trips, 26 of which will occur during the morning peak hour and 34 of which will occur during the evening peak hour). In addition, the City's Transportation Manager determined there are no concerns over safety or operational issues associated with the Project.

Transit Service Analysis

The Riverside Transit Agency, a public transit agency, serves the region and the City of Jurupa Valley. There is no bus service adjacent to the Project site. In addition, the Project is not proposing to construct any improvements would interfere with any future bus service.

Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Analysis

The Project is not proposing to construct any improvements that will interfere with bicycle and pedestrian use. Pedestrian and bicycle access will be available to the Project site from 30th Street. Therefore, the Project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy applying to non-motorized travel. Impacts are less than significant.
3.16(b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.  
*Source: Riverside County Congestion Management Program.*

**Impact Analysis**

The Riverside County Transportation Commission was designated as the Congestion Management Agency for Riverside County in 1990, and therefore, prepares and administers the Riverside County Congestion Management Program in consultation with the Technical Advisory Committee which consists of local agencies, the County of Riverside, transit agencies, and subregional agencies.

The intent of the Riverside County Congestion Management Program is to more directly link land use, transportation, and air quality, thereby prompting reasonable growth management programs that will effectively utilize new transportation funds, alleviate traffic congestion and related impacts, and improve air quality.

The 2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program is the latest version of the CMP prepared by the Riverside County Transportation Commission in accordance with Proposition 111, passed in June 1990. The Congestion Management Program was established in the State of California to more directly link land use, transportation, and air quality and to prompt reasonable growth management programs that would more effectively utilize new and existing transportation funds, alleviate traffic congestion and related impacts, and improve air quality. Deficiencies along the CMP system are identified by the Riverside County Transportation Commission when they occur so that improvement measures can be identified. Understanding the reason for these deficiencies and identifying ways to reduce the impact along a critical CMP corridor is intended to conserve scarce funding resources and help target those resources appropriately.

Due to the low volume of traffic (estimated at 324 daily vehicle trips, 26 of which will occur during the morning peak hour and 34 of which will occur during the evening peak hour), Project traffic will not result in significant direct and cumulatively considerable impacts to Congestion Management Program roadway system. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not conflict with the applicable Congestion Management Program, including Level of Service standards, and impacts would be less than significant.

3.16(c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

**Determination:** No Impact.  
*Source: Google Earth.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.
Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project does not include an air travel component (e.g., runway, helipad, etc.). Accordingly, the Project would not have the potential to affect air traffic patterns, including an increase in traffic levels or a change in flight path location that results in substantial safety risks. Impacts are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

3.16(d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

All roadway improvements will be constructed to meet City standards. The Project would not be incompatible with existing development in the surrounding area to the extent that it would create a transportation hazard as a result of an incompatible use. Accordingly, the Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use. Impacts would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

3.16(e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project proposes thirty-four (34) residential homes which would increase the need for emergency access to-and-from the site. Adequate emergency access would be provided to the
Project site from 30th Street and Sierra Avenue. During the course of the preliminary review of the Project, the Project’s transportation design was reviewed by the City’s Engineering Department, County Fire Department, and County Sheriff’s Department to ensure that adequate access to and from the site would be provided for emergency vehicles.

With the adherence to mandatory requirements for emergency vehicle access, there are no impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

3.16(f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Source: General Plan Circulation Element, Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

The Riverside Transit Agency, a public transit agency, serves the region and the City of Jurupa Valley. In addition, the Project is not proposing to construct any improvements would interfere with any future bus service. As such, the Project as proposed will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy applying to transit services. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.
3.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.17(a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Source: Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix E), AB52 Tribal Consultation.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Historic resources generally consist of buildings, structures, improvements, and remnants associated with a significant historic event or person(s) and/or have a historically significant style, design, or achievement. Damaging or demolition of historic resources is typically considered to be a significant impact. Impacts to historic resources can occur through direct impacts, such as destruction or removal, and indirect impacts, such as a change in the setting of a historic resource.

CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(a) clarifies that historical resources include the following:

1. A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.
2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements [of] section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code.

3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California.

Results of the January 12, 2018, records search at the EIC indicate there are no previously recorded resources within the Project site; however, the Project site has never been surveyed. The January 12, 2018, field survey revealed approximately 90 percent of the Project site is obscured and very little of the original surface remains exposed. There was virtually complete obstruction by vegetation, and ground visibility was exceptionally poor at approximately 10 percent.

A concentration of discarded asphalt and a stockpile of imported soil were noted in the northern portion of the site. Building and road debris (brick, concrete block, and asphalt fragments) along with sparse modern refuse (including furniture) were also noted on the surface. The southern end of the Project site has been severely disturbed by earthmoving activities.

The January 2018 review of online historic period aerial photographs and maps and online research indicated there were never any buildings or structures within Project site and agricultural cultivation was not conspicuous.

Based on the analysis above, impacts to above ground historical resources are less than significant.

3.17(b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

Determination: Potentially Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Source: Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix E), AB52 Tribal Consultation.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

On July 1, 2015 AB 52 (Gatto, 2014) went into effect. AB 52 established “Tribal Cultural resources” as a resource subject to CEQA review. Tribal Cultural Resources are either of the following:

1. Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
(A) Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.

(B) Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.

(2) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

AB 52 also created a process for consultation with California Native American Tribes in the CEQA process. Tribal Governments can request consultation with a lead agency and give input into potential impacts to tribal cultural resources before the agency decides what kind of environmental assessment is appropriate for a proposed project.

The Planning Department notified the following California Native American Tribes per the requirements of AB52:

- Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kızh Nation
- Soboba Band Luiseño Indians
- Torres Martinez Band of Cahuilla Indians.
- San Manuel Band of Mission Indians

The Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kızh Nation, Soboba Band Luiseño Indians, and the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians requested consultation and indicated that tribal cultural resources could be present on the site. As a result of the AB52 consultation process, the following mitigation measure is required:

**Mitigation Measure TCR-1- Native American Monitoring, Treatment of Discoveries, and Disposition of Discoveries.**

I.  

a. **TREATMENT PLAN:** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a treatment plan in accordance with Part II (b) “Treatment of Discoveries” of this mitigation measure for the review and approval of the Planning Director.

b. **ARCHEOLOGICAL MONITOR:** An archaeological monitor shall be present for all ground-disturbing activities that occur within the proposed project area.

II.  

a. **MONITORING:** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall contact the consulting Native American Tribe(s) that have requested monitoring through consultation with the City during the AB 52 process. The applicant shall coordinate with the Tribe to develop a Tribal Monitoring Agreement(s). A copy of the agreement shall be provided to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

b. **TREATMENT OF DISCOVERIES:** If a significant tribal cultural resource is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). A representative of the appropriate Native American
Tribe(s), the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented to protect the identified tribal cultural resources from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the tribal cultural resources in accordance with current professional archaeology standards. The treatment plan shall require monitoring by the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during data recovery and shall require that all recovered artifacts undergo basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, whichever is appropriate. At the completion of the basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, any recovered tribal cultural resources shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility, or, the artifacts may be delivered to the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) if that is recommended by the City of Jurupa Valley. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department, the Eastern Information Center, and the appropriate Native American Tribe.

c. **DISPOSITION OF DISCOVERIES:** In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this project. The following procedures will be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries:

The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to tribal cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the Jurupa Valley Planning Department with evidence of same:

1. A fully executed reburial agreement with the appropriate culturally affiliated Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed.
2. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.
3. If more than one Native American Group is involved with the project and cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center by default.
4. Should reburial of collected cultural items be preferred, it shall not occur until after the Phase IV monitoring report has been submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department. Should curation be preferred, the
developer/permit applicant is responsible for all costs and the repository and curation method shall be described in the Phase IV monitoring report.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure TCR-1, impacts will be less than significant.
## 3.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.17(a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Source: Rubidoux Community Services District.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*
Wastewater collection services would be provided to the Project site by the Rubidoux Community Services District ("District"). Pursuant to General Waste Discharge Requirements for Wastewater Collection Agencies (State Water Resources Control Board Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ) the District must demonstrate, through sanitary sewer system use ordinances, service agreements, or other legally binding procedures, that it possesses the necessary legal authority to prevent illicit discharges into its sanitary sewer system as set forth in the District's Sewer System Management Plan.

Wastewater generated by the Project will be collected and conveyed through wastewater conveyance facilities (trunk sewer, lift station, and force main) to the Riverside Water Quality Control Plant (RWQCP), which is located on Acorn Street in the City of Riverside. The RWQCP is required to operate its treatment facility in accordance with the waste treatment and discharge standards and requirements set forth by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. The proposed Project would not install or utilize septic systems or alternative wastewater treatment systems; therefore, the Project would have no potential to exceed the applicable wastewater treatment requirements established by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

3.17(b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: Rubidoux Community Services District, Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*

Water and sewer service to the Project site will be provided by the Rubidoux Community Services District. New water and sewer lines will connect to the existing facilities in 30th Street. No additional water or sewer infrastructure will be needed to serve the Project other than connection to the existing water and sewer lines in the immediate vicinity of the Project site.

The installation of water and sewer lines as proposed by the Project would result in physical impacts to the surface and subsurface of the Project site. These impacts are considered to be part of the Project’s construction phase and are evaluated throughout this Initial Study Checklist. In instances where impacts have been identified for the Project’s construction phase, Plans, Policies, Programs (PPP), Project Design Features (PDF), or Mitigation Measures (MM) are required to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, additional measures beyond those identified throughout this Initial Study Checklist would not be required.
3.17(c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

Refer to PPP 3.9-1 through PPP 3.9-4 under Section 3.9-Hydrology and Water Quality.

Project Design Features (PDF)

Refer to PDF 3.9-1 under Section 3.9-Hydrology and Water Quality.

Drainage will flow in Street A from north to south where it will be captured in the water quality basin at the southern end of the Project site. After first flush treatment, it will be discharged via a storm drain line that will connect to the storm drain line maintained by the Riverside County Flood Control District which borders the western boundary of the Project site.

The construction of the on-site and off-site drainage facilities would result in physical impacts to the surface and subsurface of the Project site. These impacts are part of the Project's construction phase and are evaluated in the appropriate sections of this Initial Study Checklist. In any instances where impacts have been identified for the Project's construction phase, Plans, Policies, Programs (PPP), Project Design Features (PDF), or Mitigation Measures are required to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, additional measures beyond those identified throughout this Initial Study Checklist would not be required.

3.17(d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Rubidoux Community Services District.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site is located within the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD). The JCSD Board of Directors approved a “no contest” action that supports the de-annexation of the Project site from
JCSD and the annexation of the Project site to the Rubidoux Community Services District. As such, water service will be provided to the Project site by the Rubidoux Community Services District ("District").

According to the District's Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, the base daily water use is 208 gallons per day per capita (gpcd). According to the California Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2018* Jurupa Valley has 3.35 persons per household. Thus, the Project would generate 114 residents. Based on the 208 gpcd, the Project would result in an estimated water demand of 23,712 gpcd.

According to the District’s Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, the sole source of potable water supply for the District and for all water users in the Rubidoux Community is groundwater extracted from the southern portion of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin 1 (also referred to herein as the Riverside Basin) of the Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin. The Basin encompasses the District’s entire service area. The District expects that groundwater extracted from the Basin by six potable and six non-potable (irrigation only) groundwater wells will continue to be its primary (and possibly only) source of water through the year 2040, and possibly beyond.

The Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin is adjudicated, as set forth in Judgment No. 78426 (also referred to herein as the Basin Judgment). According to Section IX(b) of the Basin Judgment, entered April 17, 1969, "over any five-year period, there may be extracted from such Basin Area, without replenishment obligation, an amount equal to five times such annual average for the Basin Area; provided, however, that if extractions in any year exceed such average by more than 20 percent, Western [Western Municipal Water District] shall provide replenishment in the following year equal to the excess extractions over such 20 percent peaking allowance."

In August 2015, DWR released a draft list of 21 groundwater basins and subbasins significantly overdrafted by "excessive" pumping in response to a series of executive orders issued by Governor Brown since January 2014. The Riverside-Arlington Subbasin was not included in this list. DWR published the final list in January 2016, with no changes to the designation of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin.

The District does not have an immediate concern with water supply reliability. Because the District’s water supply is groundwater, which has historically not been impacted by seasonal or year-to-year climatic change, the District is not subject to short-term water shortages resulting from temporary dry weather conditions. In the foreseeable future, the District will continue to be reliant on local groundwater supplies. The District will develop additional groundwater extraction and groundwater treatment facilities as needed to ensure a continuous and adequate water supply for its service area.

Based on the analysis above, impacts are less than significant.
3.17(e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Rubidoux Community Services District, CalEEMod.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project site is located within the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD). The JCSD Board of Directors approved a “no contest” action that supports the de-annexation of the Project site from JCSD and the annexation of the Project site to the Rubidoux Community Services District. As such, sewer service will be provided to the Project site by the Rubidoux Community Services District ("District").

The District purchases treatment capacity at the Riverside Water Quality Control Plant (RWQCP), which is located on Acom Street in the City of Riverside. The current capacity of the RWQCP is 40 million gallons per day (approximately 123 acre-feet per day). The District is currently in the early planning stages for construction of additions to the plant. Quantities of wastewater collected and conveyed by the District to the RWQCP in 2015 was 2,212 AF/yr. The quantities projected to be conveyed by District and treated by the City of Riverside over the next 25 years are: 2,290 AF/yr in 2020; 2,310 AF/yr in 2025; 2,320 AF/yr in 2030; 2,330 AF/yr in 2035; and 2,350 SF/yr in 2040.

Wastewater use for the Project was estimated by using The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). The model can be used to estimate wastewater usage for analysis in CEQA documents. The Project is estimated to have an indoor water demand of 1.77 million gallons per year which includes wastewater. Assuming (a maximum) that all the water is discharged to the sewer system, the increase in wastewater from the proposed Project would be 5.79 AF (acre feet per year), which is within the operational capacity of the RWQCP. The capacity of existing wastewater treatment plant would be able to accommodate this increase within the existing capacity. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in impacts related to wastewater treatment provider capacity, and impacts would be less than significant.

3.17(f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project’s solid waste disposal needs?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: Riverside County Waste Management, Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details, CalEEMod.

Impact Analysis
**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to landfill capacity. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

**PPP 3.17-1** The Project shall comply with Section 4.408 of the *2013 California Green Building Code Standards*, which requires new development projects to submit and implement a construction waste management plan in order to reduce the amount of construction waste transported to landfills. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the City of Jurupa Valley shall confirm that a sufficient plan has been submitted, and prior to final building inspections, the City of Jurupa shall review and verify the Contractor's documentation that confirms the volumes and types of wastes that were diverted from landfill disposal, in accordance with the approved construction waste management plan.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

**Construction Related Impacts**

Waste generated during the construction phase of the Project would primarily consist of discarded materials from the construction of streets, common areas, infrastructure installation, and other project-related construction activities. Solid waste generated in Jurupa Valley is generally transported to the Agua Mansa Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility at 1830 Agua Mansa Road. From there, recyclable materials are transferred to third-party providers, and waste materials are transported to various landfills in Riverside County, including the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and the El Sobrante Landfill.

According to the Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details website accessed on June 2, 2018, these landfills receive well below their maximum permitted daily disposal volume and demolition and construction waste generated by the Project is not anticipated to cause these landfills to exceed their maximum permitted daily disposal volume. Furthermore, none of these regional landfill facilities are expected to reach their total maximum permitted disposal capacities during the Project’s construction period. As such, these regional landfill facilities would have sufficient daily capacity to accept construction solid waste generated by the Project.

**Operational Related Impacts**

To determine the solid waste demand of the proposed Project, default values for single-family residential housing were taken from CalEEMod. Based on CalEEMod default estimates for the proposed Project’s land uses, the proposed Project would result in a solid waste generation of approximately 9.94 tons per year. Based on the current recycling requirements, which require diversion of 50 percent of solid waste away from landfills, the proposed Project’s solid waste generation would be reduced to 4.97 tons of solid waste per year. In 2020, state regulations per AB 341 will become effective, which will require diversion of 75 percent of solid waste from landfills. Thus, it is anticipated that solid waste landfill disposal from operation of the Project in 2020 would be further reduced to approximately 2.2 tons per year.
According to the Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details website accessed on June 2, 2018 the Badlands Sanitary Landfill has a permitted disposal capacity of 4,000 tons per day with a remaining capacity of 14,730,020 cubic yards. The Badlands Sanitary Landfill is estimated to reach capacity, at the earliest time, in the year 2024. The El Sobrante Landfill has a permitted disposal capacity of 16,034 tons per day with a remaining capacity of 145,530,000 tons. The El Sobrante Landfill is estimated to reach capacity, at the earliest time, in the year 2045.

Solid waste generated during long-term operation of the Project would ultimately be disposed of at the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and/or the El Sobrante Landfill. During long-term operation, the Project’s solid waste (without the 50% and 75% reduction described above) would represent less than 0.003% of the daily permitted disposal capacity at the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and less than 0.0009% of the daily permitted disposal capacity at the El Sobrante Landfill.

Because the Project would generate a relatively small amount of solid waste per day, as compared to the permitted daily capacities for Badlands Sanitary Landfill and the El Sobrante Landfill, these regional landfill facilities would have sufficient daily capacity to accept solid waste generated by the Project.

Based on the above analysis, impacts are less than significant.

| 3.17(g) | Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? |

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**
*Sources: California Assembly Bill 939 (Sher), Riverside County Waste Resources Management District, Riverside County Integrated Waste Management Plan, Riverside County Waste Management Department, Solid Waste System Study Report, Waste Management “El Sobrante Landfill”*

**Impact Analysis**

**Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)**

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to solid waste. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program:

PPP 3.17-1 The Project shall comply with Section 4.408 of the 2013 California Green Building Code Standards, which requires new development projects to submit and implement a construction waste management plan in order to reduce the amount of construction waste transported to landfills. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the City of Jurupa Valley shall confirm that a sufficient plan has been submitted, and prior to final building inspections, the City of Jurupa shall review and verify the Contractor’s documentation that confirms the volumes and types of wastes that were diverted from landfill disposal, in accordance with the approved construction waste management plan.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*
Construction Related Impacts

Waste generated during the construction phase of the Project would primarily consist of discarded materials from the construction of streets, common areas, infrastructure installation, and other project-related construction activities. According to the Riverside County Waste Management Department, solid waste generated within the City of Jurupa Valley is deposited at the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and the El Sobrante Landfill.

According to the Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details website accessed on March 28, 2018, these landfills receive below their maximum permitted daily disposal volume and demolition and construction waste generated by the Project is not anticipated to cause these landfills to exceed their maximum permitted daily disposal volume. Furthermore, none of these regional landfill facilities are expected to reach their total maximum permitted disposal capacities during the Project’s construction period. As such, these regional landfill facilities would have sufficient daily capacity to accept construction solid waste generated by the Project.

Operational Related Impacts

The California Integrated Waste Management Act established an integrated waste management system that focused on source reduction, recycling, composting, and land disposal of waste. In addition, the Act established a 50% waste reduction requirement for cities and counties by the year 2000, along with a process to ensure environmentally safe disposal of waste that could not be diverted. Per the requirements of the Integrated Waste Management Act, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors adopted the Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan which outlines the goals, policies, and programs the County and its cities will implement to create an integrated and cost effective waste management system that complies with the provisions of California Integrated Waste Management Act and its diversion mandates.

The Project’s waste hauler would be required to coordinate with the waste hauler to develop collection of recyclable materials for the Project on a common schedule as set forth in applicable local, regional, and State programs. Recyclable materials that would be recycled by the Project include paper products, glass, aluminum, and plastic.

Additionally, the Project’s waste hauler would be required to comply with all applicable local, State, and Federal solid waste disposal standards, thereby ensuring that the solid waste stream to the landfills that serve the Project are reduced in accordance with existing regulations.

Based on the analysis above, impacts are less than significant.
### 3.19 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the Project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact Analysis**

**3.19(a) Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.**  
*Source: This Initial Study Checklist.*

**Impact Analysis**

As noted in the analysis throughout this Initial Study Checklist, the following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to this issue. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:
Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

All Plans, Policies, or Programs pertaining to Biological Resources and Cultural Resources shall apply.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Mitigation Measure(s)

BIO-1 through BIO-5, CR-1 through CR-4, and TCR-1 shall apply.

In instances where impacts have been identified, the Plans, Policies, or Programs were applied to the Project based on the basis of federal, state, or local law currently in place which effectively reduces environmental impacts, or Mitigation Measures are required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, Project does not have impacts which would have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

3.19(b) Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Source: This Initial Study Checklist.

Impact Analysis

As noted in the analysis throughout this Initial Study Checklist, the following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to this issue. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

All Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) identified in this Initial Study Checklist document shall apply.

Project Design Features (PDF)

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

Mitigation Measures (MM)

BIO-1 through BIO-5, CR-1 through CR-4, NOI-1, and TCR-1 shall apply.
In instances where impacts have been identified, the Plans, Policies, or Programs were applied to the Project based on the basis of federal, state, or local law currently in place which effectively reduces environmental impacts, or Mitigation Measures are required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, Project does not have impacts that are cumulatively considerable.

3.19(c) Does the Project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Source: This Initial Study Checklist.

Impact Analysis

As noted in the analysis throughout this Initial Study Checklist, the following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to this issue. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*


*Project Design Features (PDF)*

There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

*Mitigation Measures (MM)*

NOI-1 shall apply.

In instances where impacts have been identified, the Plans, Policies, or Programs were applied to the Project based on the basis of federal, state, or local law currently in place which effectively reduces environmental impacts. Therefore, Project does not have impacts which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
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6.0 MITIGATION MONITORING REPORTING PROGRAM

PROJECT NAME: Change of Zone No. 18001, Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 with exception, and Variance No. 18004

DATE: November 12, 2018

PROJECT MANAGER: Annette Tam, Senior Planner

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

- **Change of Zone (CZ) No. 18001**: Amend the City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map from R-R (Rural Residential) to R-1 (One Family Dwelling).

- **Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 37470**: Subdivide 6.76 acres of land into 34 single-family residential lots with a minimum lot size of 5,711 square feet. The exception application to allow several lots out of 34 lots to have lot depth greater than 2 ½ times than the lot width.

- **Variance (VAR) No. 18004**: The Variance application is to request the change of minimum lot area from 7,200 square-feet to 5,711 square-feet and the minimum average frontage of lot from 60 feet to 50 feet.

PROJECT LOCATION: The Project is located on the south side of intersection of Sierra Avenue & 30th Street. The Project site is identified by the following Assessor Parcel Numbers: 177-020-012, 177-020-018, and 177-110-005.

Throughout this *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program*, reference is made to the following:

- **Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)** – These include existing regulatory requirements such as plans, policies, or programs applied to the Project based on the basis of federal, state, or local law currently in place which effectively reduce environmental impacts.

- **Project Design Features (PDF)** – These measures include features proposed by the Project that are already incorporated into the Project’s design and are specifically intended to reduce or avoid impacts (e.g., water quality treatment basins).

- **Mitigation Measures (MM)** – These measures include requirements that are imposed where the impact analysis determines that implementation of the proposed Project would result in significant impacts; mitigation measures are proposed in accordance with the requirements of CEQA.
Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) and Project Design Features (PDF) were assumed and accounted for in the assessment of impacts for each issue area. Mitigation Measures were formulated only for those issue areas where the results of the impact analysis identified significant impacts. All three types of measures described above will be required to be implemented as part of the Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM)</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AESTHETICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.1-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 9.55.020(1) (1) building height shall not exceed three (3) stories, with a maximum height of forty (40) feet.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.1-2 As required by General Plan Policy COS 10.1, require outdoor lighting to be shielded and prohibit outdoor lighting that: 1. Operates at unnecessary locations, levels, and times. 2. Spills onto areas off-site or to areas not needing or wanting illumination. 3. Produces glare (intense line-of-site contrast). 4. Includes lighting frequencies (colors) that interfere with astronomical viewing.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of an building permit and during project operation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PPP 3.3-1 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, “Fugitive Dust.” Rule 403 requires implementation of best available dust control measures during construction activities that generate fugitive dust, such as earth moving and stockpiling activities, grading, and equipment travel on unpaved roads. Measures listed below (or equivalent language) shall appear on all Project grading plans, construction specifications and bid documents, and the City shall ensure such language is incorporated prior to issuance of any grading permits:  
  1. “All clearing, grading, earth-moving, or excavation activities shall cease when winds exceed 25 mph per SCAQMD guidelines in order to limit fugitive dust emissions.”  
  2. “The contractor shall ensure that all disturbed unpaved roads and disturbed areas within the Project are watered at least three (3) times daily during dry weather. Watering, with complete coverage of disturbed areas, shall occur at least three times a day, preferably in the mid-morning, afternoon, and after | Engineering Department | Notes must be on the grading plan prior to the issuance of the grading permit and the project is required to comply with the provisions of “Fugitive Dust” during grading | |
### MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)

| PPP 3.3-2 | The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1186 “PM10 Emissions from Paved and Unpaved Roads and Livestock Operations” and Rule 1186.1, “Less-Polluting Street Sweepers.” Adherence to Rules 1186 and 1186.1 reduces the release of criteria pollutant emissions into the atmosphere during construction. |
| PPP 3.3-3 | The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113; “Architectural Coatings” Rule 1113 limits the release of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) into the atmosphere during painting and application of other surface coatings. The measure listed below (or equivalent language) shall appear on all Project grading plans, construction specifications and bid documents, and the City shall ensure such language is incorporated prior to issuance of any building permits: |
| PPP 3.3-4 | The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1186 “PM10 Emissions from Paved and Unpaved Roads and Livestock Operations” and Rule 1186.1, “Less-Polluting Street Sweepers.” Adherence to Rule 1186 and Rule 1186.1 reduces the release of criteria pollutant emissions into the atmosphere during construction. |
| PPP 3.3-5 | The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 402 “Nuisance.” Adherence to Rule 402 reduces the release of odorous emissions into the atmosphere. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Notes must be on the plans and documents; the project shall comply with the provisions of “Architectural Coatings” during construction and on-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*work is done for the day.*

- “The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and Project site areas are reduced to 15 miles per hour or less.”
### BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

| PPP 3.4-1 | The Project is required to pay mitigation fees pursuant to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MHSCP) as required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.80. | Planning Department | Prior to the issuance of a grading permit |
| MM-BIO-1: July 2019 Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly Survey | Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly Survey shall be conducted pursuant to the Interim General Survey Guidelines for the Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, December 30, 1996) and submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department. In order to issue a grading permit, the results of the survey must be negative for the presence of the species. In the event, the species is present, the Applicant shall be required to maintain the MSHCP in rough step. Mitigation may include, but is not limited to, the funding or purchase of suitable DSF habitat, purchasing conservation credits from an existing DSF mitigation bank, and/or acquiring and funding of habitat restoration. | Planning Department | Prior to the issuance of a grading permit |
| MM-BIO-2: Pre-Construction Burrowing Owl Survey | Within 30 calendar days prior to grading, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey of the Project’s proposed impact footprint and make a determination regarding the presence or absence of the burrowing owl. The determination shall be documented in a report and shall be submitted, reviewed, and accepted by the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit and subject to the following provisions: | Planning Department | Prior to the issuance of a grading permit |

a. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies no burrowing owls in the impact area, a grading permit may be issued without restriction.

b. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies the presence of burrowing owl, then prior to the issuance of a grading permit and prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities on the property, the qualified biologist shall follow the methods recommended by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW, 2012) and Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP, 2006) for passive or active relocation of burrowing owls. Passive relocation, including the required use of one-way doors to exclude owls from the site and the collapsing of burrows, will occur if the biologist determines that the proximity and availability of alternate habitat is suitable for successful passive relocation. Passive relocation shall follow...
California Department of Fish and Wildlife relocation protocol. If proximate alternate habitat is not present as determined by the biologist, active relocation shall follow California Department of Fish and Wildlife relocation protocol. The biologist shall provide evidence in writing to the Planning Department that the species has fledged or been relocated prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

**MM BIO-3. Coordination With Regulatory Agencies.** Prior to the issuance of grading permit, the Project Applicant shall contact the United State Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to positively determine whether or not either agency wishes to exert jurisdiction of the onsite drainage features. If either agency decides to exert jurisdiction, Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and BIO-5 shall be implemented.

**Planning Department**
Prior to the issuance of a grading permit

| BIO-4. Federal Jurisdiction. | If federal jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-3, the following shall be implemented: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall obtain a Clean Water Act Section 404 Nationwide Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) and compensate for the loss of 746 linear feet of streambed totaling 0.02 acre at a ratio of not less than 3:1 onsite or not less than 2:1 for permanent impacts, and a Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification from the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). These permits will address impacts to identified jurisdictional resources on the Project site and appropriate offsite mitigation such as such as the Santa Ana Watershed Project Area (SAWPA), Prado Basin, or an appropriate nearby downstream established mitigation bank area. The developer shall implement this measure to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department.

No USACE mitigation will be required and this mitigation measure may be waived for the proposed Project, if the applicant provides written evidence to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department that the USACE will rely upon the Highland Park (TM 31893) Approved Jurisdictional Determination. The adjacent project also has a waste discharge order, dated May 1, 2017 (Adoption of Order No. RS-2017-0020). The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) will likely issue a waste discharge order for the proposed project, if the USACE makes a non-jurisdictional determination.

**Planning Department**
Prior to the issuance of a grading permit

| BIO-5. CDFW Jurisdiction. | If state jurisdictional authority is exercised under Mitigation Measure BIO-3, the following shall be implemented: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project applicant shall obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement under Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code from the

**Planning Department**
Prior to the issuance of a grading permit

M-5
California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The following shall be incorporated into the permitting, subject to approval by the regulatory agencies: (a) Replacement and/or restoration of jurisdictional “waters of the State” within the Santa Ana River watershed for 746 linear feet of streambed totaling 0.02 acre at a ratio of not less than 3:1 onsite or not less than 2:1 for permanent impacts; (b) The applicant shall restore any onsite or offsite temporary impact areas to pre-project conditions and revegetate where applicable; and (c) Off-site mitigation may occur on land acquired for the purpose of in-perpetuity preservation, or through the purchase of mitigation credits at an agency approved off-site mitigation bank or within an agency-accepted off-site permittee responsible mitigation area such as the Santa Ana Watershed Project Area (SAWPA), Prado Basin, or an appropriate nearby downstream established mitigation bank area.

No CDFW mitigation will be required and this mitigation measure may be waived for the proposed Project, if the applicant provides written evidence to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department that if the CDFW does not respond to the streambed alteration notification, then the proposed Project can proceed 60 days after the CDFW states the application is complete or after receiving a CDFW Operation of Law letter.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

**MM- CR-1: Archaeological Monitoring.** A qualified archaeologist (the “Project Archaeologist”) shall be retained by the Project Applicant prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Project Archaeologist will be on-call to monitor ground-disturbing activities and excavations on the Project site following identification of potential cultural resources by project personnel. If archaeological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project, ground-disturbing activities will be temporarily redirected from the vicinity of the find. The Project Archaeologist will be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading or excavation activities in the vicinity in order to make an evaluation of the find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure CR-2 shall apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MM- CR-2: Archeological Treatment Plan</th>
<th>Planning Department</th>
<th>Pior to the issuance of grading permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If a significant archaeological resource(s) is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). The archaeological monitor, the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented by the archaeologist to protect the identified archaeological resource(s) from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>During grading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the archaeological resource(s) in accordance with current professional archaeology standards (typically this sampling level is two (2) to five (5) percent of the volume of the cultural deposit). At the completion of the laboratory analysis, any recovered archaeological resources shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department and the Eastern Information Center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MM-CR-3: Paleontological Monitoring</strong></th>
<th>Engineering Department</th>
<th>During grading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A qualified paleontologist (the &quot;Project Paleontologist&quot;) shall be retained by the Project Applicant prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Project Paleontologist will be on-call to monitor ground-disturbing activities and excavations on the Project site following identification of potential paleontological resources by project personnel. If paleontological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project, ground-disturbing activities will be temporarily redirected from the vicinity of the find. The Project Paleontologist will be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading or excavation activities in the vicinity in order to make an evaluation of the find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure CR-4 shall apply.</td>
<td><strong>MM-CR-4: Paleontological Treatment Plan</strong></td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a significant paleontological resource(s) is discovered on the property, in consultation with the Project proponent and the City, the qualified paleontologist shall develop a plan of mitigation which shall include salvage excavation and removal of the find, removal of sediment from around the specimen (in the laboratory), research to identify and categorize the find, curation in a local qualified repository, and preparation of a report summarizing the find.</td>
<td><strong>PPP 3.5-1</strong></td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project is required to comply with the applicable provisions of California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 as well as Public Resources Code §5097 et. seq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GEOLOGY AND SOILS

| PPP 3.6-1 | As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, the Project is required to comply with the most recent edition of the *California Building Code* to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic hazards. | Building & Safety Department | Prior to the issuance of building permits |
| PPP 3.91-1 through PPP 3.9-4 in Section 3.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality* shall apply. | Engineering Department | Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and during operation |

### GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

| PPP 3.7-1 | As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, *California Energy Code*, prior to issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant shall submit plans showing that the Project will be constructed in compliance with the most recently adopted edition of the applicable California Building Code Title 24 requirements. | Building & Safety Department | Prior to the issuance of building permits |
| PPP 3.7-2 | As required by Municipal Code Section 9.283.010, *Water Efficient Landscape Design Requirements*, prior to the approval of landscaping and irrigation plans, the Project Applicant shall prepare and submit landscape and irrigation plans that demonstrate compliance with this section. | Building & Safety Department | Prior to the issuance of building permits |
| PPP 3.7-3 | As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010 (8), the Project proponent shall comply with the *California Green Building Standards*. | Building & Safety Department | Prior to the issuance of building permits |

### HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

| PPP 3.8-1 | As required by *General Plan Policy CSSF 1.31-Federal/State Laws*. Comply with federal and state laws regarding the management of hazardous waste and materials. | Fire Department | On-going |
### HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

#### PPP 3.9-1

As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, *Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section B (1)*, any person performing construction work in the city shall comply with the provisions of this chapter, and shall control storm water runoff so as to prevent any likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. The City Engineer shall identify the BMPs that may be implemented to prevent such deterioration and shall identify the manner of implementation. Documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 shall be required when requested by the City Engineer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of grading permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### PPP 3.9-2

As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, *Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section B (2)*, any person performing construction work in the city shall be regulated by the State Water Resources Control Board in a manner pursuant to and consistent with applicable requirements contained in the General Permit No. CAS000002, State Water Resources Control Board Order Number 2009-0009-DWQ. The city may notify the State Board of any person performing construction work that has a non-compliant construction site per the General Permit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### PPP 3.9-3

As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, *Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section C*, new development or redevelopment projects shall control storm water runoff so as to prevent any deterioration of water quality that would impair subsequent or competing uses of the water. The City Engineer shall identify the BMPs that may be implemented to prevent such deterioration and shall identify the manner of implementation. Documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 shall be required when requested by the City Engineer. The BMPs may include, but are not limited to, the following and may, among other things, require new developments or redevelopments to do any of the following:

1. Increase permeable areas by leaving highly porous soil and low lying area undisturbed by:
   1. Incorporating landscaping, green roofs and open space into the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
design;

(b) Using porous materials for or near driveways, drive aisles, parking stalls and low volume roads and walkways; and

(c) Incorporating detention ponds and infiltration pits into the project design.

(2) Direct runoff to permeable areas by orienting it away from impermeable areas to swales, berms, green strip filters, gravel beds, rain gardens, pervious pavement or other approved green infrastructure and French drains by:

(a) Installing rain-gutters oriented towards permeable areas;

(b) Modifying the grade of the property to divert flow to permeable areas and minimize the amount of storm water runoff leaving the property; and

(c) Designing curbs, berms or other structures such that they do not isolate permeable or landscaped areas.

(3) Maximize storm water storage for reuse by using retention structures, subsurface areas, cisterns, or other structures to store storm water runoff for reuse or slow release.

(4) Rain gardens may be proposed in-lieu of a water quality basin when applicable and approved by the City Engineer.

PPP 3.9-4 As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section E, any person or entity that owns or operates a commercial and/or industrial facility(s) shall comply with the provisions of this chapter. All such facilities shall be subject to a regular program of inspection as required by this chapter, any NPDES permit issued by the State Water Resource Control Board, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Wat. Code Section 13000 et seq.), Title 33 U.S.C. Section 1251 et seq. (Clean Water Act), any applicable state or federal regulations promulgated thereto, and any related administrative orders or permits issued in connection therewith.

<p>| Engineering Department | During operation |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOISE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.12-1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **PPP 3.12-2** | As required by Jurupa Valley Municipal Code Section 11.05.040, no person shall create any sound, or allow the creation of any sound, on any property that causes the exterior sound level on any other occupied property to exceed the sound level standards set forth in Table 1 of this section or that violates the special sound source standards set forth in Section 11.05.060. |
| Building & Safety Department | During operation |

| **Mitigation Measure NOI-1-Construction Noise Mitigation Plan.** | Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant is required to submit a construction-related noise mitigation plan to the City Planning Department for review and approval. The plan must depict the location of construction equipment and how the noise from this equipment will be mitigated during construction of this project. In addition, the plan shall require that the following notes are included on grading plans and building plans. Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the notes and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by City of Jurupa Valley staff or its designee to confirm compliance. These notes also shall be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors. |
| Planning Department | Prior to the issuance of a grading permit |

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPP 3.14-1</th>
<th>The Project Applicant shall comply with all applicable Riverside County Fire Department codes, ordinances, and standard conditions regarding fire prevention and suppression measures relating to water improvement plans, fire hydrants, automatic fire extinguishing systems, fire access, access gates, combustible construction, water availability, and fire sprinkler systems.</th>
<th>Fire Department</th>
<th>Prior to issuance of a building permit or occupancy permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.14-2</td>
<td>As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 et seq., the Project proponent shall pay a Development Impact Fee (DIF) following protocol for impact fee collection.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Per Municipal Code Chapter 3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.14-3</td>
<td>As required by Section 65995 of the Government Code, the Project Applicant shall pay required development impact fees to the applicable school district following protocol for impact fee collection required by that district.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.14-4</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Project Applicant shall pay required park development impact fees to the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District pursuant to District Ordinance No. 01-2007 and 02-2008.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPP 3.16-1</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Project Proponent shall make required per-unit fee payments associated with the Western Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF), and the City of Jurupa Valley Development Impact Fee (DIF) per Title 3 of the Municipal Code.</th>
<th>Building &amp; Safety Department</th>
<th>TUMF shall be paid in accordance to the deadline stated in Chapter 3.70 DIF shall be paid in accordance to the deadline stated in Chapter 3.75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.16-2</td>
<td>As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75, the Project is required to pay a Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing revenue that the City can use to fund transportation improvements such as roads, bridges, major improvements and traffic signals.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>DIF shall be paid in accordance to the deadline stated in Chapter 3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. <strong>TREATMENT PLAN</strong>: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a treatment plan in accordance with Part II (b) “Treatment of Discoveries” of this mitigation measure for the review and approval of the Planning Director.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <strong>ARCHEOLOGICAL MONITOR</strong>: An archaeological monitor shall be present for all ground-disturbing activities that occur within the proposed project area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. <strong>MONITORING</strong>: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall contact the consulting Native American Tribe(s) that have requested monitoring through consultation with the City during the AB 52 process. The applicant shall coordinate with the Tribe to develop a Tribal Monitoring Agreement(s). A copy of the agreement shall be provided to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <strong>TREATMENT OF DISCOVERIES</strong>: If a significant tribal cultural resource is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). A representative of the appropriate Native American Tribe(s), the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented to protect the identified tribal cultural resources from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the tribal cultural resources in accordance with current professional archaeology standards. The treatment plan shall require monitoring by the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during data recovery and shall require that all recovered artifacts undergo basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, whichever is appropriate. At the completion of the basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, any recovered tribal cultural resources shall be processed and curated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department &amp; Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and during grading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility, or, the artifacts may be delivered to the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) if that is recommended by the City of Jurupa Valley. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department, the Eastern Information Center, and the appropriate Native American Tribe.

c. **DISPOSITION OF DISCOVERIES**: In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this project. The following procedures will be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries: The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to tribal cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the Jurupa Valley Planning Department with evidence of same:

1. A fully executed reburial agreement with the appropriate culturally affiliated Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed.

2. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.

3. If more than one Native American Group is involved with the project and cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center by default.
4. Should reburial of collected cultural items be preferred, it shall not occur until after the Phase IV monitoring report has been submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department. Should curation be preferred, the developer/permit applicant is responsible for all costs and the repository and curation method shall be described in the Phase IV monitoring report.

**UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

**PPP 3.17-1** The Project shall comply with Section 4.408 of the 2013 California Green Building Code Standards, which requires new development projects to submit and implement a construction waste management plan in order to reduce the amount of construction waste transported to landfills. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the City of Jurupa Valley shall confirm that a sufficient plan has been submitted, and prior to final building inspections, the City of Jurupa shall review and verify the Contractor’s documentation that confirms the volumes and types of wastes that were diverted from landfill disposal, in accordance with the approved construction waste management plan.

| Building & Safety Department | Prior to the issuance of building permits |
ORDINANCE NO. 2019-02

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY OFFICIAL ZONING MAP CHANGING THE ZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 6.74 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED SOUTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF 30TH STREET AND SIERRA AVENUE (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) FROM RURAL RESIDENTIAL (R-R) ZONE TO ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE, AND MAKING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Project Procedural Findings. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that:

(a) JA Bray, LLC (the “Applicant”) has applied for Change of Zone No. 18001, Variance No. 18004, and an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 (collectively, Master Application No. 18089 or MA No. 18089) to change the classification of real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) from Rural Residential (R-R) Zone to One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone, and to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 6.74 gross acres into thirty-four (34) single-family residential lots on real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005).

(b) All of the components of Master Application No. 18089 shall collectively be known as the “Project.” Change of Zone Application No. 18001 is the subject of this Ordinance.

(c) The Applicant is seeking approval of Change of Zone No. 18001 to rezone 6.74 gross acres located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) from Rural Residential (R-R) Zone to One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone.

(d) Section 9.285.020.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the owner of real property, or a person authorized by the owner, may request that the City consider a change in the zoning classification that has been applied to the owner’s property.

(e) Section 9.285.020.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that applications for change of zone must be made to the Planning Commission on forms provided by the Planning Department, must supply all required information, and must be accompanied by the filing fee set forth in Chapter 3.65.
Section 9.285.020.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that an application for a change of zone may not be set for a public hearing until (1) all procedures required by the Jurupa Valley Rules Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) to hear a matter have been completed; and (2) the requested change of zone is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan.

Sections 9.285.040.(1) and (2) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provide that the Planning Commission shall hold a noticed public hearing on a proposed amendment to Title 9 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code that proposes to change property from one zone to another.

Section 9.285.040.(3) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that, after closing the public hearing, the Planning Commission must render its decision within a reasonable time and transmit it to the City Council in the form of a written recommendation, which shall contain the reasons for the recommendation and the relationship of the proposed amendment to 2017 General Plan. A copy of the Planning Commission’s recommendation must be mailed to the applicant and proof thereof must be shown on the original transmitted to the City Council.

Section 9.285.040.(4)(a) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that upon receipt of a recommendation for approval by the Planning Commission, the City Clerk shall set the matter for public hearing before the City Council at the earliest convenient day, and give notice of the time and place of the hearing in the same manner as notice was given of the hearing before the Planning Commission.

Section 9.285.040.(5) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after closing the public hearing the City Council must render its decision within a reasonable time and may approve, modify, or disapprove the recommendation of the Planning Commission; provided, however, that any proposed modification of the Planning Commission's recommendation not previously considered by the Planning Commission must first be referred back to the Planning Commission for a report and recommendation.

The Project was processed including, but not limited to a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

On January 9, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 18089, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing. At the conclusion of the Planning Commission hearing and after due consideration of the testimony, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2019-01-09-01, recommending that the City Council adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approve Change of Zone No. 18001 to change the zoning classification of approximately 6.74 gross acres of real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) from Rural Residential (R-R) Zone to One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone. Additionally, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2019-01-09-02, approving Variance No. 18004, an exception to Section 9.285.040.(4)(a) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.
7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37052 to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 6.74 gross acres of real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) into thirty-four (34) single-family residential lots.

(m) On February 4, 2019, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 18004 with the City Clerk and a copy of the notice was mailed to the Applicant, the Applicant’s authorized agent, and all interested parties requesting a copy.

(n) On February 7, 2019, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 18004 with the City Council, which notice was placed on the City Council’s regular meeting agenda on that date.

(o) On February 7, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the proposed Change of Zone No. 18001, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council continued the public hearing.

(p) On February 7, 2019, the City Council Member filed a timely appeal of the Planning Commission’s approval of Variance No. 18004, an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37052 (the “Appeal”). The Appeal set aside the Planning Commission’s action and made the Council the approving body.

(q) On March 21, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a continued public hearing on the introduction this Ordinance and a public hearing on the Appeal, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearings.

(r) All legal preconditions to the adoption of this Ordinance have occurred.

Section 2. California Environmental Quality Act Findings. The City Council hereby makes the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of proposed Change of Zone No. 18001:

(a) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Cal. Pub. Res. Code §21000 et seq.) and the State Guidelines (the “Guidelines”) (14 Cal. Code Regs. §15000 et seq.), City staff prepared an Initial Study of the potential environmental effects of the approval of the Project. Based upon the findings contained in that Study, City staff determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there was no substantial evidence that the Project could have a significant effect on the environment and a Mitigated Negative Declaration (“MND”) was prepared by the City in full compliance with CEQA.

(b) Thereafter, City staff provided public notice of the public comment period and of the intent to adopt the MND as required by law. The public comment period commenced on November 20, 2018, and expired on December 19, 2018. Copies of the documents have been available for public review and inspection at City Hall, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley,
California 92509. The City received did not receive any comments during the public review period.

(c) On January 9, 2019, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the Project and the MND, reviewed the staff report, accepted and considered public testimony. After due consideration, the Planning Commission found that agencies and interested members of the public were afforded ample notice and opportunity to comment on the MND and the Project and approved Resolution No. 2019-01-09-01 recommending that City Council adopt the MND, adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, and approve the proposed Change of Zone No. 18001.

(d) On February 7, 2019, the City Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider proposed Change of Zone No. 18001 and the MND, reviewed the staff report, accepted and considered public testimony. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council continued the public hearing.

(e) On March 21, 2019, the City Council held a continued public hearing to consider proposed Change of Zone No. 18001 and the MND, reviewed the staff report, accepted and considered public testimony. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing, including the staff report and oral testimony, the City Council, by separate Resolution No. 2019-10, adopted the MND and a MMRP for the proposed Change of Zone No. 18001 as set forth in Exhibit “A” to City Council Resolution No. 2019-10.

(f) All actions taken by City have been duly taken in accordance with all applicable legal requirements, including the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code, § 21000 et seq.) (“CEQA”), and all other requirements for notice, public hearings, findings, votes and other procedural matters.

(g) The custodian of records for the MND, MMRP, and all other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City Council’s decision was based, including, without limitation, the staff reports for Master Application No. 18089, all of the materials that comprise and support the MND and all of the materials that support the staff reports for Master Application No. 18089, is the Planning Department of the City of Jurupa Valley. Those documents are available for public examination during normal business hours at the City of Jurupa Valley, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509.

Section 3. Findings for Approval of Change of Zone. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby finds and determines that Change of Zone No. 18001 should be adopted because the proposed change of zoning classification from Rural Residential (R-R) Zone to One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and the requirements of the General Plan land use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR). The General Plan land use designation of MDR permits single-family detached and attached residential and allows up to five (5) dwelling units per acre. The Project proposes single-family detached and a density of five (5) dwelling units per acre. The General Plan land use designation of MDR permits lot ranges from 5,500 square-feet to 20,000 square-feet. The proposed Project’s average lot size is almost 6,400 square-feet, with one lot under 6,000 square-feet and a several lots greater than 7,200 square-feet.
Section 4. Approval of Zone Change. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby rezones approximately 6.74 gross acres of real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) from Rural Residential (R-R) Zone to One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone, and directs the City Manager to revise the official City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Map to designate the property as being in this new zone.

Section 5. Severability. If any sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions of this Ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this Ordinance and each sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or otherwise invalid.

Section 6. Effect of Ordinance. This Ordinance is intended to supersede any ordinance or resolution of the County of Riverside incorporated by the City of Jurupa Valley that may in conflict with the terms of this Ordinance.

Section 7. Certification. The City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley shall certify to the passage and adoption of this Ordinance and shall cause the same to be published or posted in the manner required by law.

Section 8. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall take effect on the date provided in Government Code Section 36937.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 4th day of April, 2019.

______________________________
Brian Berkson
Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE ) ss.
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY )

I, Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance No. 2019-02 was regularly introduced at a regular meeting of the City Council held on the 21st day of March, 2019 and thereafter at a regular meeting held on the 4th day of April, 2019 it was duly passed and adopted by the following vote of the City Council:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, this 4th day of April, 2019

________________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-18


THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Project. JA Bray, LLC (the “Applicant”) has applied for Change of Zone No. 18001, Variance No. 18004, and an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 (collectively, Master Application No. 18089 or MA No. 18089) to change the classification of real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) from Rural Residential (R-R) Zone to One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone, and to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 6.74 gross acres into thirty-four (34) single-family residential lots on real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) (the “Project”). Variance No. 18004, the exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 are the subject of this Resolution.

Section 2. Variance.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Variance No. 18004 from: (1) the minimum lot area of 7,200 square feet for premises in the R-1 Zone, as set forth in Section 9.55.020.(2) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, to permit lot areas ranging between 5,711 and 6,792 square feet for Lots 3-15 and 17-34, (2) the minimum average lot width of sixty (60) feet for premises in the R-1 Zone, as set forth in Section 9.55.020.(3) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, to permit an average lot width of fifty (50) feet for Lots 1-15 and 17-34, and (3) the minimum lot frontage of sixty (60) feet for premises in the R-1 Zone, as set forth in Section 9.55.020.(4) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, to permit lot frontages ranging between 50 and 53 feet for Lots 1-15 and 21-34.

(b) Section 9.240.270.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that variances from the terms of Title 9 (Planning and Zoning) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, may be granted when, because of special circumstances applicable to a parcel of property,
including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, the strict application of Title 9
deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity that is under the
same zoning classification. A variance may not be granted for a parcel of property that
authorizes a use or activity that is not otherwise expressly authorized by the zone regulation
governing the parcel of property, but must be limited to modifications of property development
standards, such as lot size, lot coverage, yards, and parking and landscape requirements.

(c) Section 9.240.270.D. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that
any variance granted shall be subject to such conditions as are necessary so that the adjustment
does not constitute a grant of special privileges that is inconsistent with the limitations upon
other properties in the vicinity and zone in which the property is situated, and which are
necessary to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the community.

(d) Section 9.240.270.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that
all public hearings on variances that require approval of a land division shall be heard by the
hearing body that has jurisdiction of the principal application.

(e) Section 9.240.270.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code further
provides that a public hearing shall be held on all variance applications in accordance with the
provisions of Section 9.240.250, and all the procedural requirements and rights of appeal as set
forth therein shall govern the hearing.

(f) Section 9.240.250.(6) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that
for any decision where the hearing body is the Planning Commission and it has rendered a final
decision rather than a recommendation to the City Council, that decision shall be considered
final unless an appeal is filed with the City Clerk within ten (10) days after the decision. An
appeal may be filed by the applicant, any interested person, or an individual Council Member or
by a majority vote of the Council. If an appeal is filed by an applicant or other interested person,
it shall be accompanied by the fee set forth in County Ordinance No. 671. Any appeal filed by
an individual Council Member or by a majority vote of the Council does not require the payment
of a fee. After an appeal is filed and the fee is received by the city, the City Clerk shall set the
matter for public hearing before the City Council not less than thirteen (13) nor more than sixty
(60) days thereafter and shall give notice of the time and place of the hearing in the same manner
as notice was given of the hearing before the Planning Commission.

(g) Section 9.240.250.(7) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that
the City Council shall hear the matter de novo; however, the documents and the minutes of the
hearing before the hearing body shall be a part of the City Council’s record at its hearing on the
matter. The City Council shall hear relevant testimony from interested persons and within a
reasonable time after the close of the hearing, make its decision sustaining, reversing or
modifying the decision of the hearing body.

Section 3. Exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley
Municipal Code.
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.”

The Applicant is seeking approval of an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code for the depth of Lots 1-4 and 18 in the proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 to exceed 2½ times the width.

Section 7.10.010.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code states that exceptions from the requirements of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code relating to the design or improvement of land divisions shall be granted by the appropriate advisory agency or appeal board only when it is determined that there are special circumstances applicable to the property, such as but not limited to size, shape or topographical conditions, or existing road alignment and width, and that the granting of the modification will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare or be damaging to other property in the vicinity.

Section 4. Tentative Tract Map.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37470, a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 6.74 gross acres into thirty-four (34) single-family residential lots on real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005).

(b) Section 7.05.020.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission is designated as the “Advisory Agency” charged with the duty of making investigations and reports on the design and improvement of all proposed Schedule “A” maps. Further, Sections 7.05.020.A. and 7.15.150 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provide that the Planning Commission is authorized to approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove all such tentative map land divisions and report the action directly to the City Council and the land divider.

(c) Section 7.15.130.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that within fifty (50) days after the date of filing of a commercial parcel map, a public hearing on the map must be held before the Planning Commission. Section 7.15.130.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after the close of the hearing, the Planning Commission must approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove the proposed tentative map, file notice of the decision with the City Clerk, and mail notice of the decision to the land divider, or his or her authorized agent, and any interested party requesting a copy.

(d) Section 7.15.180 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code requires denial of a tentative tract map if it does not meet all of the requirements of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, or if any of the following findings are made:

1) That the proposed land division is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans.

2) That the design or improvement of the proposed land division is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans.
3) That the site of the proposed land division is not physically suitable for the type of development.

4) That the site of the proposed land division is not physically suitable for the proposed density of the development.

5) That the design of the proposed land division or proposed improvements are likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.

6) That the design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements are likely to cause serious public health problems.

7) That the design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements will conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed land division. A land division may be approved if it is found that alternate easements for access or for use will be provided and that they will be substantially equivalent to ones previously acquired by the public. This subsection shall apply only to easements of record or to easements established by judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction.

8) Notwithstanding subsection 5) above, a tentative map may be approved if an environmental impact report was prepared with respect to the project and a finding was made, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), that specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

(e) Section 7.15.140 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the action of the Planning Commission on a tentative Schedule “A” map will be final, unless the final decision is appealed by the land divider or any interested party.

(f) Sections 7.05.030.B. and 7.15.150 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provide that if a land divider or any interested party believes that they may be adversely affected by the decision of the Planning Commission, the land divider or any interested party may appeal the decision to the City Council. Any such appeal shall be filed with the City Clerk within ten (10) days after the notice of decision of the Planning Commission appears on the City Council’s agenda. The appeal must be filed in writing, stating the basis for appeal, and must be accompanied by the applicable fee.

(g) Section 7.15.150 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that, upon the filing of the appeal, the City Clerk must set the matter for public hearing on a date within thirty (30) days after the date of the filing of the appeal and must give notice of the public hearing in the same manner as was given for the original hearing. The City Council must render its decision on the appeal within ten (10) days of the closing of the hearing.

Section 5. Procedural Findings. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that:
(a) The application for MA No. 18089 was processed including, but not limited to, a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

(b) On January 9, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 18089, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing. At the conclusion of the Planning Commission hearing and after due consideration of the testimony, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2019-01-09-01, recommending that the City Council adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approve Change of Zone No. 18001 to change the zoning classification of approximately 6.74 gross acres of real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) from Rural Residential (R-R) Zone to One (1) Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone. Additionally, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2019-01-09-02, adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approving Variance No. 18004, an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37052 to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 6.74 gross acres of real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) into thirty-four (34) single-family residential lots.

(c) On February 4, 2019, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 18004 with the City Clerk and a copy of the notice was mailed to the Applicant, the Applicant’s authorized agent, and all interested parties requesting a copy.

(d) On February 7, 2019, the Planning Department filed a notice of the Planning Commission’s decision approving Tentative Tract Map No. 18004 with the City Council, which notice was placed on the City Council’s regular meeting agenda on that date.

(e) On February 7, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the proposed Change of Zone No. 18001, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council continued the public hearing.

(f) On February 7, 2019, the City Council filed a timely appeal of the Planning Commission’s approval of Variance No. 18004, an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37052 (the “Appeal”). The Appeal set aside the Planning Commission’s action and made the Council the approving body.

(g) On March 21, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a continued public hearing on the introduction of Ordinance No. 2019-02 and a public hearing on the Appeal, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearings.
Section 6. California Environmental Quality Act Findings for Adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby make the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Project:

(a) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Cal. Pub. Res. Code §21000 et seq.) and the State Guidelines (the “Guidelines”) (14 Cal. Code Regs. §15000 et seq.), City staff prepared an Initial Study of the potential environmental effects of the approval of the Project as described in the Initial Study. Based upon the findings contained in that Study, City staff determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there was no substantial evidence that the Project could have a significant effect on the environment and a Mitigated Negative Declaration (“MND”) was prepared by the City in full compliance with CEQA.

(b) Thereafter, City staff provided public notice of the public comment period and of the intent to adopt the MND as required by law. The public comment period commenced on November 20, 2018, and expired on December 19, 2018. Copies of the documents have been available for public review and inspection at City Hall, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509. The City received did not receive any comments during the public review period.

(c) On January 9, 2019, the Planning Commission reviewed the MND and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”) and found that (1) the MND was prepared in compliance with CEQA, (2) with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment, and (3) the MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Planning Commission. Based on those findings, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2019-01-09-02, adopting the MND and MMRP for the Project, and approving Variance No. 18004, an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of Chapter 7.10 of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37052.

(d) Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing, including the staff report and oral testimony, the City Council hereby sustains the Planning Commission’s adoption of the MND and MMRP for the Project, attached as Exhibit “B” to Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-01-09-02.

Section 7. Findings for Approval of Variance. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the proposed Variance No. 18004 should be granted because:

(a) Special circumstances apply to the subject parcel of property, including existing irregularly shaped lots, and the strict application of the minimum lot area, average lot width, and lot frontage requirements under Sections 9.55.020.(2), (3), and (4) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code will deprive the subject parcel of property of privileges enjoyed by other
properties in the vicinity under the same R-1 zoning classification that have lot areas less than 7,200 square feet.

(b) The adjustment does not constitute a grant of special privileges that is inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and the R-1 Zone, which have lot areas less than 7,200 square feet, and will not be detrimental to the health, safety, and general welfare of the community because the proposed Project meets the intent of the City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan.

Section 8. **Findings for Approval of Exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of Title 7 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.** The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the City of Jurupa Valley should be granted because:

(a) There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property, such as, but not limited to, size, shape or topographical conditions, or existing road alignment and width, in that these lots have a greater lot depth due to the design of the internal street (Street A), which is an extension of the existing Sierra Avenue. The slightly curved angle of Street A along these lots causes the lot depth to be greater than the lots along the straight portion of Street A. Additionally, the existing irregular shape of the southern boundary combined with the cul-de-sac, causes Lot 18 to have a greater depth.

(b) The granting of the modification will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or be damaging to other property in the vicinity, in that allowance of slightly greater lot depth will increase the backyard area that is used by the residents.

Section 9. **Findings for Approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 37470.** The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 should be granted because:

(a) The proposed land division will be consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan upon approval of Change of Zone No. 18001 and Variance No. 18004, in that the land use designation of MDR and the subject property are suitable for the proposed residential land division of 6.74 acres and the proposed density.

(b) The design and improvement of the proposed land division is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan, including the characteristics and allowed density of premises designated MDR.

(c) The site of the proposed land division is physically suitable for the type of development as designed.

(d) The site of the proposed land division is physically suitable for the proposed density of the development.

(e) The design of the proposed land division and proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or
wildlife or their habitat with the imposition of the recommended conditions of approval and mitigation measures.

(f) The design of the proposed land division and the type of improvements are not likely to cause serious public health problems. The Project will not be a danger to the welfare of the general public.

(g) The subject property does not have any easements, acquired by the public at large, for either access through, or use of, the subject property within the proposed land division.

Section 10. **Approval of Variance, Exception, and Tentative Tract Map with Conditions.** Based on the foregoing, the City Council hereby sustains the Planning Commission’s approval of Variance No. 18004, an exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 to permit a Schedule “A” subdivision of approximately 6.74 gross acres into thirty-four (34) single-family residential lots on real property located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue (APNs: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005), subject to the recommended conditions of approval attached hereto as Exhibit “A,” and denies the Appeal of the Appellant. The Planning Commission’s approval of Variance No. 18004, the exception to Section 7.10.080.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 is conditioned upon the City Council’s adoption of an ordinance approving Change of Zone No. 18001, and the Commission’s approval shall not take effect until the effective date of the ordinance approving Change of Zone No. 18001.

Section 11. **Certification.** The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

**PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED** by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 21st 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. 2019-18 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 21st 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 21st day of March, 2019.

__________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
EXHIBIT “A”

Conditions of Approval
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. **TTM & VAR - PROJECT PERMITTED.** MA18089 (CZ18001, TTM37470 with exception to Section 7.10.080.C of Title 7, VAR18004) is for the subdivision of 6.74 gross acres into 34 single-family lots with common lot numbers 35 (open space) & 36 (water quality basin).

2. **TTM & VAR - INDEMNIFY CITY.** The applicant, the property owner or other holder of the right to the development entitlement(s) or permit(s) approved by the City for the project, if different from the applicant (herein, collectively, the “Indemnitor”), shall indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the City of Jurupa Valley and its elected city council, its appointed boards, commissions, and committees, and its officials, employees, and agents (herein, collectively, the “Indemnitees”) from and against any and all claims, liabilities, losses, fines, penalties, and expenses, including, without limitation, litigation expenses and attorney’s fees, arising out of either (i) the City’s approval of the project, including without limitation any judicial or administrative proceeding initiated or maintained by any person or entity challenging the validity or enforceability of any City permit or approval relating to the project, any condition of approval imposed by City on such permit or approval relating to the project, any condition of approval imposed by City on such permit or approval, and any finding or determination made and any other action taken by any of the Indemnitees in conjunction with such permit or approval, including, without limitation, any action taken pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), or (ii) the acts, omissions, or operations of the Indemnitor and the directors, officers, members, partners, employees, agents, contractors, and subcontractors of each person or entity comprising the Indemnitor with respect to the ownership, planning, design, construction, and maintenance of the project and the property for which the project is being approved. The City shall notify the Indemnitor of any claim, lawsuit, or other judicial or administrative proceeding (herein, an “Action”) within the scope of this indemnity obligation and request that the Indemnitor defend such Action with legal counsel reasonably satisfactory to the City. If the Indemnitor fails to so defend the Action, the City shall have the right, but not the obligation, to do so and, if it does, the Indemnitor shall promptly pay the City’s full cost thereof. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the indemnity obligation under clause (ii) of the first sentence of this condition shall not apply to the extent the claim arises out of the willful misconduct or the sole active negligence of the City.

3. **TTM & VAR - CONSENT TO CONDITIONS.** Within thirty (30) days after project approval, the property owner or designee shall submit written consent to the required conditions of approval to the Planning Director or designee.
4. **TTM & VAR - MITIGATION MEASURES.** This project shall be subject to the mitigation measures of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

5. **TTM & VAR - FEES.** The approval of MA18089 (CZ18001, TTM37470 with exception, VAR18004) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

6. **TTM - APPROVAL PERIOD.** An approved or conditionally approved tentative map shall expire 36 months after such approval unless within that period of time a final map shall have been approved and filed with the County Recorder. Prior to the expiration date, the land divider may apply in writing for an extension of time pursuant to Title 7 of the Municipal Code.

7. **VAR – APPROVAL PERIOD.** Any variance that is granted shall be used within one (1) year from the effective date thereof, or within such additional time as may be set in the conditions of approval, which shall not exceed a total of three (3) years, except that a variance in connection with a land division may be used during the same period of time that the land division approval may be used; otherwise the variance shall be null and void.

8. **TTM - CONFORMANCE TO APPROVED EXHIBITS.** The project shall be in conformance to the approved plans listed below with changes in accordance to these conditions of approval:
   a) TTM37470
   b) Landscape Plan
   c) Maintenance Plan

9. **TTM – PLANNING REVIEW OF GRADING PLANS.** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the aesthetic impact of slopes and grade differences where the project adjoins streets or other properties shall be approved by the Planning Director.

10. **TTM – COVENANTS, CONDITIONS & RESTRICTIONS (CC & RS).** Prior to the recordation of the map, the applicant shall record CC & Rs providing for maintenance of the project in perpetuity that meets the Planning Director’s approval. The CC & R shall, at a minimum, include provisions for all of the following items:
   a) Formation of a home owner’s association (HOA). One HOA shall maintain both TTM37470 (MA18089 – Highland Park 2) and TTM31894 (MA1212 - Highland Park 1);
   b) Description of the responsibilities of HOA and property owner(s)
   c) HOA shall be responsible for the following items (at minimum):
      1. Ensuring the architecture of the homes is consistent with Highland Park’s (MA1212 TTM31894) development plan by conducting architectural review.
2. Maintenance of Lot 36 including any landscaping and lighting fixtures

3. Two-car garage shall be maintained at all times for each unit
d) Identify locations or areas to be maintained by home owner’s association, property owner(s), special districts, and City (if applicable) in text and by exhibit(s)

Any changes or modifications to the requirements of the CC & Rs shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Director.


a) **Prior to the issuance of any building permit**, the applicant shall submit a landscape and irrigation plan that includes an 8-foot-wide multi-purpose trail constructed of decomposed granite. The trail shall be consistent with this MA18089 conceptual landscape plan with the following exception: A five-foot wide landscaped planter with shrubs shall be constructed along the split-face block wall located on the rear property line of Lots 18 to 34.

In the event the adjacent properties (located to the west and south of TTM37470) are developed, this multi-purpose trail may be re-aligned to provide a more direct connection to the trail of Highland Park (MA1212 TTM31894).

The plan shall provide bollards that are fully shielded adjacent to the multi-purpose trail for public safety.

b) **Prior to the final inspection of a building permit for a residential unit**, the trail with the bollards shall be constructed in accordance to the plan.

12. TTM – MAINTENANCE OF MULTI-PURPOSE TRAIL ON LOTS 35 AND 36. The multi-purpose trail on Lots 35 and 36 shall be maintained by Jurupa Recreation Area Park District (JARPD). **Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the first single-family unit of the tract**, the applicant shall provide documentation that JARPD accepts maintenance of the multi-purpose trail to the Planning Department.

If JARPD does not accept the maintenance of the trail, the maintenance of the trail shall be the responsibility of the HOA.

13. TTM - ON-SITE LANDSCAPING. **Prior to the issuance of the first Building permit**, the applicant shall submit the following items, including landscape and irrigation as modified in accordance with this condition, for Planning Director’s review and approval:

a) Complete “Professional Services (PROS)” application (Planning) for the review of the final landscape, irrigation, and shading plans.

b) Initial deposit for PROS application.
c) The total cost estimate of landscaping, irrigation, labor, and one-year maintenance.

d) Completed “City Faithful Performance Bond for Landscape Improvements” form with original signatures after the City provides the applicant with the required amount of bond. This bond is for landscaping not within publicly maintained areas.

e) Completed City Landscape Agreement with original signatures after the City has reviewed the submitted cost estimate.

f) Three (3) sets of final on-site landscape, irrigation plans, shading plan with digital copies in 8.5” x 11” on a CD that shall address all the following requirements:

1. Compliance with Chapter 9.283 Water Efficient Landscape Design Requirements

2. Consistent with the approved conceptual plans

3. Satisfies the conditions including Condition No. 11 (A five-foot wide landscaped planter with shrubs shall be constructed along the split-face block wall located on the rear property line of Lots 18 to 34.)

4. Add 5 more trees around the perimeter of the basin. Trees shall be spaced at 40 feet on center.

5. Provide an inventory of on-site existing trees 4” caliper or larger. Indicate caliper, approximate height, and condition. Provide an exhibit indicating which existing trees will be preserved.

6. Provide landscape erosion control planting and irrigation for all manufactured slopes 3 feet or taller or otherwise provide retaining walls at the property line.

7. Provide a preliminary horticultural soils report and recommendations upon which initial soil preparation specifications are based.

Prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy for MA18089 (TTM37470), the following events shall be satisfied in the order it is listed:

1. Substantial Conformance Letter: The Landscape Architect of Record shall conduct an inspection and submit a letter to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department once the landscape architect has deemed the installation is in conformance to the approved plans.

2. City Inspection: The City landscape architect shall conduct an inspection of the installation to confirm the landscape and irrigation plan was constructed in accordance to the approved plans.
14. TTM – SDP APPROVAL FOR ARCHITECTURE & FLOOR PLANS. The architecture and floor plan for this tract shall be consistent, in quality and aesthetics, with Highland Park 1 (MA1212 – TTM31894) as determined by the Planning Director.

Prior to the issuance of the first Building permit for a single-family unit, a Site Development Permit (SDP) shall be submitted for the review and approval of plotting plan, architectural styles, and floor plans by the Planning Director.

15. TTM – SDP APPROVAL FOR MODEL HOMES. If model homes are proposed, a Site Development Permit application shall be submitted for the review and approval by the Planning Director prior to the issuance of any building permit(s) for the model homes.

16. TTM – SDP APPROVAL FOR WALL & FENCE PLAN. Prior to the issuance of the first Building Permit for a unit, the applicant shall submit a “Final Wall & Fence Plan" with a Site Development Permit application for the review and approval of the Planning Director. The plan shall be consistent with the MA18089 approval. All locations, dimensions, and construction materials for fences, walls, and gates shall be shown on the plans.

   e) No solid fence or wall shall exceed 42 inches in height within the front setback.

   f) The maintenance gate shall be constructed with a material that is open view to allow the public to view into the basin area for safety.

   g) The decorative block walls shall comply with the following requirements:

       o All block walls that face a public street or face a common open space shall have anti-graffiti wall coating.

       o Pilasters shall be constructed at the following places:

           ▪ Each end of the tract perimeter walls;

           ▪ Each turn or corner (for example: at each corner of the rear yard)

           ▪ Otherwise evenly spaced at approximately 30 feet on center but shall not exceed 40 feet apart.

17. TTM - INCORPORATE CONDITIONS. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the owner or designee shall include within the first four pages of the working drawings a list of all conditions of approval imposed by the project's final approval.

18. TTM – ACKNOWLEDGEMENT LETTER OF R-1 STANDARDS. Prior to the issuance of first building permit for a unit, the applicant shall submit a written acknowledgement of the following development standards of R-1:

   a. Building setbacks

   b. Lot Coverage

19. TTM - JURUPA AREA RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit proof of satisfying any fees,
dedications, or requirements by the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District to the Building Official.

20. **TTM – IMPACT FEES.** The applicant shall pay the following impact fees (unless exempt) in accordance to Title 3 of the Municipal Code:

   a. **Development Impact Fee (DIF) Program.** The applicant shall pay any owed DIFs by the required deadline pursuant to Chapter 3.75 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

   b. **Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Mitigation (MSHCP) Fee.** The applicant shall pay any owed MSHCP fees by the required deadline pursuant to Chapter 3.80 of the Municipal Code.

   c. **Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) Program.** The applicant shall pay any owed TUMFs by the required deadline pursuant to Chapter 3.70 of the Municipal Code.

21. **TTM – GARAGES.** All residential units shall not have less than two parking spaces in a garage with roll-up door and shall be maintained at all times. Garage conversions shall only be permitted if a two-car garage is replaced in the original size and architectural style of the home.

22. **TTM – MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF SOLID FENCES AND WALLS WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK.** No solid fence or wall shall exceed 42 inches in height within the front yard setback.

23. **TTM - STREET TREES.** Street trees and related security and agreements are required pursuant Chapter 7.55 of Title 7.

24. **TTM - LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE.** All landscaped areas shall be maintained as approved on the final landscape plans in an orderly, attractive and healthy condition. This shall include proper pruning, mowing of turf areas, weeding, removal of litter, fertilization, replacement of plants when necessary, and the regular application of appropriate quantities of water to all landscaped areas. Irrigation systems shall be maintained as approved on the final landscape plans in proper operating condition. Waterline breaks, head/emitter ruptures, overspray or runoff conditions and other irrigation system failures shall be repaired immediately. The applicant shall maintain canopy trees in a manner that they provide the required shade coverage and encourages the canopy to grow to provide shade. Avoid topping trees or pruning the trees in a manner that the trees do not achieve mature height and form.

25. **TTM – REMOVAL OF GRAFFITI.** The homeowner’s association (HOA) shall remove any graffiti on the common areas as soon as possible. In addition, if the HOA was notified by the City, the HOA shall remove the graffiti within seven (7) days of the City’s notice.
ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

1. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (ENGINEERING)

1.1. The use hereby conditioned is for a Schedule "A" subdivision, Tentative Tract Map No. 37470; being a subdivision of a portion of Section 8 and Section 9, Township 2 South Range 5 West SBB & M.; more particularly Assessor's Parcels Number APNs 177-020-018, 177-020-012, and 177-110-005; consisting of 6.74 acres, into 34 numbered parcels for residential purposes, 2 numbered lots for open space purpose and water quality basin, and 1 lettered lot for road dedication. Exhibit titled Tentative Tract Map No. 37470, prepared by VSL Engineering, dated March 2018, is hereby referenced.

1.2. This land division shall comply with the State of California Subdivision Map Act, the City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and Riverside County Ordinance No. 460; as it pertains for Schedule "A" subdivision for residential purposes, unless otherwise modified by the conditions listed herein.

1.3. It is assumed that any easements shown on the referenced exhibits are shown correctly and include all the easements that encumber the subject property. The Applicant shall secure approval from all easement holders for all grading and improvements which are proposed over the respective easement or provide evidence that the easement has been relocated, quitclaimed, vacated, abandoned, easement holder cannot be found, or is otherwise of no affect. Should such approvals or alternate action regarding the easements not be provided, the Applicant may be required to amend or revise the permit application.

1.4. 30th Street is a Local Road (modified) with a right-of-way width of 66 feet. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on 30th Street as described on these conditions of approval. The improvements include, but are not limited to, curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaped parkway and signing and striping. The Applicant shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.5. Existing Sierra Avenue will be realigned to the east by adjacent development. Future Street J, as identified on the referenced exhibit, is considered a Local Road. The applicant will be required to coordinate the alignment of the road with adjacent development for TTM31894. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements for the intersection of J Street and 30th Street per these conditions of approval.

1.6. Proposed Street A shall be dedicated as a public local road with a right-of-way width of 56 feet. The applicant will be required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements per these conditions of approval. Improvements include, but are not limited to, a 36-foot paved road, curb and gutter, sidewalk, drive approaches, landscaped parkway, and signing and striping. The Applicant shall cause improvement plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.7. New street lights are required on 30th Street and Street A. The Applicant shall
cause streetlight plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.8. In compliance with Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Orders this project is required to comply with the Water Quality Management Plan for Urban Runoff (WQMP). The WQMP addresses post-development water quality impacts from new development and redevelopment projects. Guidelines and templates to assist the developer in completing the necessary studies are available on-line at www.floodcontrol.co.riverside.ca.us under Programs and Services, Stormwater Quality.

1.9. Electrical power, telephone, communication, street lighting, and cable television lines shall be placed underground in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance 460 and 461, as adopted by the City. This also applies to existing overhead lines which are 33.6 kilovolts or below within and along the project frontage and between the nearest poles offsite in each direction of the project site. All utility extensions within the subdivision and within individual lots shall be placed underground.

1.10. Owner will be required to form a Community Facilities District (CFD) for maintenance of parkway improvements as identified on these conditions of approval and approved by the Director of Public Works.

1.11. An Environmental Constraint Sheet (ECS) is required to be prepared for this project for filing with the City Engineer at the time of recording the Final Map.

2. PRIOR TO GRADING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

2.1. No grading permit shall be issued until the Tentative Tract Map (TTM), and all other related cases are approved and are in effect, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

2.2. The Developer shall prepare a “rough” grading plan or a combined “rough and precise” grading plan for the entire site. The grading plan shall be prepared under the supervision of a civil engineer licensed in the state of California (Project Civil Engineer) and he/she must sign the plan. The printed name and contact information of the Project Civil Engineer shall be included on the face of the grading plan. The grading plan shall be approved by the City Engineer.

2.2.1. The grading plan shall provide for acceptance and proper disposal of all off-site drainage flowing onto or through the site. Should the quantities of flow exceed the capacity of the conveyance facility, the Applicant shall provide adequate drainage facilities and/or appropriate easement(s), if necessary, as approved by the City Engineer.

2.2.2. The grading plan shall provide for protection of downstream properties from damages caused by alteration of the drainage patterns, i.e., concentration or diversion of flow. Protection shall be provided by constructing adequate drainage facilities including enlarging existing facilities and/or by securing a drainage easement(s), if necessary, as approved by the City Engineer.
2.2.3. Temporary erosion control measures shall be implemented immediately following rough grading to prevent transport and deposition of earthen materials onto downstream/downwind properties, public rights-of-way, or other drainage facilities. Erosion Control Plans showing these measures shall be submitted along with the grading plan for approval by the City Engineer.

2.2.4. Driveway approaches shall be constructed per Riverside County Standard No. 207. Existing driveway approaches, if any, shall be removed and replaced with full height curb and gutter and adjacent sidewalk to match approved street sections.

2.2.5. Grading agreement and securities shall be in place prior to commencement of grading.

2.3. Prior to approval of the grading plan, the applicant shall submit for review and approval of the City Engineer a project specific final geotechnical report.

2.3.1. Grading of the site shall be per the recommendations of the geotechnical report as reviewed and approved by the Engineering department.

2.3.2. A preliminary geotechnical report for the Proposed Single-Family Residential Development for the Highland Park Project, prepared by LGC Geo-Environmental, Inc.; dated July 27, 2018; was prepared and submitted during entitlement. Applicant shall address comments provided on the Engineering review letter dated September 20, 2018 prior to submittal of the final report for review.

2.3.3. Final report shall include percolation test and results for the water quality basin if infiltration is proposed.

2.4. Prior to approval of grading plans and if grading is required offsite, the Developer shall obtain written notarized letter of permission from the property owner(s) to grade as necessary and provide a copy to the Engineering Department. It shall be the sole responsibility of the Developer to obtain any and all proposed or required easements and/or permissions necessary to perform the grading shown on the site plan, tentative tract map and grading exhibits.

2.5. Prior to approval of grading plans, the applicant shall obtain written authorization from Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFC&WCD) for any grading work and operations performed over or impacting the existing RCFC&WCD easement.

2.6. Prior to the issuance of the precise grading permit, the Applicant shall cause a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to be prepared in conformance with the requirements of the City of Jurupa Valley and the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFC&WCD) for approval of the City Engineer.

2.7. Prior to approval of the grading plan for disturbance of one (1) or more acres the landowner shall provide evidence that it has prepared and submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) a Storm Water Pollution Prevention plan (SWPPP). The SWRCB issued WDID number shall be included on the face of the grading plan.
2.8. Prior to issuance of the grading permit, the applicant shall obtain authorization from RCFC&WCD for basin overflow connection to their facilities.

2.9. Any proposed retaining walls will require a separate permit(s). Permits shall be obtained prior to the issuance of the precise grading permit unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer and Building Official.

2.10. Where grading involves import or export the Applicant shall obtain approval for the import/export location, from the Engineering department, if located in the City. If an Environmental Assessment did not previously address the import/export location a Grading Environmental Assessment shall be submitted to the Engineering Department for comment and to the Planning Director for review and approval. If import/export location is outside the City the Applicant shall provide evidence that the jurisdictional agency has provided all necessary, separate approvals for import/export to/from the site.

2.11. Where grading involves import or export using City streets the Applicant shall obtain approval of the haul route and a haul route permit from the Public Works Department.

2.12. Prior to approval of the grading plan the Applicant shall prepare a final Hydrology Report, corresponding with the proposed improvements, for approval of the City Engineer. The report shall be consistent with the proposed development and signed by a California licensed civil engineer.

2.12.1. All drainage and storm drain improvements shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District's standards.

2.12.2. Applicant is responsible for obtaining the necessary permits from Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCD) for connection to their facilities.

2.12.3. A preliminary Hydrology Report for the proposed development prepared by VSL Engineering, dated September 9, 2017, was prepared and submitted during the entitlement. Applicant shall address any comments made during the entitlement process and submit final report to the Engineering department for final review and approval.

2.13. The Applicant shall prepare separate landscaping and irrigation plans for areas within the street right-of-way for review and approval by the City Engineer.

2.14. The Applicant shall prepare separate street improvement and street lighting plans for review and approval by the City Engineer.

2.15. Where grading involves import to or export of more than 50 cubic yards from the site the Developer shall obtain approval for the import/export location from the Engineering Department if located in the City.

3. PRIOR TO FINAL MAP RECORDATION

3.1. No final Map shall be recorded until all other related cases, Change of Zone CZ18001 and Variance VAR18004, are approved and are in effect unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.
3.2. No final Map shall be recorded until the formation / annexation process for the Community Facilities (CFD) associated with this project, if any, is finalized.

3.2.1. Applicant shall prepare Landscape and Irrigation plans for CFD. Plans shall be prepared per Riverside County Ordinance No. 859 and per the City’s submittal guidelines and package.

3.2.2. CFD will include, but is not limited to, the maintenance of the following:

- Water Quality Basins;
- Tree trimming for trees within the public right-of-way, as identified on the CFD landscape plans and approved by the Director of Public Works;
- Landscape Maintenance
- Entry Monuments (if proposed)

3.2.3. The CFD will not maintain the parkway area in front of the homeowner’s lot. Property owners will be responsible of the maintenance of the landscaping in front of their homes within the public right-of-way. The following exception applies: the CFD will be responsible for the tree trimming of trees along parkways on public right-of-way.

3.2.4. Formation of an HOA for parkway improvements in lieu of CFD will require the City Engineer’s approval.

3.3. The Applicant shall provide improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer for all public improvements including, but not limited to, street improvements plans showing parkway improvements, road and pavement improvements, streetlights, landscape and irrigation, and water system.

3.4. Rights-of-way for streets and public utilities purposes shall be dedicated and shown on the final Map in accordance with these conditions of approval, the City’s Municipal Code, Riverside County Ordinance 460, and Riverside County Ordinance 461. It is understood that the Tentative Tract Map exhibit correctly shows acceptable centerlines, existing easements, traveled ways, and drainage courses, and that the omission or unacceptability may require that the Developer amend or revise the tentative map as may be necessary to allow a finding that the final Map is in substantial conformance with the tentative map.

3.5. The Applicant shall prepare improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer:

3.5.1. Applicant shall prepare plans for improvements on 30th Street consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible for the construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:

   a) Ultimate road and pavement conditions;
   b) 22-ft wide paved road from centerline to curb face;
c) Curb and gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report and to match existing improvements west of development;

3.5.2. Applicant shall prepare plans for improvements for proposed in-tract Street A consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible of construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:

a) Ultimate road and pavement conditions, 36-ft wide paved road within a 56-ft right-of-way section (Riverside County Standard 105);

b) Curb and gutter per Riverside County Standard No. 200 / 201 in accordance to the final drainage report and connecting to the improvements on 30th Street;

c) 5-ft curb adjacent landscape and 5-ft sidewalk within a 10-foot parkway.

3.5.3. Applicant shall prepare plans for improvements at the intersection of 30th Street, proposed Street A, and future J Street (existing Sierra Avenue), consistent with these conditions of approval and shall be responsible of construction of the improvements. Improvements shall provide for:

a) Ultimate road and pavement conditions;

b) Due to current line of sight restrictions and curvilinear alignment of Street A, the intersection of 30th Street with A and J Streets will be controlled by 3-way stop signs to be installed by the developer.

c) ADA compliant access ramps should be provided for crossing north and south legs of the intersection.

d) Parkway landscaping at the intersection of 30th Street with Street A and J Street should be selected such that adequate line of sight is maintained.

3.6. Should this project be within any assessment/benefit district, the Applicant shall make application for and pay any reapportionment of the assessment or pay the unit fees in the assessment/benefit district.

3.7. Applicant shall provide clearance letter from water and sewer utility purveyor, that all and any conditions by the water and sewer utility purveyor (if any) have been satisfied or appropriately initiated to its satisfaction.

3.8. Electrical power, telephone, communication, street lighting, and cable television lines shall be designed to be placed underground in accordance with Riverside County Ordinances 460 and 461, as adopted by the City. The Applicant is responsible for coordinating the work with the serving utility company. This requirement applies to underground existing overhead electrical lines which are 33.6 kilovolts or below along the project frontage and between the nearest poles onsite in each direction of the project site including services that originate from poles on the far side of the street. A disposition note describing the above shall be reflected on design improvement plans whenever those plans are required.
Written proof confirming initiation of the design of utility improvements or relocations, issued by the utility company, shall be submitted to the Engineering Department for verification purposes.

3.9. Applicant shall obtain approval by water and sewer purveyor for water system and sewer system improvement plans (if any). The plans shall be submitted to and approved by the appropriate service district and the City.

3.10. Prior to Final Map approval, the applicant shall submit for review and approval an application and complete package for the vacation of right-of-way, for that portion of the right-of-way at the easterly terminus of 30th street generally shown on the TTM. Vacation documents shall be approved and recorded prior to Final Map filing.

3.11. Agreement and securities for street improvements shall be in place.

4. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

4.1. The Project geotechnical/soils engineer shall certify to the completion of grading in conformance with the approved grading plans and the recommendations of the Geotechnical/Soils report approved for this project. Minimum street sections and traffic indexes are to be according to Riverside County Standards. Final sections may be greater based on the final R values determined by a Geologist registered in the State of California, and as approved by the City Engineer.

4.2. A licensed land surveyor or civil engineer shall certify to the completion of grading in conformance with the lines and grades shown on the approved grading plans.

4.3. The Applicant shall prepare a precise grading plan, if precise grading was not included in a combined "rough and precise" grading plan. The precise grading plan shall be approved by the City Engineer.

4.4. The site's BMP facilities and features shall be constructed as shown on the project's site grading plans or separate post-construction BMP improvement plans approved of the City Engineer. Post-construction water quality surface features and facilities such as basins and bio-swales are not required to be landscaped prior to issuance of building permits, but must be otherwise constructed and additional temporary erosion control measures in place as approved by the City Engineer.

4.5. The required domestic water system improvements, including fire hydrants, shall be installed and accepted.

5. PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION (ENGINEERING)

5.1. The Applicant is responsible for the completing off all grading and construction of all infrastructure improvements within the public right-of-way in accordance with approved plans, with Riverside County Ordinance 461, as adopted by the City, and with all other applicable requirements, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Applicant shall ensure that streetlights are energized along the streets.
where Applicant is seeking Building Final Inspection (Occupancy).

5.2. The Project geotechnical/soils engineer shall provide a Final Grading Certification, certifying to the completion of the precise grading in conformance with the approved grading plans, the recommendation of the Geotechnical/Soils report approved for this project and the California Building Code.

5.3. A licensed surveyor or civil engineer shall certify to the completion of precise grading in conformance with the lines and grades shown on the approved grading plans.

5.4. The Applicant is responsible for completing all landscaping and irrigation improvements within the public right-of-way as applicable. The Applicant shall provide a Landscaping Certificate of Completion to the City Engineer.

5.5. The Applicant is responsible for the completion of all post-construction water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) facilities and features. These facilities and features will require operation and maintenance in perpetuity by the Property Owner(s).

6. PRIOR TO BOND EXONERATION (ENGINEERING)

6.1. All street improvements must be completed and accepted by the City.

6.2. CFD maintained improvements shall be completed and accepted by the City Engineering.

6.3. The applicant is responsible for completing all utility mainline and service line extensions within and serving the project site, including but not limited to, electrical power, telephone, other communication, street lighting, and cable television as herein before required, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineering in writing. Utility extensions from the mainline or other points of connection within the public right-of-way require that the applicant obtained an Encroachment Permit from the Engineering Department. Correspondence from the respective utility company approving and accepting utility improvements shall be provided from each respective utility company. The City will make a final inspection of work to verify that any impacts that the work might have had to other City owned infrastructure is restored or repaired to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

The Applicant hereby agrees that these Conditions of Approval are valid and lawful and binding on the Applicant, and its successors and assigns, and agrees to the Conditions of Approval.

Applicant’s name (Print Form): __________________________________________

Applicant’s name (Signature): __________________________________________

Date: ____________________
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STAFF REPORT

DATE: FEBRUARY 7, 2019
TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS
FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER
BY: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 14.A

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER CHANGE OF ZONE (CZ) NO. 18001 FROM R-R (RURAL RESIDENTIAL) TO R-1 (ONE FAMILY DWELLINGS) AND NOTICE OF PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION TO APPROVE MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 18089 (TTM37470, VAR18004, AND EXCEPTION TO SECTION 7.10.080 (C) OF TITLE 7) A PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT FOR NOTICING THE ADVISORY AGENCY’S (PLANNING COMMISSION) DECISION OF APPROVING A SUBDIVISION OF A PROPERTY LOCATED SOUTH OF INTERSECTION OF 30TH STREET AND SIERRA AVENUE, APNS: 177-020-018; 177-020-012; 177-110-005 (APPLICANT: JA BRAY, LLC)

RECOMMENDATION

1) That the City Council receive and file the Notice of Decision, initiating the commencement of a ten-day appeal period for TTM37470, VAR18004, and Exception to Section 7.10.080 (c) of Title 7.

2) That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-10, entitled:


3) That the City Council conduct a first reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2019-02, entitled:
AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY OFFICIAL ZONING MAP CHANGING THE ZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 6.74 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED SOUTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF 30TH STREET AND SIERRA AVENUE (APNS: 177-020-018, 177-020-012, 177-110-005) FROM RURAL RESIDENTIAL (R-R) ZONE TO ONE (1) FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE AND MAKING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

BACKGROUND

On January 9, 2019, the Planning Commission held a public hearing and took the following actions:

1. Approved the entitlements for a 34-single family lot subdivision, Highland Park 2, and adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting program. The entitlements included a Tentative Tract Map with an exception to Section 7.10.080 (c) of Title 7, and a Variance.

2. Recommended to the City Council to approve the Change of Zone of the project site.

Both adopted Planning Commission resolutions are attached to this staff report.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Highland Park 2. The proposed project is for a 34-single-family lot subdivision on approximately 6.74 acres. The average lot size for this project is 6,400 square-feet. It is located south of the intersection of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue in the Sunnyslope area. See Exhibit A for the project location. Project location is indicated with a star.

The land was originally intended to be made a part of the original Highland Park 1 application that was approved by the City Council in 2016. However, the applicant and the previous owner, County of Riverside, did not come to an agreement on the land acquisition until after the Highland Park 1 approval. Thus, the applicant made a separate application for this 34-single-family lot subdivision. Highland Park 2 (34 units) adds about 8% to Highland Park 1 (398 units). See Exhibit B for the approved Highland Park 1 project.

The applicant intends for both projects to be developed similar in character and quality including architectural styles and floor plans. Highland Park 2 cannot request to change the zoning to R-4 (same zoning as Highland Park 1) due to a code requirement that requires the project area to be at least 9 acres. Highland Park 2 is 6.74 acres. Thus, the request is for an R-1 zone.

Although Highland Park 1 is zoned R-4 and Highland Park 2 will be zoned R-1, both R-1 and R-4 zones are consistent with the General Plan land use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) (maximum 5 units per acre).
The intended residential character for Medium Density Residential detached single-family homes is for an average lot size of 6,000 square-feet.

Had the project been included with the original Highland Park application, the project site could have been zoned R-4. Thus, if the project had been zoned R-4, all the lots would comply with the R-4 development standards. It is only a technicality that the project cannot be zoned R-4.

The project site abuts the western boundary of Highland Park 1. Exhibit C presents the location of “Highland Park 1” in yellow and indicates the location of “Highland Park 2” with a star.

**EXHIBIT A. PROJECT SITE (SOURCE: COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE GIS)**

Table 1 presents general project information and Table 2 presents the requested applications. Per the Municipal code, the Planning Commission is the advisory agency for Schedule “A” tentative maps and Variances. Thus, the Planning Commission takes action on both of the Tentative Tract Map (TTM) with exception and Variance applications for this project.

The Planning Commission approved those entitlements on January 9, 2019 and recommended City Council to approve the Change of Zone. The TTM and VAR will not take effect unless the Change of Zone is approved and effective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACREAGE OF PROJECT SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING GENERAL PLAN LAND USE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGNATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2: REQUESTED ENTITLEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change of Zone (CZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentative Tract Map (TTM) with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exception to Section 7.10.080 (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Title 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (VAR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background of Highland Park 1. In March 2016, the City Council approved a residential subdivision for 398 single-family homes, see Exhibit C, with a community park on 168 acres of land in the Sunnyslope community. The residential subdivision is named Highland Park and it is surrounded by residential communities. Highland Park 1 has an average lot size of 6,550 square-feet for a total of 398 single-family homes.
Highland Park 2 has an average lot size of 6,400 square-feet. It is located north of Canal Street, east of Sierra Avenue / 20th Street, and north of the Union Pacific Railroad line. Refer to Exhibit B for location.

EXHIBIT B. LOCATION OF APPROVED HIGHLAND PARK 1 PROJECT
(SOURCE: COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE GIS)

Highland Park 1 includes an abandoned quarry located adjacent to the homes and community. The land use designation and zoning were for industrial use and mining. Since Highland Park was approved, the Medium Density Residential land use designation and R-4 (Planned Residential) zone are for residential use.

R-4 zone allows for both (1) a minimum lot area of 3,600 square-feet and (2) a minimum of 6,000 square-feet overall per dwelling unit that includes recreation and service areas. The zone is intended for smaller lots with a greater area of shared common recreation and open space or a conventional single-family neighborhood with 6,000 square-feet lots.
2017 General Plan. As part of the adoption of the 2017 General Plan, the City Council approved the project site for Highland Park 2 to have a land use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) which was recommended by staff in anticipation of this application. The surrounding area has the same land use designation of MDR. The General Plan Land Use Element states that the MDR allows up to 5 units per acre with a minimum lot size of 5,500 square-feet. The General Plan also allows multiple zones consistent with MDR: R-1, R-2, R-2A, R-4, R-6, R-T, SP, and PUD. See Exhibit D for the land use map which shows the general area designated as MDR.

EXHIBIT D. EXCERPT FROM 2017 GENERAL PLAN LAND USE MAP
ANALYSIS

I. **CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT.** The City of Jurupa Valley has prepared and intends to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Project. The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration is supported by an Initial Study that evaluated potential effects with respect to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forest Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration determines that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made or agreed to by the Applicant. The City's decision to prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration should not be construed as a recommendation of either approval or denial of this Project. Planning Condition No. 4 requires all the mitigation measures of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to be as conditions.

**Public Review Period.** The public review period for the environmental document began on November 20, 2018 and ended on December 19, 2018. The City did not receive any comments.

II. **GENERAL PLAN.** The proposed project is consistent with the recently adopted General Plan. The project meets the intent, characteristics and policies of the land use designation. The zones that can be used with MDR are R-1, R-2, R-2A, R-4, R-6, R-T, SP, and PUD. The proposed zoning classification of R-1 (One (1) Family Dwellings) is consistent with Medium Density Residential (MDR). MDR is for single-family detached and attached residential and allows up to 5 dwelling units per acre. This project is for single-family detached and the project’s density is 5 dwelling units per acre. MDR’s typical lot size ranges from 5,500 square-feet to 20,000 square-feet. The project’s average lot size is almost 6,400 square-feet with one lot under 6,000 square-feet and a several lots greater than 7,200 square-feet.

III. **ZONING ORDINANCE.** The project is consistent with the proposed R-1 zone (One (1) Family Dwellings). The Planning Commission approved the TTM with exception and a Variance for the subdivision. Table 3 summarizes the variances to the lot area, lot width, lot depth, and lot frontage. The characteristics of this proposed neighborhood will be very similar to the existing neighborhoods especially from the street. The setbacks are the same. The size of the homes is generally the same. The only difference is a slightly larger backyard that is not visible from the street. In other words, it is not possible to visually determine whether a neighborhood has 6,000 square-feet lots or 7,200 square-feet lots.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>Does The Project Comply?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area: Minimum 7,200 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Yes – with an approved Variance. Average lot size is almost 6,400 square-feet with one lot at 5,711 square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Width of Lot: Min. 60 ft.</td>
<td>Yes – with an approved Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Depth of Lot: Min. 100 ft.</td>
<td>Yes, as shown on the TTM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Lot Frontage:  
  - Minimum 60 ft.  
  - Lots fronting on knuckles or cul-de-sac may have a min. of 35 ft. | Yes – with an approved Variance |

CONCLUSION

This project is designed to be a part of the Highland Park 1 community that the City Council approved. The character and aesthetics of both tracts will be the same as this project will have the same architecture and floor plans. Moreover, the lot design is similar. The average lot size for Highland Park 1 is 6,550 square-feet and Highland Park 2 is 6,400 square-feet. The project is small since it adds only 8% to the overall Highland Park project. The proposed project is compatible with the community.

The Planning Commission approved the entitlements for the subdivision and has recommended approval of Change of Zone to the City Council.

For these reasons, the staff recommends approval of the Change of Zone.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

There are no financial impacts associated with the Notice of Decision or the Change of Zone as the Applicant has covered all associated costs for processing.

ALTERNATIVES

1. That the City Council receive and file the Notice of Decision, initiating the commencement of a ten-day appeal period for TTM37470, VAR18004, AND Exception to Section 7.10.080 (c) of Title 7; adopt Resolution No. 2019-10 and conduct the first reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2019-02, to allow the Change of Zone No. 18001 from R-R (Rural Residential) to R-1 (One Family Dwellings) for property located south of 30th Street and Sierra Avenue, APNS: 177-020-016; 177-020-012; 177-110-005; (the recommended action)

2. That the City Council receive and file the Notice of Decision.
3. Provide alternative direction to staff.

Prepared by: Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director

Submitted by: Gary S. Thompson
City Manager

Reviewed by: Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Reviewed by: Peter M. Thorson
City Attorney

ATTACHMENTS
1. Resolution No. 2019-10
   a. Exhibit A. Mitigated Negative Declaration & Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) (on file with City and on City’s website)
2. Ordinance No. 2019-02
   a. Mitigated Negative Declaration & Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-01-09-01 (on file with City and on City’s website)
4. Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-01-09-02
   a. Exhibit A. Conditions of Approval
   b. Exhibit B. Mitigated Negative Declaration & Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) (not included because it is included as Exhibit A in Resolution No. 2019-10)
4. Planning Commission Staff Report for January 9, 2019 (excluding exhibits)
5. Tentative Tract Map No. 37470 (2 pages)
6. Landscape Plan with Wall & Fence Plan (2 pages)
7. Change of Zone exhibit
8. Radius Map
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

PARCEL 1:

THAT PORTION OF TRACT 1 OF THE RESUBDIVISION OF THE LANDS FORMERLY BELONGING TO THE A. C. ARMSTRONG ESTATE, AS SHOWN BY MAP ON FILE IN BOOK 6, PAGE 51 OF MAPS, RIVERSIDE COUNTY RECORDS, AND SHOWN ON RECORD OF SURVEY OR PLAT IN BOOK 1, PAGE 70 OF RECORDS OF SURVEY, RIVERSIDE COUNTY RECORDS. DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

THAT PORTION OF THE LAND DESCRIBED IN DEED RECORDED IN BOOK 1695, PAGE 431 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, RIVERSIDE COUNTY RECORDS, Lying Northerly of the following described line:

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SUBDIVISION HEIGHTS UNIT NO. 5, AS SHOWN BY MAP OR FILE IN BOOK 33, PAGE 47 AND 48 OF MAPS, RIVERSIDE COUNTY RECORDS; THEREON NORTH 82° 52' 00" EAST, ON THE PROLATION OF THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF SAID SUBDIVISION HEIGHTS UNIT NO. 5, 571.29 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE MOST WESTERLY CORNER OF THE NORTH PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN THE ABOVE MENTIONED DEED; THEREON SOUTH 14° 42' 30" WEST, 30.7 FEET, MORE OR LESS, ON THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF SAID PROPERTY, AS SAID PROPERTY EXTENED, ON THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF SAID PROPERTY MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES FROM THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF SAID SUBDIVISION HEIGHTS UNIT NO. 5, 6.06 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE BEGINNINGS OF A TANGENT CURVE CONCAVING NORTHEAST AND HAVING A RADIUS OF 310 FEET (SAID CURVE BEING TAMGAGED AT ITS POINT OF CURVING TO A LINE THAT IS PARALLEL WITH AND DISTANT NORTHEASTERLY MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES, 153 FEET FROM THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF THE THIRD EXCEPTION DESCRIBED IN THE ABOVE MENTIONED DEED); THEREON EASTERLY, ON SAID CURVE 140 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO A LINE THAT IS PARALLEL TO SAID CURVE AND PASSED THROUGH THE MOST NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF THE SECOND EXCEPTION DESCRIBED IN THE ABOVE MENTIONED DEED; THEREON AS SAID CURVE AND PASSED THROUGH THE MOST NORTH水电角 to THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE SOUTHWESTERLY 115 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO SAID MOST NORTHERLY CORNER; THEREON SOUTH 8° 25' 00" EAST ON THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF THE PROPERTY CONVEYED TO SUBDIVISION HEIGHTS WATER COMPANY BY DEED RECORDED JANUARY 03, 1959, AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2493, RIVERSIDE COUNTY RECORDS, TO THE INTERSECTION WITH THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF SAID DEED RECORDED IN BOOK 1695, PAGE 431 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, RIVERSIDE COUNTY RECORDS.

RECEIVING A RIGHT OF WAY TO THE NORTH RIVERSIDE CHEMICAL COMPANY OVER THIS PROPERTY FOR A PIPE LINE AND ITS MAINTENANCE.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM THAT PORTION LYEING NORTHEASTERLY OF THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED LINE:

BEGINNING AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF 13TH STREET, 60 FEET WIDE, AND THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF SUBDIVISION HEIGHTS UNIT NO. 5, AS SHOWN ON MAP OR FILE IN BOOK 33, PAGE 47 AND 48 OF MAPS, RIVERSIDE COUNTY RECORDS; THEREON SOUTH 82° 36' 00" EAST ALONG SAID SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF SAID PROPERTY, 20 FEET TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING, THEREON SOUTHWESTERLY PARALLELING THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF SAID SUBDIVISION HEIGHTS UNIT NO. 5 TO A POINT ON THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF THE LAND DESCRIBED IN THE DEED RECORDED IN BOOK 1695, PAGE 431 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY.

PARCEL 2:

THAT PART OF TRACT NO. 1 OF THE RESUBDIVISION OF THE LANDS FORMERLY BELONGING TO THE A. C. ARMSTRONG ESTATE, AS SHOWN BY MAP ON FILE IN BOOK J, PAGE 31 OF MAPS, RIVERSIDE COUNTY RECORDS, AND SHOWN ON RECORD OF SURVEY OR PLAT IN BOOK 1, PAGE 70 OF RECORDS OF SURVEY, RIVERSIDE COUNTY RECORDS, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT STATION 36 IN TRACT NO. 1 OF LANDS FORMERLY BELONGING TO A. C. ARMSTRONG ESTATE, AS SHOWN ON SAID MAP, THEREON SOUTH 85° 25' 00" EAST, ALONG COURSE 24 OF SAID A. C. ARMSTRONG ESTATE, 225.1 FEET TO THE INTERSECTION WITH THE CENTERLINE OF PACIFIC AVENUE PRODUCED; THEREON NORTH 16° 16' 00" EAST, ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF SAID PACIFIC AVENUE PRODUCED, TO THE INTERSECTION WITH THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF THE RIGHT OF WAY OF THE SAN PEDRO, LOS ANGELES AND SAN LAC RAILROAD COMPANY; THEREON WESTERLY ALONG THE NORTHEASTERLY RIGHT OF WAY FOLLOWING A 1/4" CURVE TO THE INTERSECTION WITH THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF PACIFIC AVENUE, PRODUCED; THEREON NORTH 16° 00' 00" WEST, 44.41 FEET TO TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING; THEREON SOUTH 85° 25' 00" WEST, 225.1 FEET TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 21, 2019

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: GARY S. THOMPSON, CITY MANAGER
BY: STEVE LORISO, P.E., CITY ENGINEER/PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 16.A

APPOINTMENTS TO THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

RECOMMENDATION

1) That Mayor Brian Berkson, Mayor Pro Tem Anthony Kelly, Council Member Chris Barajas, Council Member Lorena Barajas, and Council Member Michael Goodland nominate one member each to serve on the Community Development Advisory Committee for a term of four (4) years, or until the Community Development Advisory Committee member’s successors are appointed and sworn-in, whichever is later and which nomination shall be ratified by a majority vote of the entire City Council, pursuant to Chapter 2.36 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code

BACKGROUND:

On June 7, 2018, the City Council adopted the City’s first Consolidated Plan (“ConPlan”), Annual Action Plan, and Citizen’s Participation Plan for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding program. The passage of these planning documents was required by the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to become an “entitlement city” and administer CDBG funds independently. Previously, the City’s CDBG efforts were administered by the County of Riverside.

A portion of the total CDBG allocation that the City receives from HUD must go to fund public services. Typically, this process is served through a public service grant (“PSG”) application process. Non-profit entities that serve a population with certain demographic characteristics (low to moderate income, homeless, low-income seniors, etc.) are encouraged to apply for public service grant funding from the City.

During the 2018-2019 CDBG program year, City Staff administered the public service
grant application process. This is typical of municipalities that recently receive entitlement status from HUD, as the first year of entitlement status usually involves an extremely tight reporting schedule. A budget amount of $75,000 was made available. City Staff received proposals, established an informal review committee made up of City Staff, and recommended that the City Council formalize an Agreement with Path of Life Ministries, Inc. (“Path of Life”) for homelessness services. Since incorporation, City Staff have worked with various regional and County-led efforts to mitigate homelessness. However, the formalization of the agreement with Path of Life in 2018 marked the City’s first significant step towards mitigating local homelessness independently through a City-administered effort.

On February 21, 2019, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2019-04 which provided for the creation of a Community Development Advisory Committee (“CDAC”). Residents of Jurupa Valley were encouraged to submit a letter of interest expressing their desire to serve on the CDAC and confirm that they are indeed qualified to do so per the guidelines described in Ordinance No. 2019-04 (Attachment C). A formal Notice of Vacancy document (Attachment B) was published in the Press Enterprise on February 22, 2019. The Notice of Vacancy was also advertised on the City’s website, Facebook page, and discussed at length at an informal “CDBG 101” public meeting held on February 22, 2019.

The role of the CDAC is to assume oversight over the PSG application process. When PSG applicants submit their application documents for review, City Staff will perform a technical analysis to ensure that they comply with HUD, CDBG, and other relevant guidelines. City Staff will assist the CDAC in constructing a system by which members of the CDAC can efficiently evaluate incoming applications. In addition to assessing the PSG application documents, the CDAC will likely receive presentations from each PSG applicant at a regularly scheduled PSG meeting. After assessing each PSG application and receiving presentations from the applicants, the CDAC will vote to create a formal recommendation of PSG funding allocations. That recommendation will become part of the City’s Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan, which will be submitted for City Council approval at the May 2, 2019 City Council meeting. Typically, CDAC’s at nearby municipalities meet about twice per year.

ANALYSIS

The Mayor, Mayor Pro Tem, and each City Council member will need to nominate one member each to serve on the CDAC for a term of four (4) years, or until their successors are appointed and sworn-in. Each nomination shall be ratified by a majority vote of the entire City Council. In future years, Council Members are free to re-appoint an existing CDAC member, subject to confirmation of the nomination by a majority of the entire City Council.

The requirements to serve on the CDAC are described in Ordinance No. 2019-04 and Section 2.36.040 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and are listed below:
- Members must be residents of Jurupa Valley
- Members must be registered voters
- No member of the CDAC shall be a City Employee, or serve on another City commission or committee at any time
- No member of the CDAC shall serve in any capacity on a board, committee, or commission of any public agency or district
- No member of the CDAC shall maintain a decision-making authority (serve on governing board, board of directors, etc.) in any community organization that applies for or receives funds through the City’s CDBG program

City Staff have worked to ensure that each of the six residents that submitted their name for consideration (Attachment A) qualify to serve on the CDAC in accordance with Ordinance No. 2019-04 and Section 2.36.040 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. Each person that submitted their name for consideration to serve on the CDAC will be given the opportunity to address the City Council at the March 21, 2019 City Council meeting. At that time, each person that submitted their name for consideration to serve on the CDAC will have the opportunity to publicly attest that they are indeed qualified to serve on the CDAC per Ordinance No. 2019-04.

Upon being confirmed by the City Council to serve on the CDAC, members of the CDAC will be required to attend regularly scheduled meetings. The CDAC’s first meeting will occur on March 22, 2019. They will meet again on March 28, 2019 to formalize their recommended PSG budget allocations. These meeting dates correspond to a much larger timeline that includes various legal deadlines that must be met in order to secure HUD funding.

In future years, the CDAC will have more flexibility in their meeting schedules as there will be an established committee. Becoming an “entitlement city” and administering CDBG funds independently of the County of Riverside has provided significant financial benefit to the City, but it also means that the City needs to deal with HUD directly. As such, the City must abide by a rigid timeline of events and legal requirements. City Staff will work to advise the CDAC on the critical importance of meeting various deadlines to ensure that the City will continue to receive CDBG funds directly.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

There is no fiscal impact.

**ALTERNATIVES**

Give alternate direction to City Staff.
ATACHMENTS:

A. Letters of Interest  
B. Notice of Vacancy  
C. Ordinance No. 2019-04
Hello,

This letter is to inform you that I wish to become part of your advisory committee. I have lived in Jurupa Valley since 2001 and before that grew up in Ontario all my life, so very close. I am a resident and a business owner here and my intent is to help the city in whatever capacity possible. I feel I am very knowledgeable about our city having lived here for a while and the fact that I drive through our fair city on a daily basis traversing it for personal, dropping kid off at school, and for business, we have a pool supply delivery company. I will say that I know almost every block of our city and if you named a cross street I could guide you there without using a map or google with great accuracy. My knowledge of politics is such that I really stand independent and try to keep an open mind about a lot of subjects, one side or the other and wish the best possible outcome. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me via phone, text or email. Thank you for the consideration.

Regards,

Andrew Mac Millan
Dear Jurupa Valley City Council Members:

Brian Berkson, Mayor
Anthony Kelly, Jr., Mayor Pro Tem
Chris Barajas, Council Member
Lorena Barajas, Council Member
Micheal Goodland, Council Member

I am a, seventeen year, resident of Jurupa Valley. I am a Member of Equestrian Trails Patrol (a program of California State Horsemen’s Association). As a member I have assisted with Christmas with Santa Claus, parking for the Jurupa Rodeo, trash clean up in the river bed and various other community service events. I take pride in my community and try to provide my feedback, when possible.

I retired from San Bernardino County last year. My job title was Eligibility Worker II. I administered Cal Fresh and Medi-Cal benefits. My job required me to interpret state and federal regulations, as well as research and apply those regulations. I currently am employed with Teamsters Local 1932. Prior to my employment I served as a Trustee on the Executive Board. My current position requires that I maintain flexibility to meet the needs of our Membership.

I am interested in obtaining a seat on the Community Development Advisory Committee. Thank you for your time and consideration regarding this request.

Respectfully,

Laura Shultz
3/2/19

Dear Members of the City Council and City Staff,

My name is Edward S. Lee. I have lived at St. Jurupa Valley for 39 years. I am a registered voter. I have attended city events, coached JARPD basketball league, attended City Council and City Planning meeting as well as Town hall meetings and General Plan Workshop meetings.

I have earned a BA of Management in Human Resources, BA of Finance, BA of Operation Management and a MBA. So I feel qualified to make informed decisions on the Community Development Advisory Committee. I am submitting my name for consideration for the CDBG Committee.

Sincerely,

Edward S. Lee.
March 4, 2019

To the City Council of Jurupa Valley

I am writing this letter of interest regarding the Community Development Advisory Committee.

My Name is Rachel Lopez I live in the community of Mira Loma I have lived in Mira Loma for approximately 19 years. I have been a community activist in our community for approximately 15 years. I have not been as active for the last 3 years as I had very rare auto immune virus which limited my activity in the community. I am now able to get back to participating in the issues in our community and am interested in this advisory committee to work with the residents/community organizations to provide funding recommendations which would be for the betterment of Jurupa Valley.

A mother of three, grandmother of ten, and great grandmother of four I enjoy supporting worthy community causes, reading novels, gardening and tending my flock of chickens and ducks (as well as assorted other livestock-who are friends not food).

MY career has encompassed both public and private sector experiences and my community work includes having served on several non-profit boards. My current and most recent work and community activities include, but are not limited to:

- Organizer: community workshops, trainings, and program implementation for social and environmental health issues
- Reviewer: land use projects, with an eye for community compatibility and environmental impact
- Presenter: Pomona College Environmental Justice Classes, The Wellness Foundation-Los Angeles, City of Industry, City of Fontana, City of Moreno Valley, and City of Norco regarding environmental and social justice impacts on communities
- Program Director and Community Organizer: regional environment justice organization (CCAEJ)
- Member and Board Officer: Jurupa Valley Association (formerly Save Jurupa Valley)
- 2006 Latino Network Celebración de la Mujer Award for demonstrating leadership and commitment to the community
- 2007 Josie Lozano Memorial Award from the Greater Riverside Hispanic Chamber of Commerce for fostering economic, political and educational development in the Latino Community
- Served as Planning commissioner for Jurupa Valley from January 2015 –December 2016
- Current Member of the Latino Advisory Board of Parkview Hospital
- Current Member of Latino Network of Riverside

Rachel Lopez

Thank you for the opportunity to apply for this committee.
---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Marilyn Kraft
To: Vwasko@jurupavalley.org
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Tue, 5 Mar 2019 15:57:03 -0800
Subject: Community Development Advisory Committee

Please consider appointing me to the Community Development Advisory Committee. I have been involved in the community wherever I have lived. I marched for dimes, rocked and rallied for multiple sclerosis. I participate in clean-ups and clearing trails in the Santa Ana Riverbottom. Through my church I have packed and distributed hygiene packages to the homeless.

I have worked in the Aerospace, Construction, Retail and Logistics industries. I have experience in Accounting, Payroll, Material Planning, Customer Service, Shipping, Receiving, Scheduling, Dispatching, Inventory Control.

Thank you for your consideration,

Marilyn Blackwell
March 3, 2019

Vicki Wasko  
City of Jurupa Valley  
City Clerk  
8930 Limonite Avenue  
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509  

Dear Ms. Wasko,

While going through the city website I came across the notice of vacancies for the City of Jurupa Valley Community Development Advisory Committee. I am very interested in becoming a member of the advisory committee, and with my work experience and my investment in our city I believe I would be a good fit for the committee.

I am a veteran and I proudly serviced in the United States Army for six years before settling in Jurupa Valley. I have earned a bachelor's degree in social science and I have worked with youth and families in different non-profits connecting them to community resources and understand the importance of service accessibility in communities. I have also volunteered several seasons at our local Jurupa AYSO 462. I am a person who believes strongly in personal accountability and integrity and take pride in representing myself, employer and community in the utmost professional and ethical manner.

I will call you on March 25th to answer any questions about this letter. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions at 555-1234 or e-mail,  

Thank you for your time in considering my qualifications.

Regards,

Evelyn Hedrick
NOTICE OF VACANCIES
ON THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Notice is hereby given that at their March 21, 2019 meeting, the City Council will make one or more appointments to the Community Development Advisory Committee. The term of each member of the Community Development Advisory Committee shall be for four years or until their successors are appointed and sworn in as members whichever is later.

Applicants must be Jurupa Valley residents and registered voters of the city. Applicants cannot be an employee of the City of Jurupa Valley. Applicants cannot serve in any capacity on any board, committee, or commission of any public agency or district. Applicants cannot have any decision-making authority in a community organization that applies for or receives funds through the CDBG program. The appointments are ratified by the City Council.

The five-member committee shall meet on an as-needed basis to review applications for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding and provide the City Council with recommendations regarding the allocation of such funding.

All persons interested in being appointed to the Community Development Advisory Committee are invited to submit a letter of interest to the City Council that includes information about the applicant’s community involvement, work experience, and current contact information.

The letters of interest shall be public documents and should be sent to:

Vicki Wasko, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
8930 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
vwasko@jurupavalley.org

Letters of Interest will be accepted until Tuesday, March 5, 2019 at 5:00 p.m.

If you have questions about this matter, please contact the City Clerk’s Office at (951) 332-6464.

Posted: February 22, 2019
ORDINANCE NO. 2019-04

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL 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

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Enactment of Chapter 2.36. Chapter 2.36, Community Development Advisory Committee, is hereby added to Title 2, Administration and Personnel, of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code to read as follows:

“Chapter 2.36 – COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Sections:

2.36.010 – Community Development Advisory Committee Established.
2.36.020 – Number of Members; Appointment and Removal.
2.36.030 – Term; Annual Reconfirmation.
2.36.040 – Qualifications.
2.36.050 – Officers.
2.36.060 – Duties.
2.36.070 – Meetings/Quorum.
2.36.080 – Stipend.

2.36.010 – Community Development Advisory Committee Established.

The Community Development Advisory Committee has been established pursuant to the Citizen Participation Plan for the Community Development Block Grant (“CDBG”) Program to review applications for CDBG funding and provide the City Council with recommendations regarding the allocation of such funding.

2.36.020 – Number of Members; Appointment and Removal.

A. The Community Development Advisory Committee shall consist of five (5) members. Members of the Community Development Advisory Committee shall be appointed by the City Council. Each Council Member shall nominate one member of the Community Development Advisory Committee. Each such nomination shall require confirmation by a majority vote of the entire City Council.

1. Not less than ten (10) days prior to the meeting at which the Council will consider one or more appointments to the Community
Development Advisory Committee the City Clerk shall post notice of the pending appointments and invite qualified persons to apply for the position or positions.

2. The City Clerk shall post such notice at the locations where the City Council Agendas are posted pursuant to City Council resolution and on the City’s website.

3. In addition to these posting requirements, the City Clerk shall also comply with the posting requirements for vacancies and terms of members of the Community Development Advisory Committee as provided in Sections 54970 through 54974 of the California Government Code or their successor sections.

B. Members of the Community Development Advisory Committee shall serve at the pleasure of the City Council and a member of the Community Development Advisory Committee may be removed from the Community Development Advisory Committee by a majority vote of the entire City Council for any reason, with or without cause. If a member of the Community Development Advisory Committee is removed from office, then at the time of this vote the member shall be deemed removed from the Community Development Advisory Committee, the member’s term and tenure as a member of the Community Development Advisory Committee shall end, and a vacancy shall exist for that position.

C. If a vacancy should occur on the Community Development Advisory Committee such vacancies shall be filled by appointment of a new member by the City Council for the unexpired portion of the term pursuant to the procedures of subsection A. of this Section.

2.36.030 – Term; Annual Reconfirmation.

A. The term of each member of the Community Development Advisory Committee shall be for four (4) years or until their successors are appointed and sworn in as members, whichever is later.

B. Each year the City Council shall reconfirm the appointment of each member of the Community Development Advisory Committee.

1. The reconfirmation shall occur at a regular City Council meeting during the month of December of each year.

2. Each member of the Community Development Advisory Committee shall be reconfirmed by a majority vote of the entire City Council.

3. If a member of the Community Development Advisory Committee is not reconfirmed by a majority vote of the entire City Council, then at the time of this vote the member shall be deemed removed from the
Community Development Advisory Committee, the member's term and tenure as a member of the Community Development Advisory Committee shall end, and a vacancy shall exist for that position.

2.36.040 – Qualifications.

A. Members of the Community Development Advisory Committee shall, at all times during their incumbencies, be bona fide residents and registered voters of the city.

B. No member of the Community Development Advisory Committee shall be a city employee, nor shall any member of the Community Development Advisory Committee be a member of another city commission or committee at any one time.

C. No member of the Community Development Advisory Committee shall serve in any capacity on a board, committee, or commission of any public agency or district.

D. No person shall serve on the Community Development Advisory Committee if he or she has any decision-making authority in a community organization that applies for or receives funds through the CDBG Program. Any participation as a decision-maker in such community organization must have ceased at least thirty (30) days prior to the time of appointment to the Community Development Advisory Committee and may not occur during incumbency. Any community organization with a decision-maker that is also a member of the Community Development Advisory Committee shall not be entitled to receive funds through the CDBG Program as long as the member continues to serve in both capacities. For purposes of this section, any person serving on the governance board, e.g., board of directors, of a community organization shall be deemed to have decision-making authority in that organization.

2.36.050 – Officers.

The officers of the Community Development Advisory Committee shall consist of a Chairperson and a Vice-Chairperson who shall be selected by a majority vote of the entire Community Development Advisory Committee. The terms of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson shall be from January 1 to December 31 of each year, subject to removal or failure to reconfirm pursuant to this Chapter.

2.36.060 – Duties.

The duties of the Community Development Advisory Committee shall include reviewing applications for CDBG funding, attending meetings regarding CDBG-related activities, receiving testimony from applicants, and providing the City Council with recommendations regarding the allocation of CDBG funding.
2.36.070 – Meetings/Quorum.

A. The Community Development Advisory Committee shall meet on an as-needed basis, as determined by the City Manager or designee. All meetings of the Community Development Advisory Committee shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act (Gov. Code Section 54950 et seq.).

B. A quorum of three members of the Community Development Advisory Committee shall be required for the transaction of any business.

2.36.080 – Stipend.

Members of the Community Development Advisory Committee may receive a stipend per meeting in an amount set by resolution of the City Council.”

Section 2. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions of this Ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this Ordinance and each section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more section, subsection, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or otherwise invalid.

Section 3. Certification. The City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley shall certify to the passage and adoption of this Ordinance and shall cause the same to be published or posted in the manner required by law.

Section 4. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall take effect on the date provided in Section 36937 of the California Government Code.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 21st day of February, 2019.

Brian Berkson
Mayor

ATTEST:

Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  )
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  ) ss.
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY  )

I, Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance No. 2019-04 was regularly introduced at a regular meeting of the City Council held on the 7th day of February, 2019 and thereafter at a regular meeting held on the 21st day of February 2019 it was duly passed and adopted by the following vote of the City Council:

AYES:  C. BARAJAS, L. BARAJAS, B. BERKSON, M. GOODLAND, A. KELLY

NOES:  NONE

ABSENT: NONE

ABSTAIN: NONE

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, this 21st day of February, 2019

Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MARCH 21, 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. 16.B

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS REGARDING THE ANNEXATION OF ZONE 2-C (TR 32722) TO CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO. 89-1-CONSOLIDATED (“CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY L&LMD 89-1-C”) VOLUME 2, TRACT 32722 NORTH OF MISSION BOULEVARD AT SUNNYHILL DRIVE

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-19, entitled:


2. That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-20, entitled:

3. That the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2019-21, entitled:


BACKGROUND

Upon incorporation on July 1, 2011, the City of Jurupa Valley assumed the responsibility for certain City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-1-C zones now within the City's jurisdictional boundaries. As such, the City is now responsible for the services and charges provided by the City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-1-C zones within its boundaries. City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD No. 89-1-C currently maintains and services 44 locations throughout the City of Jurupa Valley. The District contains 29 landscaping assessment zones and 14 street lighting assessment zones. The annual levy of assessments on the parcels within the boundaries of L&LMD No. 89-1-C is consistent with the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972.

On February 4th, 2016 the City adopted Resolution 2016-01 clarifying that the City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-1-C is distinct from the County of Riverside Landscaping and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated and assumes all responsibility for such district, including annexation of territory to the district.

The parcel owner, Hacienda Properties, LLC, requested annexation of the parcel into the existing City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-1-C in order to cover costs associated with the maintenance of streetlight improvements within the annexation known as Zone 2-C. The territory proposed to be annexed will include 16 assessable parcels generally located north of Mission Boulevard and west of Sunnyhill Drive. The annexation was formed in order to provide for the operation cost associated with streetlights installed benefiting this zone. The benefits associated with streetlight improvements include:

- Enhanced deterrence of crime such as vandalism and other criminal activities which would reduce damage to improvements or property.
- Improved visibility to assist police in the protection of property.
- Improved visibility for egress and ingress to the property.

ANALYSIS

Adoption of Resolution Nos. 2019-19, 2019-20, and 2019-21 will initiate the process for the City of Jurupa Valley to levy and collect assessments to maintain Zone 2-C of the City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-1-C.

The proposed annexation will have an initial Maximum Assessment in the amount of $493.39 for Zone 2-C, $30.84 per assessable parcel. The Maximum Assessment will be adjusted annually.
by the greater of two percent (2%) or the cumulative percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index over the base year of 2019. The owners have filed a petition representing their willingness to move forward.

The attached resolutions declare the City’s intention to annex territory to the District and call a public hearing scheduled for 7:00 p.m. on May 16, 2019 to receive testimony for and against the proposed assessments and to provide for a majority protest proceeding.

OTHER INFORMATION

None.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The property owners are responsible for the annual payments of the special assessment. The City will file the special assessment with the County Auditor-Controller for inclusion on the annual property tax roll. The property owners have posted a deposit with their application to form Zone 2-C, in order to cover City costs incurred in connection with the annexation. Approval of these resolutions does not in any way commit the City to any financial contribution or liability by Zone 2-C. The City’s cost to administer Zone 2-C annually will be paid through the special assessment charged to property owners.

The revenue from this special assessment will be deposited into City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD 89-1-C and will be used to pay for the services as listed above. Both the revenue and expenses will be part of the City’s FY 2019-2020 Adopted Budget, and there is no anticipated impact to the general fund.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Take no action.
2. Provide staff with further direction.

***********************SIGNATURES ON FOLLOWING PAGE**************************
Prepared by:

[Signature]

Carolina Fernandez, E.I.T.
Assistant Engineer

Reviewed by:

[Signature]

Alan Kreimeier
Administrative Services Director

Approved as to form:

[Signature]

Peter Thorson
City Attorney

Attachments:

1) Resolution No. 2019-19
2) Resolution No. 2019-20
3) Resolution No. 2019-21
4) Engineer’s Report

Reviewed by:

[Signature]

Steve R. Loriso, P.E.
City Engineer /Director of Public Works

Reviewed by:

[Signature]

George A. Wentz
Deputy City Manager

Submitted by:

[Signature]

Gary S. Thompson
City Manager
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-19


THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY HEREBY FINDS, DETERMINES, RESOLVES AND ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley proposes to annex territory, described below in Section 2 of this Resolution, to an existing landscaping and lighting district located within the City of Jurupa Valley, which was established pursuant to the provisions of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, Part 2 of Division 15 of the California Streets and Highways Code (hereinafter referred to as the "Act") and which is designated as City of Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated (hereinafter referred to as the "District") and to levy and collect assessments pursuant to the Act and Article XIII D of the California Constitution against lots and parcels within such territory to pay for the costs and expenses of the improvements described below in Section 3 of this Resolution for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 2019 and ending June 30, 2020.

Section 2. The territory proposed to be annexed to the District includes 16 parcels generally located at north of Mission Boulevard and west of Sunnyhill Drive. Such territory is shown on a map on file in the office of the City Clerk and open to public inspection.

Section 3. The proposed improvements are briefly described as follows: The maintenance and operating energy cost of streetlights.

Section 4. After the proposed territory is annexed to the District, the District shall continue to be designated as City of Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated.

Section 5. Lots or parcels of land within the territory proposed to be annexed to the District that are owned or used by any county, city, city and county, special district or any other local governmental entity, the State of California, or the United States shall be assessed unless the City demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that such lots or parcels receive no special benefit from the proposed improvements.

Section 6. The City Council hereby orders the City Engineer, or his designee, to prepare and file with the City Clerk a report in writing in connection with the annexation of territory described herein to the District and the levy and collection of assessments against lots and parcels of land within such territory. This report shall be prepared in accordance with the Act and Section 4 of Article XIII D of the California Constitution.
PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 21st 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. 2019-19 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 21st 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 21st day of March, 2019.

___________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-20


THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY HEREBY FINDS, DETERMINES, RESOLVES AND ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley, pursuant to the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, Part 2 of Division 15 of the California Streets and Highways Code (hereinafter referred to as the "Act"), did by previous resolution order the City Engineer, or the City Engineer’s designee, to prepare and file a written report in accordance with the Act and Article XIII D of the California Constitution in connection with the proposed annexation of territory to City of Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated as Zone 2-C and the levy and collection of assessments against lots and parcels of land within City of Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 2019 and ending June 30, 2020.

Section 2. The Engineer has prepared and filed with the City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley and the City Clerk has presented to the City Council such report entitled "Engineer’s Report for City of Jurupa Valley Landscape & Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated, Volume 2, Zone 2-C, TR 32722" (the "Report").

Section 3. The City Council has carefully examined and reviewed the Report, and the Report is hereby approved as filed.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 21st day of March, 2019.

______________________________
Brian Berkson
Mayor
ATTEST:

________________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk

CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA                 
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE                   
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY                  

I, Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-20 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 21st 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 21st day of March, 2019.

________________________________
Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-21


THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY HEREBY FINDS, DETERMINES, RESOLVES AND ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Pursuant to the provisions of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, Part 2 of Division 15 of the California Streets and Highways Code (hereinafter referred to as the "Act") and as provided by Article XIII D of the California Constitution, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley, by previous Resolution, has initiated proceedings for the annexation of territory described below in Section 4 of this Resolution to City of Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated (hereinafter referred to as the "District") as Zone 2-C, and the levy and collection of assessments against the lots and parcels of land within such territory for fiscal year 2019-2020 to pay for the costs and expenses of the improvements described below in Section 6 of this Resolution.

Section 2. The Engineer selected by the City Council has prepared and filed with the City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley and the City Clerk has presented to the City Council a report in connection with the proposed annexation of territory to the District and the levy and collection of assessments against the lots and parcels of land within such territory for fiscal year 2019-2020, and the City Council did by previous Resolution approve such report.

Section 3. The City Council hereby declares its intention to order the annexation of territory described below in Section 4 of this Resolution to the District and to levy and collect assessments against the lots and parcels of land within such territory for fiscal year 2019-2020 to pay for the costs of the improvements described below in Section 6 of this Resolution. The Council hereby determines that the public interest requires this annexation to the District and levy and collection of assessments.

Section 4. The territory proposed to be annexed to the District includes 1 parcel. Said parcels being part of Parcel map 36977, more specifically described as Assessor’s Parcel Number: 171-260-013. Such territory is shown on a map on file in the office of the City Clerk and open to public inspection.
Section 5. After the proposed territory is annexed to the District, the District shall continue to be designated as City of Jurupa Valley Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 89-1-Consolidated.

Section 6. The proposed improvements are briefly described as follows: The operating energy cost and maintenance of streetlights.

Section 7. Lots or parcels of land within the District that are owned or used by any county, city, city and county, special district or any other local governmental entity, the State of California, or the United States shall be assessed unless the City demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that such lots or parcels receive no special benefit from the proposed improvements.

Section 8. Reference is hereby made to the report of the Engineer entitled "Engineer’s Report for City of Jurupa Valley Landscape & Lighting Maintenance District 89-1-Consolidated, Volume 2, Zone 2-C, TR 32722" on file with the City Clerk for a full and detailed description of the improvements, the boundaries of the territory proposed to be annexed to the District, the boundaries of the existing District and the zones therein, and the proposed assessments upon assessable lots and parcels of land within the territory proposed to be annexed to the District.

Section 9. NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT ON OR AFTER THURSDAY, THE 16TH DAY OF MAY, 2019, AT 7:00 P.M., IN THE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS AT 8930 LIMONITE AVENUE, JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, IS THE TIME AND PLACE FIXED FOR A PUBLIC HEARING BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON THE QUESTION OF THE ANNEXATION OF THE TERRITORY TO THE DISTRICT DESCRIBED ABOVE IN SECTION 4 OF THIS RESOLUTION TO THE DISTRICT AND THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF THE ASSESSMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020 AGAINST THE LOTS AND PARCELS OF LAND WITHIN SUCH TERRITORY. All interested persons shall be afforded the opportunity to hear and be heard.

Section 10. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to give notice of such hearing as provided by law by causing a notice of the public hearing and an assessment ballot to be mailed by first class mail to the record owners of the parcels in the territory proposed to be annexed to the District no less than 45 days before the date of the public hearing.

Section 11. The City Council hereby designates Vicki Wasko, City Clerk, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California, (951) 332-6464 to answer inquiries regarding the hearing, protest proceedings, and procedural or technical matters.

PASSED, APPROVED, and ADOPTED this 21st day of March, 2019, by the following called vote:

______________________________
Brian Berkson
Mayor
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. 2019-21 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 21st 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 21st day of March, 2019.

Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley
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AGENCY: CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
SUBJECT: ANNEXATION OF PARCEL 32722 TO CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO.89-1-CONSOLIDATED VOLUME 2 (“CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY L&LMD NO.89-1-C”) AS ZONE 2-C
TO: CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY CITY COUNCIL

Pursuant to the direction from the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley (“City Council”), California, this Engineer’s Report (“Report”) is prepared and hereby submitted for the City of Jurupa Valley (“City”) in compliance with the provisions of Section 22565 through 22574 of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 (“1972 Act”), said Act being Part 2 of Division 15 of the Streets and Highways Code of the State of California, Section 4 of Article XIII D of the California Constitution.

This Report provides for the annexation of Tract 32722 to City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD No. 89-1-C as Zone 2-C and establishes the Maximum Assessment to be levied in the Fiscal Year commencing July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020 (2019-2020) and continuing in all subsequent Fiscal Years, for this area to be known and designated as:

CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY L&LMD NO. 89-1-C ZONE 2-C

TR32722

I do hereby assess and apportion the total amount of the costs and expenses upon several parcels of land within said designated area liable therefor and benefited thereby, in proportion to the estimated benefits that each parcel receives, respectively, from said services.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, the appointed ENGINEER, acting on behalf of the City of Jurupa Valley, pursuant to the 1972 Act, do hereby submit the following:

Pursuant to the provisions of law, the costs and expenses of the Zone have been assessed upon the parcels of land in the Zone benefited thereby in direct proportion and relation to the estimated benefits to be received by each of said parcels. For particulars as to the identification of said parcels, reference is made to the Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map, a reduced copy of which is included herein.

As required by law, an Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map is filed herewith, showing the Zone, as well as the boundaries and dimensions of the respective parcels and subdivisions of land within said Zone as they exist, as of the date of this Report, each of which subdivisions of land or parcels or lots, respectively, have been assigned a parcel/lot number within a specific tract map and indicated on said Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map and in the Assessment Roll contained herein.

The separate numbers given the subdivisions and parcels of land, as shown on said Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map and Assessment Roll, correspond with the numbers assigned to each parcel by the Riverside County Assessor. Reference is made to the County Assessor Roll for a description of the lots or parcels.
As of the date of this Report, there are no parcels or lots within Zone 2-C that are owned by a federal, state or other local governmental agency that will benefit from the services to be provided by the assessments to be collected.

March 21, 2019.

________________________________________

Steve Loriso, R.C.E. 64701
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the provisions of law, the costs and expenses of the Zone have been assessed upon the parcels of land in the Zone benefited thereby in direct proportion and relation to the estimated benefits to be received by each of said parcels. For particulars as to the identification of said parcels, reference is made to the Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map, a reduced copy of which is included herein. On this 21st day of March, 2019 the City Council, City of Jurupa Valley, State of California, ordering the preparation of the Report providing for the annexation of Tract 32722 to L&LMD No. 89-1-C Volume 2 as Zone 2-C, pursuant to the provisions of the 1972 Act, being Division 15 of the Streets and Highways Code of the State of California, adopt Resolution No. 2019-19 for a special assessment district zone known and designated as:

ZONE 2-C
TR 32722

As of the date of this Report, March 21st, 2019, the annexation of Zone 2-C includes annexation of that portion of land identified by the Assessor Parcel Numbers 174-170-039, 174-170-040, and 174-170-041; also known as Tract 32722 and will consist of 16 residential parcels. As required by law, an Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map is filed herewith, showing the Zone, as well as the boundaries and dimensions of the respective parcels and subdivisions of land within said Zone as they exist, as of the date of this Report, each of which subdivisions of land or parcels or lots, respectively, have been assigned a parcel/lot number within a specific tract and indicated on the Assessment Diagram/Boundary Map and in the Assessment Roll contained herein.

The following report presents the engineering analysis for the annexation of Zone 2-C and the establishment of the Maximum Assessment, based on Proposition 218 and the Act of 1972, to be levied and collected commencing Fiscal Year 2019-2020 and all subsequent fiscal years.

DEFINITIONS

Agency – Means the local government, City of Jurupa Valley.
Capital cost – Means the cost of acquisition, installation, construction, reconstruction, or replacement of a permanent public improvement by the Agency.
District – Means an area determined by the Agency to contain all parcels which will receive a special benefit from a proposed public improvement of property-related service.
Maintenance and operation expenses - Means the cost of rent, repair, replacement, rehabilitation, fuel, power, electrical current, care, and supervision necessary to properly operate and maintain a permanent public improvement.

Ad Valorem Reduction – Means the corresponding general benefit value of the improvements.
Special benefit – Means a particular and distinct benefit over and above general benefits conferred on real property located in the district or to the public at large. General enhancement of property value does not constitute “special benefit.”
PART I – BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT

LOCATION OF THE ASSESSMENT ZONE

Zone 2-C shall consist of a benefit zone encompassing the properties within the residential subdivision TR 32722. The proposed improvements described in this Report are based on current development and improvement plans provided as of the date of this Report.

Zone 2-C is generally located north of Mission Boulevard west of Sunnyhill Drive, in the City of Jurupa Valley, in the County of Riverside, State of California. It includes 16 residential parcels, identified as Tract 32722. At the time of this assessment, the assessment zone is identified as consisting of 16 assessable parcels designated as residential parcels and zero non-assessable lots. Zone 2-C consists of all lots/units, parcels, and subdivisions of land located in the following development area:

PART II – IMPROVEMENTS AND SERVICES FOR CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
L&LMD NO. 89-1-C ZONE 2-C

The services to be funded by City of Jurupa Valley L&LMD No. 89-1-C Zone 2-C include the maintenance of the streetlights (4) within the subdivision designated as Tract 32722 and at the subdivision entrance. The proposed improvements, the associated costs, and assessments have been carefully reviewed, identified, and allocated based on special benefit. Zone 2-C was reviewed and specific areas of special benefit within the District were identified, based on:

a. Level of Service
b. Improvement Types
c. Proximity to Improvement
d. Levels of Special Benefit from Zone (on Public versus Private)

The 1972 Act permits the establishment of assessment districts by agencies for the purpose of providing certain public improvements, which include the construction, maintenance, and servicing of public lights, landscaping, dedicated easements for landscape use, and appurtenant facilities. The 1972 Act further provides that assessments may be apportioned upon all assessable lot(s) or parcel(s) of land within an assessment district in proportion to the estimated benefits to be received by each lot or parcel from the improvements rather than by assessed value.

It was determined that the improvements identified by this report will directly benefit the parcels to be assessed within Zone 2-C. The assessments and method of apportionment is based on the premise that the assessments will be used for lighting improvements within the existing district as well as provide for annual maintenance of those improvements and the assessment revenues generated by the Zone will be used solely for such purpose.

STREET LIGHTING IMPROVEMENTS

The assessment will provide for the operating energy cost of the street lights servicing the residential development, as shown in the Street Lighting Improvement Plan by SAKE Engineers, Inc. prepared for Tract 32722.

The benefits associated with streetlight improvements include:

1. Enhanced deterrence of crime such as vandalism and other criminal activities which would reduce damage to improvements or property.
2. Improved visibility to assist police in the protection of property.
3. Improved visibility for egress from and ingress to the property.
PART III – FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION
The formula used for calculating assessments reflects the composition of the parcels and the improvements and services provided by the Zone to fairly apportion the costs based on the estimated benefit to each parcel.

The streetlight improvements within Zone 2-C provide direct and special benefit to the lots or parcels within the Zone. Therefore, the maintenance of these improvements also provides direct and special benefit by maintaining the functionality of the improvements and allowing the improvements to operate in a proper manner.

Because all benefiting properties consist of a uniform land use, it is determined that all residential parcels benefit equally from the improvements and the costs and expenses for the maintenance and servicing of streetlights are apportioned on a per parcel basis.

The total benefit from the works of improvement is a combination of the special benefits to the parcels within the Zone and the general benefits to the public at large and to adjacent property owners. A portion of the total maintenance costs for the streetlights, if any, associated with general benefits will not be assessed to the parcels in the Zone, but will be paid from other City of Jurupa Valley funds.

No property is assessed in excess of the reasonable cost of the proportional special benefit conferred on that property. Additionally, because the benefiting parcels within the zone consist of a uniform land use (residential), it is determined that each of the residential parcels within the Zone benefit equally from the improvements. Therefore, the proportionate share of the costs and expenses for the provisions of streetlights, as well as costs and expenses for the maintenance of the streetlights apportioned equally on a per parcel basis.

MAXIMUM ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY
The following methodology was adopted by City Council in Resolution No. 2016-01 dated February 4, 2016. Such methodology has been maintained in preparation of this Report. The purpose of establishing a Maximum Assessment formula is to provide for reasonable increases and inflationary adjustments to annual assessments without requiring costly noticing and mailing procedures, which would add to the Zone 2-C costs and assessments.

The Maximum Assessment formula shall be applied to all assessable parcels of land within the Zone. For Zone 2-C, the initial Maximum Assessment(s) for Fiscal Year 2019-2020 are as follows:

1. The initial Total Maximum Assessment established within Zone 2-C (Tract 32722) shall be $493.39.
2. The initial Maximum Assessment per assessable parcel/lot/unit established within Zone 2-C, composed of 16 assessable lots in TR 32722, is anticipated to be $30.84.

In compliance with California Constitution Article XIII D (Proposition 218), the assessment established for Zone 2-C on this report, include an adjustment formula to account for reasonable increase in cost for maintenance and inflation. The initial Maximum Assessment shall be adjusted by the greater of two percent (2%) or the cumulative percentage increase in the CPI-U Index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor for Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario.

The Maximum Assessment is adjusted annually and is calculated independent of Zone 2-C’s annual budget and proposed annual assessment. The proposed annual assessment (rate per assessable parcel) applied in any fiscal year is not considered to be an increased assessment if less than or equal to the Maximum Assessment amount. In no case shall the annual assessment exceed the Maximum Assessment.

Although the Maximum Assessment will increase each year, the actual Zone 2-C assessments may remain virtually unchanged. The Maximum Assessment adjustment is designed to establish reasonable limits on Zone 2-C assessments. The Maximum Assessment calculated each year does not require or facilitate an increase of the annual assessment and neither does it restrict assessments to the adjusted maximum amount. If the budget and assessments for the fiscal year require an increase and the increase is more than the adjusted Maximum Assessment, it is considered an increased assessment.

To impose an increase assessment, the City of Jurupa Valley must comply with the provisions of the California Constitution Article XIII D Section 4c, that requires a public hearing and certain protest procedures including mailed notice of the public hearing and property owner protest balloting. Property owner through the balloting process must approve the proposed assessment increase. If the proposed assessment is approved, then a new Maximum Assessment is established for Zone 2-C. If the proposed assessment is not approved, the City may not levy an assessment greater than the adjusted Maximum Assessment previously established for Zone 2-C.

**COST ESTIMATE**

The Ad Valorem reduction is the corresponding general benefit value of the improvements, and it is determined by identifying the general public benefit from the installation and upkeep of the improvements identified on this report. All proposed lighting improvements contained within this report are located in front of or leading to the assessed Tract Map and the construction and installation of the improvements were only necessary for the development of properties within the Zone. Therefore, it was determined that any public access or use of these local improvements by others is incidental and there is no measurable general benefit to properties outside the one or to the public at large. The Ad Valorem reduction for this assessment is zero.
The Assessment for each assessable parcel within Zone 2-C is calculated by dividing the total Annual Balance to Levy minus the Ad Valorem Reduction by the total number of assessable subdivided parcels within Zone 2-C to determine the Annual Assessment per assessable parcel.

\[
\frac{\text{Annual Balance to Levy} - \text{Ad Valorem Reduction}}{\text{Total number of assessable parcels}} = \text{Annual Assessment per assessable parcel}
\]

The Annual Balance to Levy is the Total Annual Landscaping Costs as seen in the following summary table:
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY L&LMD NO. 89-1-C ZONE 2-C  
Tract 32722  
FY 2019-2020

Total Assessable Parcels/Lots: 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Description</th>
<th>Total Cost for Zone 2-C</th>
<th>Cost per Parcel/Lot for Zone 2-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Lighting:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Energy Charge of $101.74 per street light for 3</td>
<td>$305.21</td>
<td>$19.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lights – 50 Watt LED:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Energy Charge of $111.15 per street light for 1</td>
<td>$111.15</td>
<td>$6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lights – 150 Watt LED:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration :</td>
<td>$35.39</td>
<td>$2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Reserve :</td>
<td>$41.64</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ANNUAL STREET LIGHTING COSTS:</strong></td>
<td>$493.39</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AD VALOREM REDUCTION**  
$0  $0

**INITIAL MAXIMUM ASSESSMENT PER ASSESSABLE LOT/UNIT OR PARCEL OF TR 32722:**  
$30.84
PART IV – ASSESSMENT DIAGRAM
(See next page)
ASSEMENT DIAGRAM/ BOUNDARY MAP
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING
MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO. 89-1- CONSOLIDATED
ZONE 2 - C
TR 32722
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SEC 7, T.2S, R. 5W

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER AS
OF DATE OF ENGINEER'S REPORT

174-170-039
174-170-03040
174-170-03041

Subzone Boundary

Project Site

VICINITY MAP

For details concerning the lines and dimensions of the applicable Assessor’s Parcel numbers, refer to the County Assessor’s Map as of the date of the Report.

HRGreen
PART V – ASSESSMENT ROLLS

Parcel identification for each lot/unit or parcel within Zone 2-C shall be the parcels as shown on the Riverside County Secured Roll for the year in which this Report is prepared and reflective of the Assessor’s Parcel Maps. Zone 2-C includes the following Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APNs) as of the date of this Report: 174-170-039, 174-170-040, and 174-170-041.

The initial Maximum Assessment shall be adjusted annually by the greater of two percent (2%) or the cumulative percentage increase in the CPI-U for All Items Index published by the BLS.

When subdivided, the initial Maximum Assessments per assessable lot/unit or parcel for Zone 2-C are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel/ Lot No.</th>
<th>Maximum Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$30.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>