MEETING AGENDA
OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, March 27, 2019
Regular Meeting: 7:00 P.M.
City of Jurupa Valley City Hall
City Council Chambers
8930 Limonite Ave., 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 Planning Commission. The Commission Rules of Order require permission of the Chair to speak with anyone at the staff table or to approach the dais.

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 Staff BEFORE the Chairman 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. If you wish to address the Planning Commission on a specific agenda item or during public comment, please fill out a speaker card and hand it to the Clerk with your name and address before the item is called so that we can call you to come to the podium for your comments. While listing your name and address is not required, it helps us to provide follow-up information to you if needed. Exhibits must be handed to the staff for distribution to the Commission.

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 5 minutes.

REGULAR SESSION
1. 7:00 P.M. – Call to Order and Roll Call
   • Corey Moore, Chair
   • Arleen Pruitt, Chair Pro Tem
   • Mariana Lopez
   • Penny Newman
   • Guillermo Silva

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Public Appearance/Comments (30 minutes)

4. Approval of Agenda
5. Approval of Minutes
5.1 February 27, 2019 Regular Meeting
5.2 March 13, 2019 Regular Meeting

6. Public Hearings
6.1 AGENDA ITEM NO. 6.1

MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 18056: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) NO. 18002 - REQUEST FOR A CONTRACTOR STORAGE YARD WITH TWO NEW INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS TOTALING 62,643 SQUARE FEET AT 2434 AND 2456 RUBIDOUX BLVD. (APN’S: 178-330-005, 006 & 008) APPLICANT: KIEWIT INFRASTRUCTURE WEST CO.

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, the City of Jurupa Valley has prepared and intends to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the project.

RECOMMENDATION
By motion, adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-03-27-01 to 1) adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration; and 2) approve Conditional Use Permit No. 18002, authorizing a contractor storage yard with two new industrial buildings totaling 63,000 square feet, including complete site renovation on a 19.5-acre site and subject to conditions of approval.

7. Commission Business
8. Public Appearance/Comments
9. Planning Commissioner’s Reports and Comments
10. Planning Department Report
11. Adjournment to the April 10, 2019 Regular Meeting

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

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

The Work Session of the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. on February 27, 2019 at the City Council Chambers, 8930 Limonite Ave., Jurupa Valley.

Members present:

- Corey Moore, Chair
- Arleen Pruitt, Chair Pro Tem
- Mariana Lopez, Commission Member
- Penny Newman, Commission Member
- Guillermo Silva, Commission Member

2. **Public Appearance/Comments - None**

3. **Commission Business – Study Session**

3.1 **MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. MA16170 (GPA16003, CZ16008, SP16002, DA16002, SDP18044, AND TPM37528: AGUA MANSA COMMERCE PARK SPECIFIC PLAN – NEW SPECIFIC PLAN ON 302.8 ACRES OF LAND AND WAREHOUSE DISTRIBUTION BUILDINGS INCLUDING A 200,000 SQUARE-FOOT INDUSTRIAL BUILDING AND A 70-ACRE PUBLIC PARK LOCATED AT 1500 RUBIDOUX (FORMER TXI RIVERSIDE CEMENT PLANT) APPLICANT: CRESTMORE DEVELOPMENT, LLC (VIRIDIAN)**

Ms. Annette Tam, Senior Planner, provided an introduction to the proposed Agua Mansa Commerce Specific Plan and a brief history of the site which covers 302.8 acres of land. The proposed project includes 2 parts; a new specific plan and rezone for a project site and a 70-acre public park. Ms. Tam presented the site plan which identified the proposed industrial site and the park designation.

Mr. Tate Goss, Owner/Applicant provided a PowerPoint presentation and provided a history of the company; Veridan, and highlighted other sites the company has done with remediation and reclaimed properties for productive uses.

Mr. Erik Zitek, Applicant Representative, followed the PowerPoint presentation noting details of the remediation process for this site, roadway designs, the proposed park...
design and the building elevations. Mr. Zitek stated the community outreach feedback has been positive.

QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONERS

- Park Maintenance – Staff clarified it is to be done by City of Jurupa Valley
- Equitable Salaries
- Air Quality Concerns
- Air Filtration Systems consideration for area residents
- Traffic Concerns
- Warehouse Facilities
- Contaminates of Public Park
- Vegetation / Landscaping Barriers
- Fences
- Habitat Concerns
- Alternate Access to Industrial Park consideration

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Stephen Anderson, Resident stated he is not in support of proposal
Ms. Betty Anderson, Resident stated she is not in support of proposal

REGULAR SESSION

1. 7:00 P.M. – Call to Order and Roll Call

- Corey Moore, Chair
- Arleen Pruitt, Chair Pro Tem
- Mariana Lopez
- Penny Newman
- Guillermo Silva

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Public Appearance/Comments - None

4. Approval of Agenda

Commissioner Silva moved, and Commissioner Newman seconded, a motion to approve the February 27, 2019 agenda. The motion was approved 5:0

Ayes: Lopez, Moore, Newman, Pruitt, Silva
Noes: None
Abstained: None
Absent: None

5. Approval of Minutes

Commissioner Lopez moved, and Commissioner Silva seconded, a motion to approve the February 13, 2019 agenda with corrections. The motion was approved 5:0
6. Public Hearings

6.1 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NO. 19002: CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE 2017 GENERAL PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT TO REFLECT CHANGES REQUESTED BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (HCD) AND POTENTIAL IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Ms. Mary Wright, General Plan Program Manager, provided a PowerPoint presentation and summarized background information noting the state 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). Ms. Wright stated the current HCD housing needs cycle is the 5th cycle from October 2013 and October 2021 and municipalities were required to update their housing elements within the time period however, the City of Jurupa Valley was unable to pursue due to financial constraints. The City received two extensions from the State acknowledging the financial constraints. The General Plan was initiated by the City Council in August 2014 and adopted on September 7, 2017. Ms. Wright provided potential implementation measures for affordable housing and discussed amendments to the Housing Element to more accurately reflect Jurupa Valley’s progress in meeting RHNA as well as evaluate and revise as appropriate the city’s density residential land use designation to address constraints for housing development. Ms. Wright provided and identified 11 sites for potential designation/rezone areas for initiation.

QUESTIONS BY THE COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Newman requested clarification for identifying various properties outside the recommendations. Ms. Wright clarified other options available.

City Attorney, Serita Young, further clarified implementation measures for recommendation to City Council.

Commissioner Pruitt requested separate meetings with the Planning Director for further clarification on the process.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

Ms. Betty Anderson, resident, requested clarification on sites for housing development.

Ms. Kim Jarrell Johnson, resident, stated some referenced sites will have safety concerns if high density housing is developed.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Lopez moved, and Commissioner Silva seconded, a motion for revised modifications to reflect recommendations for Resolution 2019-02-27-01. The motion was approved 5:0

Ayes: Lopez, Moore, Newman, Pruitt, Silva
Noes: None
6.2 DETERMINATION OF GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY FOR A PROPOSED STREET VACATION OF PORTION OF KACHINA DRIVE – CUL-DE-SAC NORTHWESTERLY OF VIRTUE VISTA DRIVE.

Mr. Mike Myers, Assistant City Engineer provided a PowerPoint Presentation of the lots in Tracts 20249 and 20250. The owner of the properties has requested that the City vacate a portion of Kachina Drive. Mr. Myers noted the subdivisions map was recorded in 1990; however no street improvements have been constructed and stated the purpose in requesting the proposed vacation is to facilitate a gated entrance that allows for an improved connection of the private streets serving the 57 single-family residences to be built with Kachina Dr. a public street. Mr. Myers noted the presentation of the proposed gated private drive access overlay on the proposed vacation and the newly configured dedication for the Commissioners to review.

QUESTIONS BY THE COMMISSIONERS
Commissioner Newman requested clarification of project approval by the county.
Commissioner Lopez asked about demographics of the community.
Commissioner Silva requested clarification on whether or not public notices were posted.
Commissioner Pruitt requested clarification the tract was a private community.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED
Ms. Kim Jarrell Johnson, resident, stated she lives in the neighborhood and familiar with the community however, has concern with no sidewalks or streetlights and would prefer a secondary access to the community.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

QUESTIONS BY THE COMMISSIONERS
- HOA maintenance by owner for private street
- Secondary access consideration
- Emergency vehicle access to community

Chair Pro Tem Pruitt moved and Commissioner Silva seconded a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2019-02-27-02 determining the proposed street vacation is consistent with the General Plan. The motion was approved 3-2

Ayes: Moore, Pruitt, Silva
Noes: Newman, Lopez
Abstained: None
Absent: None
7. Commission Business

7.1 STUDY SESSION: MA18161 (PAR18004): SUBDIVISION OF A 17-ACRE PROPERTY INTO 56 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF PEDLEY ROAD AND 54TH STREET

Ms. Rocio Lopez, Principal Planner, provided a PowerPoint presentation and conceptual plan layout for the Study Session. Ms. Lopez included a site plan and noted the property proposed is for 56 unite single family residential plan with lot sizes ranging for 7,500 to 10,000 square feet and lies within a riparian habitat. Within the community, the site is surrounded by single family residential land uses with most lots ranging over half an acre. Site plan includes a courtyard scheme and a large central “Green Artery” Ms. Lopez noted the required land use and zone changes for the development of this proposal.

Mr. Matthew Fagan, applicant's representative, provided a summary of the proposed project.

QUESTIONS BY THE COMMISSIONERS
- Confirmation of HOA for maintenance
- Costs of units not determined
- Gated community proposed
- Equestrian overlay connection

PUBLIC COMMENTS
Ms. Jacqueline Lee, resident, is opposed to higher density housing and thinks the area is considered a rural community.

COMMENTS BY THE COMMISSIONERS
- Omit lake feature to increase lot size
- Lower density preferred
- Gated community not recommended for this site
- Traffic concerns on Jurupa Road
- Street lighting lacking in the community
- "Animal Keeping" designation clarified
- Emissions issues from nearby train route

8. Public Appearance/Comments – None

9. Planning Commissioner’s Reports and Comments – None

10. Planning Department Report - Mr. Merrell announced upcoming Planning Commission schedule and announced another joint workshop. Mr. Merrell summarized previous City Council items.

There being no further business before the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission, Chair Moore adjourned the meeting at 9:45 p.m. to the March 13, 2019 Planning Commission meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director
Secretary of the Planning Commission
MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
March 13, 2019

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
The Regular Session of the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission meeting was called to order by the Secretary of the Planning Commission at 7:00 p.m. on March 13, 2019 at the City Council Chambers, 8930 Limonite Ave., Jurupa Valley.

Roll Call:
- Corey Moore, Chair, Absent
- Arleen Pruitt, Chair Pro Tem, Absent
- Mariana Lopez, Commission Member, Absent
- Penny Newman, Commission Member, Absent
- Guillermo Silva, Commission Member, Absent

Meeting was adjourned due to the lack of a quorum.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director
Secretary of the Planning Commission
DATE: MARCH 27, 2019
TO: CHAIR MOORE AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR
BY: ROCIO LOPEZ, SENIOR PLANNER
SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 6.1

MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 18056: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) NO. 18002 - REQUEST FOR A CONTRACTOR STORAGE YARD WITH TWO NEW INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS TOTALING 62,643 SQUARE FEET

LOCATION: 2434 & 2456 RUBIDOUX BLVD., SEC OF RUBIDOUX BLVD. AND 24TH STREET (APNs: 178-330-005, 006 & 008)

APPLICANT: KIEWIT INFRASTRUCTURE WEST CO.

RECOMMENDATION
By motion, adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-03-27-01 to 1) adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration; and 2) approve Conditional Use Permit No. 18002, authorizing a contractor storage yard with two new industrial buildings totaling 63,000 square feet, including complete site renovation on a 19.5-acre site, subject to the conditions of approval.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The Applicant (“Applicant” or “Kiewit Infrastructure West Co.”) requests approval to redevelop the former Old Castle Precast 19.5-acre site for Kiewit's operations and outside storage. The project consists of enhanced modifications to the Old Castle Precast industrial site as follows:

- Construction of two (2) new industrial buildings (24,777 and 37,866 square feet) to house equipment storage, maintenance of Kiewit's vehicles and related operations.
- New vehicle fueling and wash area, ramp and scale as well as new equipment parking and lay-down areas.
- Re-use three (3) existing buildings for office and garage/storage uses.
- Removal of several existing metal structures and concrete slabs/ramps and wash out pits.
- Modify existing pit into new infiltration basin.
- New bermed landscaped screening, fencing and walls along site perimeter at Rubidoux Blvd., 24th Street and Hall Avenue.
- New public right-of-way improvements: new curb and gutter, new sidewalk and landscaped parkways along 24th Street and Hall Avenue.
The project is proposed in two (2) phases with detailed discussion presented within the Site Development section of this report. The 19.5-acre site is located within the M-SC (Manufacturing Service Commercial) zone and has a General Plan Land Use designation of Light Industrial (LI). Table 1 below identifies the property as it relates to City code:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Land Use Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan / Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Land Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOCATION AND SURROUNDING LAND USES**

As shown on Exhibit 1, the project site is located north of State Route (SR) 60, at the southeast corner of Rubidoux Blvd. and 24th Street. The site is bordered primarily by industrial land uses including a processing and recycling base materials business to the immediate north and beyond by Abrasive Blasting Service and Golden West Moving Storage; to the east and southeast by Hall Avenue and residential properties and beyond by Penske Truck Rental; to the south and southwest by the former Belltown Landfill, carnival storage, and International Line Builders; and to the west by Rubidoux Blvd., beyond which are an office complex and StorAmerica Self Storage. Exhibit 2 provides the existing General Plan Land Use (GPLU) designations and zoning of the site and surrounding parcels.

**EXHIBIT 1: SITE LOCATION**
BACKGROUND

The site has been used for industrial land uses, including the manufacture of precast concrete, since the 1980s. Several prefabricated metal storage and office buildings totaling approximately 12,000 square feet are located primarily in the northwestern portion of the site. Additionally, a former truck storage and fueling area for Oldcastle trucks and equipment is also located in the northwest portion of the subject site, adjacent to the concrete pouring ramp formerly used to assist trucks in filling precast molds, see Exhibit 3.

The remainder of the site contains outdoor storage areas for equipment and material as well as an open pit which was previously used for concrete casting purposes. The existing pit will be reclaimed and modified into a new infiltration basin.

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was conducted and revealed four (4) recognized environmental conditions (RECs) within the subject site. As such, the ESA recommended that a limited Phase II ESA (subsurface assessment) be conducted to evaluate if the RECs have significantly impacted the subject property.

Based on the analytical results of the soil sampling conducted at the subject property under the Phase II ESA, detected concentrations of arsenic in the soil samples fell within the expected range of naturally occurring background conditions, not indicative of a site-specific release, and therefore did not present a significant environmental concern to the subject property. The study concluded that there was no other detectable contamination at the subject property.
Attached to this report is the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration which further details the previous uses and recommended project mitigation measures within the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

EXHIBIT 3: EXISTING SITE CONFIGURATION

REQUIRED ENTITLEMENTS OR APPROVALS

Per Chapter 9.148, Manufacturing - Service Commercial (M-SC), Section 9.148.020, Uses Permitted, of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code (JVMC), Contractor Storage Yards are permitted subject to a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), pursuant to Section 9.240.280 (Conditional Use Permits).

GENERAL PLAN: LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (LI)

A. **Light Industrial.** The project is consistent with the policies within the LI land use designation and consistent with the allowed Floor Area Ratio (FAR) range of 0.25 to 0.6. The applicable policies are listed below.

   Applicable Policies within the LI are as follows:

   - **LUE 3.13 Commercial Trucks.** Manage commercial truck traffic, access, loading, and parking to minimize potential impacts on adjacent residential and commercial properties.
Project: Primary operations will occur primarily along the western portion of the site and access will be taken from 24th Street as shown on the site plan as part of Phase 1. A condition has been imposed to prohibit right turns onto 24th Street.

- **LUE 3.14 Encroachment.** Protect industrial and business park designated areas from encroachment by incompatible or noise-sensitive uses that could be impacted by industrial activity, such as housing and schools.

  Project: The proposed project operations are setback approximately 800 feet from residential land uses located to the west of the proposed yard operations. Phase 1 of the project includes perimeter walls and very dense landscaping with trees planted staggered 15 feet apart. Phase 2 will include the development of a 37,866 square foot industrial building which will further shield on-site operations from residential land uses located to the west of this site.

- **LUE 3.15 Locations.** Concentrate industrial and business park uses near major transportation facilities and utilities and along public transit corridors. Avoid siting such uses close to residentially zoned neighborhoods or where truck traffic will be routed through residential neighborhoods.

  Project: The proposed project would allow development with land uses that are compatible with the existing Light Industrial land use designation. The City’s Traffic Engineering Division reviewed the project’s design layout and determined no hazardous transportation design features would be introduced into the area. Additionally, proposed roadway improvements would occur within existing public rights-of-way and would be installed in accordance with City’s design standards. A condition has been imposed to prohibit right turns onto 24th Street. Furthermore, the Applicant would be required to develop and implement a construction traffic control plan to safely route traffic during temporary construction.

- **LUE 3.16 Employee Facilities.** Encourage the inclusion of daycare, on-site lunch areas, showers, meeting rooms, and other employee-oriented facilities for new industrial and business park development.

  Project: The proposed project includes interior lunch/breakrooms and employee lockers to encourage on-site lunch and break areas.

- **LUE 3.17 Toxic Materials.** Prohibit the development of industrial and business park uses that use, store, produce, or transport toxic substances, or that generate unacceptable levels of noise or air pollution.

  Project: The proposed project will not store, produce or transport any toxic substances. Kiewit has strict environmental policies at all their sites with environmental managers on staff in every district who perform routine site inspections. Additionally, the site will be inspected routinely by the City’s Environmental Programs inspector for compliance with the County Regional Water Quality Control Board criteria.

  As for noise concerns, Mitigation Measure NE 3.5 ensures compliance as does Chapter 11.05 - Noise Regulations of the JVMC and the Noise Element of the City’s General Plan. Additionally, the project will need to comply with the South Coast Air Quality Management (SCAQMD) Rule 403 for air quality compliance.

- **LUE 3.18 Infrastructure.** Require that new industrial and business park developers provide adequate parking, transportation facilities, including sidewalks and trails, street trees, water resources, sewer facilities, and other utilities to serve new
industrial and business park businesses in addition to meeting the needs of existing residents and businesses.

**Project:** The project will include dedicated public right-of-way and public improvements such as landscaped parkways, new curb and gutter and sidewalks along Rubidoux Blvd., 24th Street and Hall Avenue.

- **LUE 3.19 Architectural Compatibility.** Ensure that new industrial and business park development is designed to enhance and be architecturally compatible with its surroundings and with designated scenic highways or public view corridors by providing high quality architecture, landscaping, and site improvements.

**Project:** The project includes the redevelopment of the Old Castle Precast site, on and off-site improvements, removal of dilapidated structures and the development of two new industrial buildings. It is staff opinion that proposed architecture is an improvement compared to existing older industrial buildings in the surrounding area.

**ZONING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS**

**A. M-SC (Manufacturing - Service Commercial).** The project complies with all development standards in the M-SC zone as presented in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Standards</th>
<th>Does The Project Comply With The Standards?</th>
<th>Supporting Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where the front, side, or rear yard adjoins a street, the minimum setback shall be twenty-five (25) feet from the property line.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>As shown on the site plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setback at residential side: 25 feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>As shown on the site plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaped setback: 10 feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>As shown on the site plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum height: 40 feet at building setback and 50 feet elsewhere</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The tallest portion of the structures is 34 feet in height as shown on the elevations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping: 10% min.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The site provides 10% on-site landscaping and additional off-site landscaping as shown on the plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking as required by Section 9.240.120</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>As shown on site plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As depicted on Table 2 above, the proposed project has been designed in accordance with the development standards within the M-SC zone.

**SITE DEVELOPMENT**

The Applicant proposes to redevelop and rehabilitate the long underutilized former Old Castle Precast site for their operations and outside storage. The project is proposed in two phases.
**Phase 1 Development**

Phase 1 proposes the redevelopment of the 19.5-acre site including the removal of several prefabricated metal structures along the northwest portion of the property and removal of concrete slabs, ramps and wash out pits. The site will be developed with a new 24,777 square foot industrial building (Bldg. A), for equipment storage, maintenance and equipment and related operations. Building A will be situated approximately 32 feet from the future right-of-way line.

Phase 1 also proposes a new vehicle fueling and wash area, ramp, scale, equipment parking and laydown areas within the northwest portion of the site as shown on the site plan. The fueling area will consist of one (1) 10,000 gallon double walled concrete lined, bullet proof tank (similar to the current tank that is on-site which will be removed) with one pump for diesel fuel only. Equipment and trailer parking and laydown areas will be centrally located within the site.

Laydown areas include the outside storage of trailers, forms, cranes and other equipment as outlined in the “on-site storage” section within this report.

The construction of all public right-of-way improvements, including curb and gutter, landscaped parkways and sidewalks, perimeter fencing and screen walls and landscaped setbacks, as shown on the development plans, will be included with Phase 1.

The existing pit will be reclaimed and modified into a new infiltration basin as shown within the civil plans.

**Phase 2 Development**

Phase 2 proposes the future development of the remaining half of the 19.5-acre site, including the construction of a 37,866 square foot industrial building (Bldg. B) for equipment storage, maintenance and equipment and related operations. Bldg. B is proposed along the eastern portion of the site, fronting Hall Avenue. Bldg. B has been designed to provide minimal impacts to the residential land uses located along the east side of Hall Avenue. Bldg. B will be oriented where roll up doors and access are provided along the western side of the building, thereby eliminating any openings along the eastern building elevation.

The Applicant indicates that the timing of Phase 2 is dependent upon the economy and timing of new construction projects Kiewit secures. Both the Noise Study and the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) do not require that Bldg. B be constructed in order to meet required noise levels since Bldg. A and site operations will be located approximately 800 feet to the west of residential land uses located east of Hall Avenue.

**Operations**

The project site will serve as an administration, maintenance, construction and outside storage laydown facility for Kiewit’s Southern California operations. Activities at the site would include construction of precast concrete segments, light manufacturing assembly, repackaging, outside storage of product and materials, forklift operations, storage and sales.

Hours of operation are proposed from 5 a.m. to 3 p.m. Monday through Friday, with occasional weekend operations. Up to 15 employees are anticipated to provide equipment and site maintenance, load and unload construction supplies and manage outside storage and inventory. Typical operations would include up to 15 flatbed truck loads per week, with a potential daily peak of five (5) trucks.

The Noise Study prepared for this project has a stipulation that the forklifts cannot be operated before 7 a.m. Based on the Noise Study, the IS/MND contains a mitigation measure stating that no forklifts can operate before 7 a.m. and forklifts will be required to use "white noise backup
alarms.” Further detailed noise information is presented within the Analysis section of this report.

**On-Site Storage**

Typical equipment to be stored on site includes the following: towable light plants, generators, welding machines, water pumps, message boards, arrow boards, air compressors, scissor lifts, man lifts, small sized backhoes, excavators of various sizes from Cat 303.5 up to Cat 374 size; Cat loaders from 930 size up to 988 size; Cat bulldozers from D5 to D10 size; water trucks, trucks F-150 pickup trucks to F-750 specialty trucks up to 35 feet in length; 40 foot enclosed trailers, various open trailers (may have specialty equipment attached) ranging from four (4) to 45 feet; enclosed trailers from eight (8) to 40 feet; various types and sizes of concrete or asphalt specialty equipment; sedans, SUV's; 36k single axle or double axle lube trucks; F-550 mechanic trucks; Kenworth flatbed trucks; Cat rock trucks from 740 to 777's; Cat scrapers from 631 to 657 size; RT cranes from 40 to 100 ton capacity; crawler cranes from 100 to 500 ton and all related boom and components that go with them. Additionally, tower cranes and related parts; miscellaneous rock crushing equipment and plant processing equipment; skip loaders, conveyors, stacking conveyors, and forklifts of various designs and sizes.

Other materials stored onsite for Kiewit’s operations include: aluminum structural beams struts, stair towers, scaffolds and all of the related parts for assembly. Steel beams of various sizes from six (6) inch in height up to three (3) feet in beam height; and steel street plates up to 20 feet in length. Wood crane mats measuring eight (8) by 20 feet; steel pipe struts; cut concrete slabs; bridge deck forms brackets and column forms; concrete K-rails, various concrete cast pieces; pipes of various sizes and lengths; crates and wooden skip boxes with various construction materials; cable rigging and hardware; and water, fuel and oil storage tanks of various sizes (all empty while on site).

Attachment 3 shows the various types of equipment proposed to be stored on site and Attachment 4 are brochures of the Applicant’s business model.

**Access, Circulation and Parking**

Access to the site would be provided by an existing driveway on Rubidoux Blvd., which will be widened and improved, and be used primarily by passenger type vehicles. There are two (2) existing driveways along 24th Street, of which one will be eliminated and the existing will be widened and improved, and four (4) additional driveways are proposed to accommodate Phase 1 and 2. Truck traffic access will be taken from 24th Street. Staff has conditioned that right turns onto 24th Street shall be prohibited, and that the Applicant work with the Engineering Department to install street signs at the intersection of Market Street and 24th Street to prohibit left turns for “Trucks over 5 Tons” onto residential neighborhoods, thereby reducing truck traffic impacts to the neighboring community. No driveways are proposed along Hall Avenue.

The site plan provides the required 34 off-street parking spaces for Bldg. A and the required 47 off-street parking spaces for Bldg. B. Additionally, the site plan provides 23 parking spaces for existing buildings to remain, an excess of the required 19 spaces. The parking areas will be paved and the storage areas will be over compacted Class II crushed Aggregate Base Material to provide a pervious, stabilized surface for limited internal circulation and material/equipment storage. On-site signage will be posted to limit traffic speeds to 15 MPH.

A masonry trash enclosure unit with self-closing wrought iron gates is proposed within both Phase 1 and Phase 2 developments as shown on the site plan.
**Perimeter Fencing, Walls and Gates**

Along Hall Avenue, the site will contain a (6) foot high decorative splitface masonry wall with pilasters located 40 feet on center, with decorative trim cap. The wall is proposed 10 feet from the property line atop a proposed 36-inch high bermed landscaped setback. There are no wall openings along Hall Avenue. Along 24th Street and Rubidoux Blvd., a six foot high wrought iron fence is proposed, ranging 10 feet and 25 feet from the property line atop a proposed 36-inch high bermed landscaped setback. Several six (6) foot high wrought iron gates are proposed, one along Rubidoux Blvd. and four roll gates along 24th Street. Gates shall be set back a minimum of 30 feet and must contain the knox rapid entry system as required by the County Fire Department. A six (6) foot high splitface wall is proposed along the entire southern property line. For reference on the type of wall/fence height, material and location, please reference sheet L-3 of the Landscape Plans. A condition has been imposed that all walls shall contain anti-graffiti coatings.

**Lighting**

All lighting fixtures, including spot lights, electrical reflectors and other means of illumination for signs, structures, landscaping, parking, loading, unloading and similar areas, will be focused, directed, and arranged to prevent glare or direct illumination on streets or adjoining property as shown on the photometric plan, included in the architectural set of plans, and per Condition No. 13.

**Landscaping**

The proposed landscape plan has been found to be in conformance with the zoning code requirements, including compliance with Chapter 9.283. - Water Efficient Landscape Design Requirements of the JVMC. The conceptual landscape plan was reviewed by the City’s consulting Landscape Architect and the applicant has addressed most of the comments. The Conceptual Landscape Plan is provided as an attachment to the set of plans.

The landscaping throughout the perimeter of the site, particularly along 24th Street and Hall Avenue, will contain dense screen trees and hedging to adequately screen the proposed development from sensitive residential land uses and in compliance with the goals and policies listed within the City’s Noise, Air Quality and Environmental Justice General Plan Elements. Exhibit 4 shows an image of the proposed screen trees and Exhibit 5 shows proposed hedging.

**EXHIBIT 4: AFGHAN PINE, PEPPER WILLOW AND BLUE LEAF WATTLE TREES**
**Public Right-of-Way Improvements**

The development will accommodate 59 feet of public right-of-way from street centerline consisting of 32 feet of paved roadway, maintain existing six (6) foot sidewalk, curb and gutter and a 15 foot landscaped parkway adjacent to future property line along Rubidoux Blvd. On 24th Street, the development will accommodate 44 feet of improvements from street centerline consisting of 32 feet of paved roadway, new curb and gutter, new six (6) foot sidewalk and 12 foot landscaped parkway adjacent to future property line. Along Hall Avenue the development will accommodate 34 feet of public right-of-way from street centerline consisting of 20 feet of paved roadway, new curb and gutter, new eight (8) foot landscaped parkway adjacent to curb, and new six (6) foot sidewalk.

Proposed parkway landscaping will provide a safety buffer between moving vehicles and pedestrians and will provide a shaded and continuously level pathway for pedestrians, thereby increasing aesthetic value of the area. Staff has conditioned that the Applicant enter into a Landscape Maintenance Agreement for the continual maintenance of the landscaping in the public right-of-way. See Exhibit 6 for a view of the street sections.
Construction Schedule

The Applicant indicates that permits will be obtained once plan check is complete and estimates completion of the project (Phase 1) within 12 months of ground breaking. It should be noted that during the overall construction phase of the project, traffic to-and-from the subject property would be generated by activities such as construction employee trips, delivery of construction materials, and use of heavy equipment.
The Applicant indicates that once Phase 2 permits have been obtained, completion of the project is anticipated to be 10 months or less. At this point in time, Phase 2 is not anticipated to begin until Kiewit secures future construction contracts.

Staff has added Condition No. 9 which requires that Phase 2 be under construction within two (2) years of the CUP approval date, unless prior to the expiration of the two (2) year period, the permittee may request up to one (1) year of extension of time in which to begin substantial construction on Phase 2. Should the extension be obtained and no substantial construction or use of this permit be initiated within three (3) years of the approval date this permit, Phase 2 approval shall become null and void.

**Distribution of Plans**

Staff circulated the proposed development plans to service providers (County Fire Department, Department of Environmental Health, Sheriff Department, etc.) and utility companies, allowing each entity the opportunity to review the proposal and determine the impacts of the development relative to their services. In addition, staff circulated the plans to internal agencies such as the Departments of Engineering, Building and Safety, Public Works, Code Enforcement and the City’s Environmental Consultant.

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.

**ANALYSIS**

**Noise**

A Noise Impact Analysis report was prepared for this project and analyzed within the IS/MND. The Noise Impact Analysis (NIA) is attached to this report, as is the IS/MND. The IS/MND provides Mitigation Measures to address construction related noise, limiting construction activities adjacent to or within 200 feet of residential uses to weekdays, between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., and limit high-noise-generating construction activities (e.g., grading, demolition, pile driving) near sensitive receptors to weekdays between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.

The NIA concluded that the laydown yard will be accessed infrequently. Typically, only one forklift would be in operation at any one time, but as a worst case it was assumed that three forklifts would be operating simultaneously. All forklifts will be equipped with white noise backup alarms. The IS/MND also provides mitigation that forklifts shall not be operated on site prior to 7 am or after 8 pm. and that all forklifts operating on the project site are required to be equipped with “white noise” backup alarms. No “beeping” alarms are allowed.

For detailed noise related information, please refer to the NIA, the Noise section of the IS/MND and required mitigation measures within the MMRP section of the IS/MND.

**Air Quality**

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Impact Analysis report was prepared for this project and was analyzed within the IS/MND. According to the IS/MND, 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.

Additionally, the project is subject to mandatory compliance with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403 which addresses dust management.
**Environmental Justice Element**

The City’s General Plan includes an Environmental Justice Element (EJE) which seeks to minimize and equalize the effect of environmental hazards among all people regardless of race, ethnicity or income level. The EJE seeks to address environmental justice through a set of comprehensive objectives and policies which is used by the City in planning for the physical development of the City.

To address the existing land uses, the project shall adhere to the following objectives and policies within the EJE:

**EJ-2.2:** Require that proposals for new sensitive land uses (or developments near existing sensitive land uses) incorporate adequate setbacks, barriers, and landscaping or other measures as necessary to minimize air quality impacts.

The project includes a 40-foot setback from the property line along Hall Avenue that will contain 35 feet of landscaping and a six (6) foot high solid splitface wall within a 36-inch berm with two rows of 24-inch box trees planted 30 feet on center in a staggered position so that they appear 15 feet on center. An eight (8) foot wide landscaped parkway adjacent to curb is also proposed within the public right-of-way along Hall Avenue. Additionally, Building B is oriented so that all openings are from the west side of the building facing the yard area. No openings to the building are proposed along Hall Avenue.

Along 24th Street, the project features a 30 foot landscaped setback area within a 36-inch berm with two rows of 24-inch box trees planted 30 feet on center in a staggered position so that they appear 15 feet on center. Additionally, a 12 foot landscaped parkway is proposed adjacent to the 30 foot landscaped setback area, and will also include 24-inch box trees. A six (6) foot high wrought iron fence is proposed along both 24th Street and Rubidoux Blvd. which features 15-gallon hedging as shown on Exhibit 5.

Along Rubidoux Blvd. the project will feature a 21 foot landscaped parkway adjacent to a proposed 28 foot landscaped setback within a 36-inch berm with 24-inch box trees planted 30 feet on center.

The wall, fence and dense landscaping will provide effective barriers to the sensitive land uses located to the east of the subject site. The IS/MND mitigation measures also mandate dust control measures during construction activities and general business operations.

**EJ-2.6:** Identify resources for the existing sensitive receptors experiencing adverse air quality issues to incorporate measures to improve air quality such as separation/setbacks, landscaping, barriers, ventilation systems, air filters/cleaners and other measures.

The project incorporates the placement of Building B to the east portion of the project site with no openings proposed along the west side elevation, orienting truck loading doors to the east elevation. Additionally, the project proposes dense landscape and wall/fence screening to help further screen on-site operations. The proposed site layout and site upgrades therefore, reduces impacts to air quality, noise and traffic as described below.

Based on a review of the IS/MND, while 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. Additionally, a condition is imposed which requires that all mitigation measures of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) be incorporated into the Conditions of Approval.

**EJ-2.7:** Designate truck routes to avoid residential areas including low-income and minority neighborhoods.
The site will be accessed primarily from 24th Street with three (3) driveways proposed within Phase 1 and three (3) additional driveways proposed with Phase 2. Staff has conditioned that right turns onto 24th Street will be prohibited, and that the Applicant work with the Engineering Department to install street signs at the intersection of Market Street and 24th Street to prohibit left turns for “Trucks over 5 Tons” onto residential neighborhoods, thereby reducing truck traffic impacts to the neighboring community.

**EJ-2.10:** Ensure that low-income and minority populations have equal access and influence in the land use decision-making process through such methods as bilingual notices, posting bilingual notices at development sites, conducting informational meetings with interpreters, etc.

Planning staff sent informational notices along with the 10-day public hearing notices in both English and Spanish to all property owners within a 1,000 foot radius and within the influence area. The informational notice along with the required public hearing notice and radius map are provided as Attachments to this report.

**EJ-2.11:** Ensure that low-income and minority populations understand the potential for adverse pollution, noise, odor, vibrations, lighting and glare when new commercial and industrial developments are proposed.

As noted above, adequate noticing was provided in both English and Spanish to all property owners and noticing was also posted within the Press Enterprise as required by the JVMC. The information notice included detailed project information and a colored site plan of the proposed project in addition to the standard public hearing notice which also included a project description of the development and the date, time and location of the Planning Commission hearing.

**EJ-2.12:** Ensure that low-income and minority populations understand the effect of projects with toxic materials or emissions.

Informational notices and the required 10-day public hearing notices in both English and Spanish were mailed to all property owners as identified previously. In addition, a 10-day public notice was advertised in the local paper, the Press Enterprise, on March 16, 2019.

**EJ-2.13:** Initiate outreach efforts as early as possible in the decision making process before significant resources have been invested in a particular outcome.

Planning staff sent informational notices along with the 10-day public hearing notices in both English and Spanish to all property owners within a 1,000 foot radius and within the influence area. The informational notice along with the required public hearing notice and radius map are provided as Attachments to this report.

As of the date of this report, staff has not received any phone calls or correspondence from any property owners or residents on this project.

**FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP)**

Per Section 9.240.280 of the JVMC, “A Conditional Use Permit shall not be granted unless the applicant demonstrates that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of the community. Any permit that is granted shall be subject to such conditions as shall be necessary to protect the health, safety or general welfare of the community.”

The proposed project is compatible with adjacent industrial land uses and is consistent with the M-SC zone and Light Industrial land use designation. The project incorporates dense landscape and wall/fence screening and orients Building B to adequately screen the project’s operations from sensitive land uses located close to 800 feet away from sensitive land uses.
The proposed Conditions of Approval and Mitigated Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), ensure that the proposed project will have a “Less than Significant Impact” to the surrounding land uses and will therefore not be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of the community. Furthermore, the existing 19.5-acre site will greatly be enhance with new public right-of-way improvements, quality architectural building design, decorative walls/fencing and beautiful, dense landscaping around the site perimeter. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the existing and future industrial development, including development layout, within this primarily industrial corridor area.

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. Staff has recommended a condition which requires that all mitigation measures of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) be incorporated into the Conditions of Approval.

Public Review Period. Copies of the Draft EIR were available for review at Jurupa Valley City Hall and on the City’s website from March 7, 2019 through March 26, 2019. To date, no comments have been received.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The Planning Department mailed detailed information notices of the project as well as the required public hearing notices to surrounding property owners within a 1,000-foot radius of the project site, and also had the Applicant include properties in the influence area (properties outside of the 1,000-foot radius map, but within the same block). Notices were mailed 10-days prior to the public hearing date. Additionally, legal advertisements were published in the Press Enterprise. As of the date of this staff report, no comments have been received.

CONCLUSION

The proposed project will serve to revitalize the existing underutilized and blighted site. The project features site upgrades which include new public improvements, attractive architectural building design, perimeter walls/fencing and landscape screening and overall site improvements. Additionally, this site will be home to a Fortune 500 company which has a long standing reputation of corporate stewardship and are active corporate partners within the community which they are located in. The project adheres to applicable goals and policies in the General Plan, and is consistent with the requirements within the City’s zoning code. Potential impacts have been analyzed and mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce any impacts to a “less than significant level”. Based upon the findings set forth above, staff recommends approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 18002, subject to the Conditions of Approval.
ATTACHMENTS:

1. Resolution No. 2019-03-27-01
   a. Exhibit A. “Initial Study Checklist / Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program”
   b. Exhibit B. Recommended Conditions of Approval
2. Noise Impact Analysis
3. Project site photos
4. Typical Kiewit storage equipment
5. Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. Brochures
6. Detailed Project Description and Public Hearing Notice
7. 1,000 foot radius map
8. Development Plans (Architectural Set; Civil Set and Concept Landscape Plan Set)
ATTACHMENT NO. 1

Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-03-27-01
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-03-27-01


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

Section 1. Project. Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. (the “Applicant”) has applied for Conditional Use Permit No. 18002 (Master Application No. 18056 or MA No. 18056) to permit a contractor storage yard and two industrial buildings totaling 62,643 square feet on approximately 19.5 acres of real property located at 2434 and 2456 Rubidoux Boulevard on the southeast corner of Rubidoux Boulevard and 24th Street (APNs: 178-330-005, -006, -008) in the Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC) Zone and designated Light Industrial (LI) (the “Project”).

Section 2. Conditional Use Permit.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 18002 to permit a contractor storage yard and two industrial buildings totaling 62,643 square feet on approximately 19.5 acres of real property located at 2434 and 2456 Rubidoux Boulevard on the southeast corner of Rubidoux Boulevard and 24th Street (APNs: 178-330-005, -006, -008) in the Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC) Zone.

(b) Section 9.148.020.B.(3)(w) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that contractor storage yards are permitted in the M-SC Zone provided a conditional use permit has been granted pursuant to Section 9.240.280 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(c) Section 9.240.280.(3) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that a public hearing shall be held on the application for a conditional use permit in accordance with the provisions of either Section 9.240.250 or 9.240.260 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, whichever is applicable, and all of the procedural requirements and rights of appeal as set forth therein shall govern the hearing. Further, the hearing body in Section 9.240.250 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code is defined as the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley.
Section 9.240.280.(4) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that a conditional use permit shall not be granted unless the applicant demonstrates that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of the community. Any permit that is granted shall be subject to such conditions as shall be necessary to protect the health, safety, or general welfare of the community.

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

(a) The application for MA No. 18056 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 March 27, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 18056, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing.

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

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

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

(b) Thereafter, City staff provided public notice of the public comment period and of the intent to adopt the MND as required by law. The public comment period commenced on March 7, 2019, and expired on March 26, 2019. Copies of the documents have been available for public review and inspection at City Hall, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509. The City received did not receive any comments during the public review period.

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

1) The MND was prepared in compliance with CEQA;

2) With the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment; and
3) The MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Planning Commission.

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

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

Section 5. Findings for Approval of Conditional Use Permit. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the proposed Conditional Use Permit No. 18002 should be granted because the proposed contractor storage yard will not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of the community in that:

(a) The proposed contractor storage yard is compatible with adjacent industrial land uses and is consistent with the M-SC zone and Light Industrial land use designation;

(b) The proposed contractor storage yard incorporates dense landscape and wall/fence screening and orients Building B to adequately screen the operations of the proposed contractor storage yard from sensitive land uses located close to eight hundred (800) feet away from sensitive land uses;

(c) The proposed conditions of approval and mitigation measures will ensure that the proposed contractor storage yard will have a less than significant impact on the surrounding land uses;

(d) The subject 19.5-acre site will be greatly enhanced with new public right-of-way improvements, quality architectural building design, decorative walls/fencing, and beautiful, dense landscaping around the site perimeter; and

(e) The proposed contractor storage yard is consistent with the existing and future industrial development, including development layout, within this primarily industrial corridor area.

Section 6. Approval of Master Application No. 18056 with Conditions. Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby approves Conditional Use Permit No. 18002 to permit a contractor storage yard and two industrial buildings totaling 62,643 square feet on approximately 19.5 acres of real property located at 2434 and 2456 Rubidoux Boulevard on the southeast corner of Rubidoux Boulevard and 24th Street (APNs: 178-330-005, -006, -008) in the Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC) Zone and designated Light Industrial (LI), subject to the recommended conditions of approval attached hereto as Exhibit “A”.

Section 7. Certification. The Planning Director shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.
PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 27th day of March, 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 Merrell, Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-03-27-01 as duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 27th day of March, 2019, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

NOES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

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

Initial Study Checklist / Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Initial Study/
Mitigated Negative Declaration

City of Jurupa Valley Master Application No. 18056

Conditional Use Permit No. 18002

City of Jurupa Valley
8930 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
Contact: Rocio Lopez, Senior Planner
(951) 332-6464
rlopez@jurupavalley.org

Applicant:

Kiewit Infrastructure West, Co.
c/o Timothy Jeffrey
3555 Farnan Street
Omaha, NE 68131

February 20, 2019
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MASTER APPLICATION NO. 18056 SUMMARY

Conditional Use Permit No. 18002: The Project proposes to rehabilitate and reconfigure the former Old Castle Precast facility. Improvements include the construction of 2 new buildings totaling 63,000 square feet; new vehicle fuel and wash area; new ramp and scale; new equipment parking and lay-down areas; new landscaping, and reclaim and bring to grade the old mine pit site. The administrative function would utilize the existing approximately 4,300 sf two story office building and accommodate up to 30 people. The administrative activities include project management, engineering, logistics and back office corporate function such as accounting, human resources, procurement, and legal.

The Project site will serve as an administration, maintenance, construction, and outside storage laydown facility for Kiewit’s Southern California operations. Activities at the site would include construction of precast concrete segments, light manufacturing assembly, repackaging, outside storage of product and materials, forklift operations, warehouse storage and distribution and sales.

Lot Line Adjustment No.1719. A Lot Line Adjustment is required to ensure that the new buildings do not cross property lines.
1.0. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of an Initial Study

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

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

1.2 Purpose of a Mitigated Negative Declaration

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

1.3 Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Document

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

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

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Notice of Intent to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration was distributed to the following entities for a 20-day public review period:

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

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

3) The Riverside County Clerk.

The Notice of Intent also was noticed to the general public in the Riverside Press-Enterprise, which is a primary newspaper of circulation in the areas affected by the Project.
The Notice of Intent identifies the location(s) where the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and its associated Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program and technical reports are available for public review. During the 20-day public review period, comments on the adequacy of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration document may be submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department.

Following the 20-day public review period, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department will review any comment letters received during to determine whether any substantive comments were provided that may warrant revisions or recirculation to the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration document. If recirculation is not required (as defined by CEQA Guidelines §15073.5(b)), written and/or oral responses will be provided to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission for review as part of their deliberations concerning the Project.

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

At the conclusion of the public hearing process, the Planning Commission will take action to approve, conditionally approve, or deny the proposed Project. If approved, the Planning Commission 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
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [X] Mandatory Findings of Significance
- [ ] Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Mineral Resources
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [X] Tribal Cultural Resources
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

The Initial Study determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the Lead Agency (City of Jurupa Valley),...
that the Project may have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, based on the findings of the Initial Study, the City of Jurupa Valley determined that a Mitigated Negative Declaration is the appropriate CEQA determination for the Project pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15070(b).
2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

2.1 Project Location

The City of Jurupa Valley covers approximately 43.5 square miles within the County of Riverside. The City is bordered by the City of Fontana and County of San Bernardino to the north, City of Norco to the south, City of Eastvale to the west, and City of Riverside and County of San Bernardino to the east. Specifically, the Project is located on the southwest corner of Rubidoux Boulevard and 24th Street. (Refer to Exhibit 1).

The Project site is identified by the following Assessor Parcel Numbers: 178-330-005, 006 & 008.

2.2 Project Description

The Project proposes to rehabilitate and reconfigure the former Old Castle Precast facility. Improvements include the construction of 2 new buildings totaling 63,000 square feet; new vehicle fuel and wash area; new ramp and scale; new equipment parking and lay-down areas; new landscaping, and reclaim and bring to grade the old mine pit site. The administrative function would utilize the existing approximately 4,300 sf two story office building and accommodate up to 30 people. The administrative activities include project management, engineering, logistics and back office corporate function such as accounting, human resources, procurement, and legal.

The Project site will serve as an administration, maintenance, construction, and outside storage laydown facility for Kiewit's Southern California operations. Activities at the site would include construction of precast concrete segments, light manufacturing assembly, repackaging, outside storage of product and materials, forklift operations, warehouse storage and distribution and sales.

The Project Applicant, Kiewit Infrastructure West Co., submitted the following applications to the City of Jurupa Valley, which comprise the proposed Project: Conditional Use Permit (CUP) No. 18002 and Lot Line Adjustment No. 1719. The City of Jurupa Valley also refers to these applications as Master Application (MA) No. 18056. 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. Conditional Use Permit No. 18002

Phase I Elements

Existing Structures

The administrative function would utilize the existing approximately 4,300 sf two story office building and accommodate up to 30 people. The administrative activities include project management, engineering, logistics and back office corporate function such as accounting, human resources, procurement, and legal.
New Structures

The Project includes new buildings to be used for equipment storage, maintenance, and related operations. A 25,000 square foot building would be located in the western portion of the site, fronting Rubidoux Boulevard (Building A).

Vehicle Fueling and Wash Area, Ramp Scale, Equipment Parking, and Laydown Areas

A new vehicle fueling area, wash area, and scale will be located in the western portion of the site. The fueling area will consist of one 10,000 gallon double walled concrete lined bullet proof tank with one pump for diesel fuel only. Equipment and trailer parking and laydown areas will be centrally located within the site.

Removal of Existing Improvements & Reclamation of the Mine Pit

Existing prefabricated metal structures, generally in the northwestern portion of the site, would be removed. Existing concrete slabs/ramps and wash out pits would also be removed. The existing mine pit will be reclaimed and brought to grade, returning that area to productive use as part of the new facilities operations.

Phase II Elements

Construct a 38,000 square foot building located in the eastern portion of the site, fronting Hall Avenue (Building B) for future use.

Street Improvements (Both Phases)

The Project proposes the following street improvements:

- Rubidoux Boulevard: 21-foot wide parkway, curb and gutter, 6-foot wide curb adjacent sidewalk.
- 24th Street: Curb and gutter, curb adjacent sidewalk connecting to existing improvements at the northeast corner of Rubidoux Boulevard intersection with 24th Street, streetlights(s), and landscaping.
- Hall Avenue: 11-foot wide parkway, curb and gutter, 6-foot wide sidewalk, and landscaping (curb adjacent).

Drainage Improvements (Both Phases)

Runoff from the Project site flows in a southeast direction onto one (1) discharge location. Point of Discharge A is located in the southeast corner of the Project site and receives runoff from the total area. Post-development conditions will drain to same locations as in existing conditions. Runoff will flow onto one (1) infiltration basin located on the southeastern section of the Project site. Runoff will then be conveyed via a storm drain system towards the same discharge location as in the existing conditions.
Sewer and Water Improvements (Both Phases)

Water: Two new 1-inch water services (one for each new building) will be installed to connect to the existing 16-inch diameter water main in 24th Street.

Sewer: Two new sewer laterals (one for each new building) will be installed to connect to the existing 12-inch diameter sewer main in 24th Street.

Construction Duration

Phase I construction is anticipated to occur over a 12 month period. Phase II construction is anticipated to occur over a 10 month period.

Operational Characteristics

The Project involves the following operations:

- Site will serve as a maintenance, construction and laydown yard for all Southern California operations.

- Maintenance of the construction equipment on site will consist of general maintenance and repairs of construction equipment including: oil changes, pressure washing of equipment, preventative maintenance, welding, parts and components replacement and touch up painting of small dings and scratches.

- Site will also facilitate light manufacturing, assembly, repackaging and sales.

- Proposed new 38,000 square foot building on the eastern portion of the site may be occupied by Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. or leased/sold to another operator.

- 5 to 15 employees.

- Typical operations will have up to 15 flatbed truck loads per week, with a potential for a peak daily count of 5 trucks per day.

B. Lot Line Adjustment No. 1719

A Lot Line Adjustment is proposed to ensure that the new buildings do not cross property lines.

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 commenced in April, 2018.
The site has been used for industrial purposes, including the manufacture of precast concrete, since the 1980s. Several prefabricated metal storage buildings are located in the northwestern portion of the site. The remainder of the site contains outdoor storage areas for equipment and material, as well as a mine pit. 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 and various structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard and 24th Street, beyond which is vacant land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>24th Street, beyond which is industrial development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>Rubidoux Boulevard, beyond which are an office complex and a self-storage facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East/Southeast</td>
<td>Hall Avenue, beyond which are Penske industrial development and residential properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South/Southwest</td>
<td>Industrial property with outdoor storage and a residence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Inspection, April 2018

2.4 Existing General Plan Land Use Designations and Zoning Classifications

The Project site’s General Plan land use designation is Light Industrial (LI) and the zoning classification is Manufacturing- Service Commercial (M-SC). The General Plan land use designation and the zoning classification allow industrial, service-commercial, and related uses including warehousing/distribution, research and development, assembly and light manufacturing, repair facilities, and supporting retail uses. A summary of the General Plan land use and designations and zoning classifications for the Project site and surrounding properties is provided in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Light Industrial (L-I)</td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Light Industrial (L-I)</td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Light Industrial (L-I)</td>
<td>M-H (Manufacturing-Heavy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>Light Industrial (L-I)</td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East/Southeast</td>
<td>Light Industrial (L-I)</td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) Public Facilities (PF)</td>
<td>M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial) R-2 (Multiple Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South/Southwest</td>
<td>Light Industrial (L-I)</td>
<td>C-1C-P (General Commercial) M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Facilities (PF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Evaluation Format

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

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

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:
### Potentially Significant Impact

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.

### Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

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.

### Less Than Significant Impact

No “significant” impact(s) identified or anticipated. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary.

### No Impact

No impact(s) identified or anticipated. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Environmental Factors Requiring Mitigation**

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

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

City of Jurupa Valley

Signature

Agency

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director

February 20, 2019

Printed Name/Title

Date
Appendices (Under Separate Cover or on Compact Disk)

Appendix B. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, AECOM, March 2018.
Appendix J. Water and Sewer Will Serve Letter, Rubidoux Community Services District, September 13, 2018.
3.1 AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</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>Yes</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>Yes</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>Yes</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 9.148-040 (3)(b), Buildings shall not exceed fifty (50) feet unless a height up to seventy-five (75) feet is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.370.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

The Project site is approximately 20 acres in size and is located in an area largely characterized by a mix of industrial and residential development. The subject property is bordered to the north by the intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard and 24th Street, beyond which is vacant land. The subject property is bordered to the northeast by 24th Street, beyond which are industrial uses and a self-storage facility. The subject property is bordered to the east and southeast by Hall Avenue, beyond which are Penske Truck Rental and residential properties. The subject property is bordered to the southwest by a junkyard, the former Belltown Landfill, carnival storage, industrial uses and a residence. The subject property is bound to the northwest by Rubidoux Boulevard, beyond which...
are an office complex and a self-storage facility.

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 La Loma Hills located approximately 2.5 miles to the northeast of the Project site and the Rattlesnake Mountain located approximately 1 mile to the northwest of the Project site.

As required by PPP 3.1-1 above, the future building proposed on the property will be restricted to 50 feet in height. As such, the Project would not block or completely obstruct views from surrounding public vantage points (Rubidoux Boulevard, 24th Street, Hall Avenue) 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 Project Design Features 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 subject property consists of the former Old Castle Precast facility and is developed with a two-story office building, a one-story maintenance garage, a one-story maintenance shop, two storage sheds, and associated paved driveways, parking areas, and former concrete manufacturing areas. The Project proposes to rehabilitate and reconfigure the former Old Castle Precast facility and construct 2 new buildings totaling 63,000 square feet; new vehicle fuel and wash area; new ramp and scale; new equipment parking and lay-down areas; new landscaping, and reclaim and bring to grade the old mine pit site. The visual character of the Project site would change as a result of the Project. A project is generally considered to have a significant impact on visual character if it substantially changes the character of the project site such that it becomes visually incompatible or visually unexpected when viewed in the context of its surroundings.

The Project site is in an area largely characterized by a mix of residential and industrial development. Development of the site with new buildings and supporting infrastructure will be developed in accordance with City design standards and development standards as required by the Municipal Code would enhance the visual character of the site and its surroundings.

In addition, the Project site is currently planned for industrial use by the General Plan (Light Industrial). The introduction of industrial development will be compatible to the existing development in the surrounding area.

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Sources: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

PPP 3.1-2  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 3.1-2, impacts relating to lighting would be less than significant.

The primary exterior of the building would primarily consist of concrete tilt-up panels which is not a reflective surface. As such, impacts relating to glare would be less than significant.
### 3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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 Manufacturing-Service Commercial (MS-C). The MS-c Zone is not considered a primary agricultural zone. As such, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use if the change of zone were approved.

*Williamson Act*

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

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

**Determination:** No Impact.

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

The Project site currently has a zoning classification of Manufacturing-Service Commercial (MS-c). 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, MSHCP Habitat Assessment Report (Appendix B).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

In addition, the Project site is approximately 20 acres in size and is located in an area largely characterized by a mix of residential and industrial development. The subject property is bordered to the north by the intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard and 24th Street, beyond which is vacant land. The subject property is bordered to the northeast by 24th Street, beyond which are industrial uses and a self-storage facility. The subject property is bordered to the east and southeast by Hall Avenue, beyond which are Penske Truck Rental and residential properties. The subject property is bordered to the southwest by a junkyard, the former Belltown Landfill, carnival storage, industrial uses and a residence. The subject property is bound to the northwest by Rubidoux Boulevard, beyond which are an office complex and a self-storage facility. In addition, the Project site is planned for industrial uses by the General Plan and this type of development has been anticipated for the Project site.

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

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

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

Sources: Air Quality & GHG Impact Analyses (Appendix A), SCAQMD Air Quality Handbook.

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Federal Air Quality Standards**

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

- Ozone (8-hour standard)
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})
Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5})
Carbon Monoxide (CO)
Nitrogen Dioxide (NOx)
Sulphur Dioxide (SO_{2}), and
Lead.

State Air Quality Standards

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

- Ozone (1-hour standard)
- Ozone (8-hour standard)
- Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})
- Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5})
- Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NOx)
- Sulphur Dioxide (SO_{2}), and
- Lead

Regional Air Quality Standards

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

Attainment Designation

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

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

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

*Source: California Air Resources Board, 2015*

**Air Quality Management Plan**

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

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

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

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

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

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

The General Plan Land Use Designation currently assigned to the Project is Light Industrial (LI). The future emission forecasts contained in the **2016 Air Quality Management Plan** are primarily based on demographic and economic growth projections provided by the Southern California Association of Governments. The Project was planned for industrial development at the time the
2016 Air Quality Management Plan adopted. Therefore, the Project will not exceed the growth forecast estimates used in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan.

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

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

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**PPP 3.3-1** The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, “Fugitive Dust.” Rule 403 requires implementation of best available dust control measures that generate fugitive dust, such as earth moving and stockpiling activities, grading, equipment travel on unpaved roads and the outdoor storage area used for equipment and material storage.

**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).”
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Emissions (Construction) (pounds/day)</th>
<th>Emissions (Operational) (pounds/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO$_x$</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO$_x$</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 (2015)*

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).

The estimated maximum regional daily construction emissions are summarized in Table 5 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>VOC (ROG)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Emissions</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Thresholds</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant? | No | No | No | No | No | No

Source: Air Quality & GHG Impact Analyses (Appendix A).

As shown in Table 5 above, 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 operation of the Project are summarized in Table 6 below (Maximum Operational Daily Emissions). Based on the results of the model, operational emissions associated with operation the Project will not exceed the thresholds established by SCAQMD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ROG (VOC)</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Emissions</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant? | No | No | No | No | No | No

Source: Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis (Appendix A).
As shown in Table 6 above, 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.

### 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 Analysis (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.**

*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 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 south of the Project site.

Localized Impact Analysis

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

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

Construction-Related Localized Emissions

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Localized Significance Threshold Analysis (lbs/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-Site Preparation Emissions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.

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.

**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.

**Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC)**

Diesel particulate matter (DPM) which is a known carcinogen would be emitted and has the potential to impact surrounding uses. Typical operations will have up to 15 flatbed truck loads per week, with a potential for a peak daily count of 5 trucks per day. With respect to the generation of TAC’s, typically larger warehouse distribution centers are associated with the generation of TAC’s. The low number of truck trips generated by the Project does not typically generate excessive amounts TAC’s. In addition, all on site idling would be limited to five minutes consistent with State law. As such, any potential impacts from DPM would be less than significant and no further analysis is warranted.

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**


**Impact Analysis**

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

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts related to objectionable odors. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program:
The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 402 “Nuisance.” Adherence to Rule 402 reduces the release of odorous emissions into the atmosphere.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

According to the South Coast Air Quality Management District CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The Project proposes a facility for the installation of refrigeration units on trailers and sales of those trailers which is a land use typically not associated with emitting objectionable odors.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.4(a)** *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Source: Field Inspection.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*
There are no Project Design Features 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 has been used for industrial purposes, including the manufacture of precast concrete, since the 1980s. Several prefabricated metal storage buildings are located in the northwestern portion of the site. The remainder of the site contains outdoor storage areas for equipment and material, as well as a mine pit. As such, there is no impact with respect to having 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.

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: Field Inspection.

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.

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

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Field Inspection.

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 drainage features, water bodies, vernal pools or seasonally inundated waters are located within the Project site. No additional information is required to determine if specific areas of the Project site meet the three-parameter criteria of a wetland and fall under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and/or California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).

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: No Impact.
Source: Field Inspection.

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 has been used for industrial purposes, including the manufacture of precast concrete, since the 1980s. Several prefabricated metal storage buildings are located in the northwestern portion of the site. The remainder of the site contains outdoor storage areas for equipment and material, as well as a mine pit. As such, there is no impact with respect to interfering 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.

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: 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 related to this issue.
The General Plan contains the following policies with respect to trees:

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

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

The site has been used for industrial purposes, including the manufacture of precast concrete, since the 1980s. Several prefabricated metal storage buildings are located in the northwestern portion of the site. The remainder of the site contains outdoor storage areas for equipment and material, as well as a mine pit. There are no significant trees or vegetation on the Project site. As such, there are no impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

### 3.4(f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Source: Field Inspection.*

**Impact Analysis**

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

There are no Project Design Features 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 site has been used for industrial purposes, including the manufacture of precast concrete, since the 1980s. Several prefabricated metal storage buildings are located in the northwestern portion of the site. The remainder of the site contains outdoor storage areas for equipment and material, as well as a mine pit. There are no significant trees or vegetation on the Project site. As such, there are no impacts related 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.
## 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:** 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.

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 site has been used for industrial purposes, including the manufacture of precast concrete, since the 1980s. Several prefabricated metal storage buildings are located in the northwestern portion of the site. The remainder of the site contains outdoor storage areas for equipment and material, as well as a mine pit.

Existing prefabricated metal structures, generally in the northwestern portion of the site, would be removed. Existing concrete slabs/ramps and wash out pits would also be removed. The existing mine pit will be reclaimed and brought to grade, returning that area to productive use as part of the new facilities operations.

According to General Plan Figure 4-19-Historic Resources in Jurupa Valley, the Project site is not identified as a historic resource.

Based on the analysis above, there are no impacts to historical resources.

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: 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.

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.

The site has been used for industrial purposes, including the manufacture of precast concrete, since the 1980s. Several prefabricated metal storage buildings are located in the northwestern portion of the site. The remainder of the site contains outdoor storage areas for equipment and material, as well as a mine pit. Although portions of the Project site have been previously graded and disturbed, the Project site retains some potential for subsurface resources and part-time archaeological monitoring is recommended.

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 are less than significant.

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**  
*Source: Riverside County Map My County Website.*

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

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

The site has been used for industrial purposes, including the manufacture of precast concrete, since the 1980s. Several prefabricated metal storage buildings are located in the northwestern portion of the site. The remainder of the site contains outdoor storage areas for equipment and material, as well as a mine pit. Although portions of the Project site have been previously graded and disturbed, the Project site retains some potential for paleontological resources. According to the Riverside County Map My County website, based on geologic formations or mappable rock units that are rocks that contain fossilized bone elements, the Project site is classified as High Sensitivity (HIGH A) for paleontological resources. As such, the following mitigation measure is required.

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

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

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

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

---

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**


**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**PPP 3.5-1** The project is required to comply with the applicable provisions of California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 as well as Public Resources Code §5097 et. seq.
Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Riverside County Map My County Website.*
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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.
Source: 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.
Source: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Appendix B), Riverside County Map My County Website.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

Based on information obtained from the County of Riverside Map My County website, the Project site has a “moderate” potential for liquefaction. Based on the State Water Resources Control Board Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) database, groundwater data at the former Belltown Landfill (south/southwestern adjacent property) is reported at a minimum depth of 37 feet and a maximum depth of 58 feet below ground surface (bgs).

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.

With the exception of the slopes within the open pit mine area, the site is relatively flat and contains no slopes that may be subject to landslides. The open pit mine area will be reclaimed and brought to grade, returning that area to productive use as part of the new facilities operations. As such, 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.  
*Sources: City Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.010, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Hydrology Study (Appendix D), Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (Appendix G).*

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

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

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

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

Operation

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

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: 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 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, with the exception of the slopes within the open pit mine area, the site is relatively flat and contains no slopes that may be subject to landslides. The open pit mine area will be reclaimed and brought to grade, returning that area to productive use as part of the new facilities operation. 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, with the exception of the slopes within the open pit mine area, the site is relatively flat and contains no slopes that may be subject to landslides. The open pit mine area will be reclaimed and brought to grade, returning that area to productive use as part of the new facilities operation. 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
Based on information obtained from the County of Riverside Map My County website, the Project site has a “moderate” potential for liquefaction. Based on the State Water Resources Control Board Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) database, groundwater data at the former Belltown Landfill (south/southwestern adjacent property) is reported at a minimum depth of 37 feet and a maximum depth of 58 feet below ground surface (bgs).

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 process.

**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 58-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: Soils Infiltration Study (Appendix F).*

**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.
The Soils Infiltration Study (Appendix F) identified silty sandy soils on the Project site which are generally considered to have a low expansion potential. 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 industrial projects:

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

A summary of the Project’s projected annual operational greenhouse gas emissions, including amortized construction-related emissions, is provided in Table 8.

<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>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>314.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>471.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Usage</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CO2E (All Sources)</td>
<td>950.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance Threshold</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Based on guidance from the SCAQMD, if this type of project would emit GHG emissions less than 10,000 MTCO2e per year, the Project is not considered a substantial GHG emitter and the GHG impact is less than significant, requiring no additional analysis and no mitigation.

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

Determinant: 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.
Source: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Appendix B), Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (Appendix C).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)
The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to this issue. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

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

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

Design Features (PDF)

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

Existing Conditions

Based on the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Appendix B), no controlled recognized environmental conditions (CRECs) were identified in association with the subject property. However, the following RECs, historical (HRECs) and de minimis conditions (DMCs) were identified in connection with the subject property:

- An approximately 4-foot deep, 12-foot long by 3-foot wide concrete-lined vehicle inspection pit is located inside the former maintenance garage. De minimis oil staining was observed on the intact concrete floor of the pit. It appears the pit was used to inspect, maintain, and repair vehicles. The inspection history age of the pit is not known. The pit is considered to be a REC.

- From at least early 1980s until the mid-1990s the subject property was occupied by an automotive dismantling facility. Historical research indicates that car storage and auto dismantling activities occurred throughout the subject property. Historical use of the subject property as a wrecking yard is considered to be a REC.

- In 2007 a drum of toluene and a drum of methyl ethyl ketone (MEK) were observed on the subject property without secondary containment. No explanation was provided for why the drum of MEK was being stored onsite, however reportedly toluene was used by the facility.
to wash parts. Given the uncertainty associated with these drums, the former drums are considered to be a REC.

- A fueling area is located in the northwest portion of the subject property, adjacent to the concrete pouring ramp formerly used to assist trucks in filling precast molds. The fueling area contains an empty steel 3,500-gallon diesel aboveground storage tank (AST). The site contact reported that this AST was used to fuel pickup trucks and former concrete equipment. Given the potential for there to be over spilling and releases near the base of the AST, the tank considers is considered to be a REC.

- Three former underground storage tanks (USTs) were removed from the subject property in 1986 and 1988. The USTs impacted soil only and received regulatory case closure from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). These closed LUST cases are considered to be an HREC.

- Oil stains measuring approximately 1-foot by 2-foot were observed on the intact concrete floor beneath a propane-powered forklift and on the floor of the pit located in the former garage. Both stains are considered to be a DMC.

A limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment was prepared to evaluate above described RECs. Based on the analytical results of the soil sampling conducted at the subject property during the limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, the following findings and conclusions were made:

- Total petroleum hydrocarbons – gasoline range organics (TPH-GRO) were not detected above the laboratory detection limit in the soil samples collected throughout the subject property. Although diesel range organics TPH-DRO) and oil range organics (TPH-ORO) detections in soil may indicate limited residual impacts from historical auto dismantling and/or storage activities, the concentrations detected are below SFRWQCB ESLs, and therefore, do not appear to represent a significant environmental concern to the subject property.

- Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) were not detected above the laboratory detection limit in the soil samples collected from throughout the subject property.

- Although the detected concentrations of arsenic in the soil samples exceeds the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) soil screening number for a commercial/industrial scenario (formerly known as California Human Health Screening Levels or CHHSLs) of 0.24 mg/kg, the concentration of arsenic in the onsite soils (average onsite concentration of 8.2 mg/kg) is within the background range of arsenic for soils of the Western United States of between 0.1 and 97 mg/kg as reported in the United States Geological Survey study published in 1984 (USGS 1984), and 0.6 and 11 mg/kg reported by the Kearney Foundation of Soil Science (Bradford, et al. 1996). Based on this information, the detected arsenic concentrations fall within the expected range of naturally occurring background conditions, are not indicative of a site-specific release, and therefore do not present a significant environmental concern to the subject property.

In conclusion, based on field observations and analytical results for the soil samples collected during the limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, no additional assessment was recommended and no mitigation measures are required.
**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 proposes to rehabilitate and reconfigure the former Old Castle Precast facility. Improvements include the construction of 2 new buildings totaling 63,000 square feet; new vehicle fuel and wash area; new ramp and scale; new equipment parking and lay-down areas; new landscaping, and reclaim and bring to grade the old mine pit site.

The Project site will serve as an administration, maintenance, construction, and outside storage laydown facility for Kiewit’s Southern California operations. Activities at the site would include construction of precast concrete segments, light manufacturing assembly, repackaging, outside storage of product and materials, forklift operations, warehouse storage and distribution and sales.

It is likely that the Project will handle and/or store hazardous materials. Any business that handles and/or stores substantial quantities of hazardous materials (§ 25500 of California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95) would be required to prepare and submit a Hazardous Materials Business Emergency Plan (HMBEP) to the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health (RCDEH) in order to register the business as a hazardous materials handler. Such business is also required to comply with California's Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Law, which require immediate reporting to Riverside County Fire Department and State Office of Emergency Services regarding any release or threatened release of a hazardous material, regardless of the amount handled by the business.

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

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

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Sources: Project Application Materials, Google Earth.*

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

The Project site is not located within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest school is Ina Arbuckle Elementary School located approximately 1.3 miles southwest 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:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Sources: DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese List,) Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (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 relating to this issue.*

The site is identified as being on the “Cortese List” as follows:

- **Inland Concrete Enterprises, Inc.** formerly located at 2434 Rubidoux Boulevard is listed on the AST, Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database (HIST UST), Facility Inventory Database (CA FID UST), Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning System UST (SWEEPS UST), Leaking Underground Storage Tank Case Listing (LUST),
Recovered Government Archive (RGA) LUST, Waste Management Unit Database (WMUDS/SWAT), Hazardous Waste and Substance Site List (HIST CORTESE), National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits Listing, RGA Solid Waste Facilities List (RGA LF), Facility and Manifest Data (HAZNET), Facility Index System/Facility Registry System (FINDS), and Waste Discharge System (WDS) databases.

According to the site contacts and a review of the GeoTracker database, three UST leaked and were removed from the property during Inlands lease of the subject property. The LUST case (T0606500028) was assigned in 1986 due to a release of gasoline to soil from a 1,900-gallon tank. No other documentation or history was available through EDR or Geotracker, with the exception that the leak received closure from the Regional Water Quality Control Board in 1989. It is likely that this tank was removed and the soil remediated. The second LUST (T0606500551) case was assigned in 1998 when a leak was discovered associated with a 10,000-gallon diesel tank and a 5,000-gallon gasoline tank. The two tanks were removed from the subject property in October 1998, with 20 feet of clearance between the area of tank removal and groundwater underneath the subject property. The AST leaks only affected soil, and groundwater was not found to be affected.

Following groundwater and soil sampling requested by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the subject property received closure in 2000 as the soil had been decontaminated, a water sample analyzed in 2000 was returned as “ND” (not determined) for contaminants of concern, and groundwater was lower than previously measured, leaving 50 feet of clean space between the former tank area and groundwater level. Based on status, these LUST listings are considered HRECs. Database listings including WMUDS/SWAT, RGA LF, NPDES and WDS pertain to waste discharge restrictions to the subject property. Due to the compliance-related nature of the remaining listings, the listings on the Cortese List are not a REC.

- **Oldcastle Precast Inc.**, formerly located at 2434 Rubidoux Boulevard is listed on the HAZNET, FINDS, and Enforcement & Compliance History Information (ECHO) databases. Due to the compliance-related nature of these listings, the listings are not a REC.

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

**3.8(e)** For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission.*

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

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

The nearest airport is Flabob Airport located approximately 1.8 miles southwest of the Project site. According to Map PL-1, Flabob Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Project site is not located within an airport compatibility zone. As such, the Project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area.

**3.8(f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?**

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Source: Google Earth. Site Reconnaissance.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

The Project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, no impact would occur.

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

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Sources: General Plan Safety Element, Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

Access to the Project site is proposed from Rubidoux Boulevard and 24th Street which are paved roadways and would be further improved by the Project. The Project site does not contain any emergency facilities nor does it serve as an emergency evacuation route. During construction and long-term operation, the Project would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles from Rubidoux Boulevard and 24th Street and connecting roadways as required by the City. Furthermore, the Project would not result in a substantial alteration to the design or capacity of any public road that would impair or interfere with the implementation of evacuation
procedures. Because the Project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan, impacts are less than significant.

3.8 (h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

_Determination: Less Than Significant Impact._
_Source: General Plan Figure 8-11._

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

According to _General Plan Figure 8-11: Wildfire Severity Zones in Jurupa Valley_, the Project site is shown as “Urban Unzoned” and is not located within a high wildfire hazard area. Therefore development of the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires and no impact would occur.
### 3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

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

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

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

1. Increase permeable areas by leaving highly porous soil and low lying area undisturbed by:

   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 multi-functional infiltration basin with an outlet structure that controls peak flow rates to be equal to or less pre-development peak flow rates.
**Construction Impacts**

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

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

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

**Operational Impacts**

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

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

The entire Project site is considered a single drainage management area (DMA) which will flow onto one (1) infiltration basin located on the southeastern section of the project site. Runoff will then be conveyed via storm drain system towards the same discharge location as in existing conditions. The proposed infiltration basin reduces the peak flows bellow pre-development conditions at the discharge location for all storms analyzed (3-hr, 6-hr, 24-hr for a 100 year return period.

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: Rubidoux Community Services District Urban Water Management Plan, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (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 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.
In addition, based on the State Water Resources Control Board Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) database, groundwater data at the former Belltown Landfill (south/southwestern adjacent property) is reported at a minimum depth of 37 feet and a maximum depth of 58 feet below ground surface (bgs). 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.
Sources: Hydrology Study (Appendix D), Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (Appendix G).

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Existing Conditions

In the pre development conditions, the Project site was intended for a concrete products fabrication and retail site. The site has storage buildings and impervious surfaces located on the western section of the Project site, and a large deep depression (pit) located on the eastern section of the area. The remaining area consists of graded, undeveloped unvegetated area. The total Project site, except for the large pit, overland flows in a southeastern direction towards the discharge point located on the southeastern corner of the site (Discharge location “A”). The aforementioned depressed area does not drain away from the project site; precipitation and/or runoff that reaches this area ponds and infiltrates onto the underlying soil.

Proposed Conditions

The entire Project site is considered a single drainage management area (DMA) which will flow onto one (1) infiltration basin located on the southeastern section of the project site. Runoff will
then be conveyed via storm drain system towards the same discharge location as in existing conditions. The proposed infiltration basin reduces the peak flows below pre-development conditions at the discharge location for all storms analyzed (3-hr, 6-hr, 24-hr for a 100 year return period.

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

3.9(f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: Hydrology Study (Appendix D), Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (Appendix G).*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

There are no conditions associated with the proposed Project that could result in the substantial degradation of water quality beyond what is described above in response to Issues 3.9 (a), 3.9(c), and3.9 (e) above.

3.9(g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

**Determination: No Impact.**

*Source: General Plan Figure 8-9.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

According to General Plan Figure 8-9: Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM, the Project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area nor does it propose any housing. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.
3.9(h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

3.9(i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

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

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

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

The Pacific Ocean is located more than 30 miles from the Project site; consequently, there is no potential for tsunamis to impact the Project. In addition, no steep hillsides subject to mudflow are located on or near the Project site. The nearest large body of surface water to the site is Lake Mathews, located approximately 12 miles to the south. Due to the distance of Lake Mathews from the Project site, a seiche in Lake Mathews would have no impact on the Project. Therefore, the Project site would not be subject to inundation by a seiche, mudflow, and/or tsunami. Therefore, no impact would occur.
3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.10(a) Physically divide an established community?

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

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

An example of a Project that has the potential to divide an established community includes the construction of a new freeway or highway through an established neighborhood. The Project site is in an area largely characterized by a mix of residential and industrial development. The subject property is bordered to the north by the intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard and 24th Street, beyond which is vacant land. The subject property is bordered to the northeast by 24th Street, beyond which are industrial uses and a self-storage facility. The subject property is bordered to the east and southeast by Hall Avenue, beyond which are Penske Truck Rental and residential properties. The subject property is bordered to the southwest by a junkyard, the former Belltown Landfill, carnival storage, industrial uses and a residence. The subject property is bound to the northwest by Rubidoux Boulevard, beyond which are an office complex and a self-storage facility. In addition, the Project site is planned for industrial uses by the General Plan and this type of development has been anticipated for the Project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur with respect to dividing an established community.
3.10(b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

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

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

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

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

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

Determination: 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.

The site has been used for industrial purposes, including the manufacture of precast concrete, since the 1980s. Several prefabricated metal storage buildings are located in the northwestern portion of the site. The remainder of the site contains outdoor storage areas for equipment and material, as well as a mine pit. There are no significant trees or vegetation on the Project site. As such, there are no impacts related 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.
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>
the months of June through September and between the hours of six (6:00) p.m. and seven (7:00) a.m. during the months of October through May.

PPP 3.12-2 As required by Jurupa Valley Municipal Code Section 11.05.040, no person shall create any sound, or allow the creation of any sound, on any property that causes the exterior sound level on any other occupied property to exceed the sound level standards set forth in Table 1 of this section or that violates the special sound source standards set forth in Section 11.05.060.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Existing Ambient Noise Environment

The background ambient noise levels in the Project study area are dominated by the transportation related noise associated with the arterial roadway network and the nearby industrial land uses. Ambient noise levels range from 70-71 dBA in the southwest quadrant and 69-70 dBA in the northwest quadrant of the site.

Construction Noise

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

Project construction activities would include: staging, site preparation (e.g., land clearing), grading, utility trenching, foundation work (e.g., excavation, pouring concrete pads), material deliveries, building construction (e.g., framing, concrete pouring, welding), paving, coating application, and site finishing work. In general, these activities would involve the use of worker vehicles, delivery trucks, dump trucks, and heavy-duty construction equipment such as (but not limited to) backhoes, tractors, loaders, graders, excavators, rollers, cranes, material lifts, generators, and air compressors. Table 9 presents the noise levels associated with typical types of construction equipment that could be used to develop the Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Reference Noise Level at 50 feet (Lmax)</th>
<th>Predicted Noise Levels (Leq) at Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulldozer</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Equipment Type | Reference Noise Level at 50 feet (Lmax) | Predicted Noise Levels (Leq) at Distance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 Feet</td>
<td>100 Feet</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 73 dBA during grading which would exceed the exterior noise level for residential uses of 55 dBA.

The noisiest activity will be filling in the pit. However, when operations begin, equipment will be operating in the bottom of the pit which is about 15 feet lower than grade. Equipment operating in the pit will be about 10 dBA quieter than equipment operating at grade. The center of the pit is about 550 feet from the Hall Avenue residences.

Filling in the pit will require import of 80,000 CY of fill material. Over a 40-day period this would equate to 258 daily one way trips with 16 CY trucks. Assuming a 10-hour work day, this would
equate to 26 trips per hour. The traffic noise level associated with 26 hourly trips is 64 dBA Leq or
60.2 dBA for a daily CNEL (64 dBA per hour for 10/24 hours). On-site noise measurements
observed Leqs of 67-68 dBA or CNELs of 69-71 dBA. The addition of 60.2 dBA to 71.0 dBA is 71.3
due to the logarithmic nature of noise. The increase of 0.3 dBA is less than the +3 dBA traffic noise
increase significance threshold.

Although construction noise is less than significant, 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.”

With implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, construction noise impacts will be reduced to
the maximum extent feasible.

**Operational Noise- On-Site Outdoor Activity Building “A”**

The laydown yards will be accessed infrequently. Typically, only one forklift would be in operation
at any one time, but as a worst case it was assumed that three forklifts would be operating
simultaneously. Three forklifts with white noise backup alarms operating simultaneously could
create a maximal noise level of 77 dBA. However, the project laydown area is 900 feet from the
closest sensitive use. There will be a 6-foot high masonry wall at the property line. At 900 feet the
noise for three forklifts would decay to 52 dBA Leq. The masonry wall would provide -5 dBA of
noise attenuation. Therefore, the resultant noise level would be 47 dBA Leq from 3 forklifts
operating at the same time, or 42 dBA from a single forklift. The impact from all three forklifts
operating simultaneously would meet the 65 dBA daytime noise standard but exceed the 45 dBA
nocturnal standard. Therefore, Mitigation Measure NOI-2 is required.
A flat-bed truck pass-by would have a noise level of 50.2 dBA Leq. The closest a flatbed truck would come to the sensitive would be at the laydown area. At 900 feet noise would be attenuated to 33 dBA Leq with distance and the CMU noise wall. A single flatbed truck would not exceed daytime or nocturnal noise standards operating on the western portion of the site.

**Operational Noise- On-Site Outdoor Activity Building “B”**

The loading docks on Building B are on the west side of the building. This location is 220 feet from the closest sensitive use across Hall Avenue and the building itself would provide at least -10 dBA of noise attenuation and the 6-foot CMU masonry wall would also assist in noise attenuation.

Three forklifts with white noise backup alarms can create a maximal noise level of 77 dBA Leq. Distance alone would provide -13 dBA of noise attenuation and the building and building itself and CMU wall would provide at least -10 dBA of noise attenuation. The resultant noise level of 54 dBA for 3 forklifts or 49 dBA Leq for a single forklift is less than the 65 dBA Leq daytime noise threshold. The nocturnal noise standard of 45 dBA Leq would not be met. Therefore, as long as Building B only has forklifts operating during daytime hours, noise thresholds will be met. Mitigation Measure NOI-2 is required to implement this restriction.

A flat-bed truck traveling to the loading dock at the Building B would create a noise level of 39 dBA Leq due to attenuation and CMU wall. Both daytime and nocturnal thresholds would be met. The loading and unloading of metal parts could create a clanging noise, but the noise standard is a 10-minute average and a few seconds of clanging would be diluted by the 9 minutes 58 seconds of no clanging.

**On-Site Indoor Activity- Buildings “A” and “B”**

Both Building A and Building B will be used for equipment repair and maintenance. Although hand tools would be used, so would air guns. Giroux and Associates has measured air guns on several occasions, most recently (August 10, 2017) at the Great Oaks Costco Tire Center in San Jose, California. The Lmax level for Pneumatic “air guns” was found to be 68 dBA at 70 feet. This noise level was then adjusted for use time, roll up door orientation and distance from the closest receptors to the east. The roll up doors in Building A face north and south. A -5 dBA credit was taken because of off-axis openings. It was observed that air guns operate continuously for approximately one minute in ten for which a -10 dBA time adjustment was taken. The 6-foot CMU masonry wall at the eastern property line was allocated a -5 dBA adjustment. Finally, the building distance separation of 1,400 feet provided a -26 dBA credit. Therefore, the residual noise from an air gun operating in Building A with the roll-up doors open would be 22 dBA for 10-minutes at a sensitive use. Indoor activity at Building A would meet daytime and nocturnal noise thresholds.

Building B is also a concrete structure but is closer to sensitive uses. The roll up doors in Building B face west and therefore a -10 dBA credit is taken because the building itself will block noise. The roll up doors in Building B are 220 feet from sensitive uses which would provide -10 dBA of noise attenuation and the property line wall would provide -5 dBA of attenuation. The residual noise level of an air gun operating in Building B would be 33 dBA for a 10-minute Leq. This is less than the daytime or nocturnal noise threshold.
Based on the above analysis, indoor activity in both Building A or B could operate at any time without exceeding the noise standard.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure NOI-2-Forklift Restrictions.**

a) Forklifts shall not be operated on site prior to 7 am or after 8 pm.

b) All forklifts operating on the Project site are required to be equipped with “white noise” backup alarms. No “beeping” alarms are allowed.

**Traffic Noise**

The Project expects to generate a maximum of 5 new truck trips per day and 248 new daily trips. Typically, a doubling of traffic volumes is required to result in an increase of 3 dBA, which is considered to be a barely audible change. Project generated traffic will not result in a doubling of traffic volumes along any affected roadway segment as shown in Table 10 below. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Segment</th>
<th>Average Daily Trips (ADT)</th>
<th>Existing Noise Level</th>
<th>Project Traffic</th>
<th>Total (Existing + Project)</th>
<th>Project Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rubidoux Blvd. (s/o 24th St.)</td>
<td>16,700</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>49.0(1)</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th St. e/o Rubidoux Blvd.</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Ave. n/o 28th St.</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 248 cars and 5 trucks in a single hour = 49 dBA CNEL.

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

**Conclusions**

With implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 and NOI-2, impacts are less than significant.

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Project Application Materials, Caltrans.*

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

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Construction Vibration

Under existing conditions, there are no known sources of ground-borne vibration or noise emanating from the Project site. The Project will not employ any pile driving, rock blasting, or rock crushing equipment during construction activities, which are the primary sources of ground-borne noise and vibration during construction.

The City has relied upon vibration standards promulgated by Caltrans in past CEQA documents. (California Department of Transportation, Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. September, 2013). According to Caltrans, the threshold at which there may be a risk of architectural damage to normal houses with plastered walls and ceilings is 0.20 PPV inch/second. Primary sources of vibration during construction would be bulldozers. A large bulldozer could produce up to 0.089 PPV at 25 feet. At a distance of 15 feet a bulldozer would yield a worst-case 0.027 PPV (inch/sec) which is within the threshold of perception and below any risk or architectural damage.

The closest residence to the Project property line is 80 feet. Construction vibration impacts at 80-feet would not create a vibration level greater than 0.2 in/sec. Vibration from project construction or operation would be below the threshold of human perception. 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.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

As discussed above under Issue 3.12(a), with implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1, impacts would be less than significant

3.12(d)  A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

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 Measures NOI-1 and NOI-2.
3.12 (e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?

Determination: No Impact.

Source: Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

According to Map FL-3, Noise Compatibility Contours, the Project site is not located within an area that will be significantly impacted by aircraft noise. As such, the Project will not result in excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area.

3.12(f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?

Determination: No Impact.

Source: Google Earth, Field Inspection.

The Project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impacts will occur.
### 3.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.13(a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

**Determination:** Less than Significant Impact.

*Source: Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

The Project would not directly result in population growth because it does not propose any residential dwelling units.

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

Typically, growth would be considered a significant impact pursuant to CEQA if it directly or indirectly affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public services and requires the expansion or new construction of public facilities and utilities.

Two new 1-inch water services (one for each new building) will be installed to connect to the existing 16-inch diameter water main in 24th Street. Two new sewer laterals (one for each new
building) will be installed to connect to the existing 12-inch diameter sewer main in 24th Street. Electricity and gas service is also available at the Project site. As such, the Project does not require the construction of new public utilities other than to connect to the existing facilities at the Project site.

In addition, the analysis in Section 3.14, Public Services, of this Initial Study 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 approximately 1.9 roadway miles southwest of the Project site at 5721 Mission Boulevard.

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

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

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

POLICE PROTECTION

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

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

PPP 3.14-2  As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 et seq., the Project proponent shall pay a Development Impact Fee (DIF) following protocol for impact fee collection.
There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

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

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

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

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

SCHOOLS

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

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

PPP 3.14-3  As required by Section 65995 of the Government Code, the Project Applicant shall pay required development impact fees to the applicable school district following protocol for impact fee collection required by that district.
There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

The Project does not propose any housing and would not directly create additional students to be served by the Jurupa Unified School District. However, the Project would be required to contribute fees to the Jurupa Unified School District in accordance with the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (Senate Bill 50). Pursuant to Senate Bill 50, payment of school impact fees constitutes complete mitigation under CEQA for Project-related impacts to school services.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.14-3, impacts related to schools are less than significant.

PARKS

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

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

PPP 3.14-4 Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant shall pay required park development impact fees to the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District pursuant to District Ordinance No. 01-2007 and 02-2008.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

As noted in the response to Issue 3.13 (a) above, the Project will not create an additional need for housing thus directly increasing the overall population of the City and generating additional need for parkland. The payment of development impact fees will reduce any indirect Project impacts related to parks.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.14-4, impacts related to parks are less than significant.

OTHER PUBLIC FACILITIES

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

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)
The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to other public facilities. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.14-2 above is applicable to the Project.

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

As noted in the response to Issue 3.13(a) above, development of the Project could result in a direct increase in the population of the Project area and would not increase the demand for public services, including public health services and library services which would require the construction of new or expanded public facilities.

The Project would be required to comply with the provisions of Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 which requires payment of the Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing public services. Payment of the Development Impact Fee would ensure that the Project provides fair share of funds for additional public services. These funds may be applied to the acquisition and/or construction of public services and/or equipment.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.14-2 above, impacts related to other public facilities are less than significant.
3.15 RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks 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 cause a substantial physical deterioration of any park facilities or would accelerate the physical deterioration of any park facilities because the Project does not proposes residential dwelling units which would increase the population that would use parks. The payment of Development Impact Fees will reduce any indirect Project impacts related to recreational facilities.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.14-1, impacts r
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: 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.

As noted in the response to Issue 3.15(a) above, the Project does not propose any recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment. In addition, no offsite parks or recreational improvements are proposed or required as part of the Project.

Based on the above analysis, there are no impacts related to on-site recreational facilities.
### 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: Trip Generation Analysis (Appendix I).*
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 trip generation was analyzed using trip rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation, 10th Edition (2017). Three ITE manufacturing land use categories may apply to the site based on the anticipated operations. These are Manufacturing, Light Industrial and Industrial Park. The trip rates for “Manufacturing” land use were used, as the Project includes construction of precast concrete segments and light manufacturing assembly, which is consistent with the description of “Manufacturing” land use in the ITE manual. The trips for the office are based on the “Corporate Office” category. Based on these uses, the proposed Project is forecast to generate 318 daily trips including 41 trips during the AM peak hour and 54 trips during the PM peak hour.

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

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

Transit Service Analysis

The Riverside Transit Agency, a public transit agency, serves the region and the City of Jurupa Valley. There is no bus service adjacent to the Project site. In addition, the Project is not proposing to construct any improvements would interfere with any future bus service.

Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Analysis
The Project is not proposing to construct any improvements that will interfere with bicycle and pedestrian use. Pedestrian and bicycle access will be available to the Project site from Rubidoux Boulevard and 24th 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 proposed Project is forecast to generate 318 daily trips including 41 trips during the AM peak hour and 54 trips during the PM peak hour.

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

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

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

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

**Determination: No Impact.**

*Source: Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

All roadway improvements will be constructed to meet City standards. The Project would not be incompatible with existing development in the surrounding area to the extent that it would create a transportation hazard as a result of an incompatible use. Accordingly, the Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use and there is no impact.

### 3.16(e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

**Determination: No Impact.**

*Source: Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

The Project which would increase the need for emergency access to-and-from the site. Adequate emergency access would be provided to the Project site from Rubidoux Boulevard and 24th Street. During the course of the preliminary review of the Project, the Project’s transportation design was reviewed by the City’s Engineering Department, County Fire Department, and County Sheriff’s Department to ensure that adequate access to and from the site would be provided for emergency vehicles.
With the adherence to mandatory requirements for emergency vehicle access, there are no impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

### 3.16(f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Source: General Plan Circulation Element, Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

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

The Riverside Transit Agency, a public transit agency, serves the region and the City of Jurupa Valley. In addition, the Project is not proposing to construct any improvements would interfere with any future bus service. As such, the Project as proposed will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy applying to transit services and there are no impacts.
### TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

**Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</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: 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.

The site has been used for industrial purposes, including the manufacture of precast concrete, since the 1980s. Several prefabricated metal storage buildings are located in the northwestern portion of the site. The remainder of the site contains outdoor storage areas for equipment and material, as well as a mine pit.

Existing prefabricated metal structures, generally in the northwestern portion of the site, would be removed. Existing concrete slabs/ramps and wash out pits would also be removed. The existing mine pit will be reclaimed and brought to grade, returning that area to productive use as part of the new facilities operations.

According to General Plan Figure 4-19-Historic Resources in Jurupa Valley, the Project site is not identified as a historic resource.

Based on the analysis above, there are impacts to historical resources.

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

Determination: Potentially Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

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

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Tribal Cultural Resources are either of the following:

(1) Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
(A) Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.

(B) Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.

(2) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

AB 52 also created a process for consultation with California Native American Tribes in the CEQA process. Tribal Governments can request consultation with a lead agency and give input into potential impacts to tribal cultural resources before the agency decides what kind of environmental assessment is appropriate for a proposed project.

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

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

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

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

II. a. MONITORING: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall contact the consulting Native American Tribe(s) that have requested monitoring through consultation with the City during the AB 52 process. The applicant shall coordinate with the Tribe(s) to develop a Tribal Monitoring Agreement(s). A copy of the agreement shall be provided to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

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

Two new 1-inch water services (one for each new building) will be installed to connect to the existing 16-inch diameter water main in 24th Street.

Two new sewer laterals (one for each new building) will be installed to connect to the existing 12-inch diameter sewer main in 24th Street.

The installation of water and sewer lines as proposed by the Project would result in physical impacts to the surface and subsurface of the Project site. These impacts are considered to be part of the Project’s construction phase and are evaluated throughout this Initial Study Checklist. In instances where impacts have been identified for the Project’s construction phase, Plans, Policies, Programs (PPP), Project Design Features (PDF), or Mitigation Measures (MM) are required to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, additional measures beyond those identified throughout this Initial Study Checklist would not be required.
3.17(c) **Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Project Application Materials.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

*Refer to PPP 3.9-1 through PPP 3.9-4 under Section 3.9-Hydrology and Water Quality.*

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*Refer to PDF 3.9-1 under Section 3.9-Hydrology and Water Quality.*

Runoff from the Project site flows in a southeast direction onto one (1) discharge location. Point of Discharge A is located in the southeast corner of the project site and receives runoff from the total area. Post-development conditions will drain to same locations as in existing conditions. Runoff will flow onto one (1) infiltration basin located on the southeastern section of the Project site. Runoff will then be conveyed via storm drain system towards the same discharge location as in existing conditions.

The construction of the on-site and off-site drainage facilities would result in physical impacts to the surface and subsurface of the Project site. These impacts are part of the Project's construction phase and are evaluated in the appropriate sections of this Initial Study Checklist. In any instances where impacts have been identified for the Project's construction phase, Plans, Policies, Programs (PPP), Project Design Features (PDF), or Mitigation Measures are required to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, additional measures beyond those identified throughout this Initial Study Checklist would not be required.

3.17(d) **Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Rubidoux Community Services District.*

**Impact Analysis**

*Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)*

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

*Project Design Features (PDF)*

*There are no Project Design Features applicable to the Project relating to this issue.*
Water service would be provided to the Project site by the Rubidoux Community Services District ("District"). According to the District's 2015 Draft Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the sole source of potable water supply for the District is groundwater extracted from the southern portion of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin (also referred to herein as the "Basin") of the Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin.

The Basin encompasses the District's entire service area. The District currently does not purchase or otherwise obtain water from a wholesale water supplier, and recycled water is not currently available to the District. The District expects that groundwater extracted from the Basin by six potable and six non-potable (irrigation only) groundwater wells will continue to be its primary (and possibly only) source of water through the year 2040, and possibly beyond.

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

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

The District does not have an immediate concern with water supply reliability. Because the District's water supply is groundwater, which has historically not been impacted by seasonal or year-to-year climatic change, the District is not subject to short-term water shortages resulting from temporary dry weather conditions. In the foreseeable future, the District will continue to be reliant on local groundwater supplies. The District will develop additional groundwater extraction and groundwater treatment facilities as needed to ensure a continuous and adequate water supply for its service area.

Water use for the Project was estimated by using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). The model can be used to estimate water usage for analysis in CEQA documents. The Project is estimated to have a water demand of 14.56 million gallons per year which equates to 4.47 acre feet per year (AFY).

The 2015 UWMP estimated that, in 2020 during normal-year, single-dry-year, and multiple-dry-year conditions, the District anticipates a total water supply of approximately 17,000 AFY and a demand of 10,397 AFY, resulting in an excess capacity of 6,603 AFY (RCSD 2015). The District issued a "Will Serve" letter dated September 13, 2018. The Will Serve letter does not guarantee that the District will provide water service for the Project, but rather is an indicator that the District has the potential to provide water service provided that fees are paid and water improvements are constructed per the District’s standards.

Based on the analysis above, impacts are less than significant.
3.17(e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Rubidoux Community Services District.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

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

The current capacity of the RWQCP is 40 million gallons per day (approximately 123 acre-feet per day). The City is currently in the early planning stages for construction of additions to the plant. Quantities of wastewater collected and conveyed by the District to the RWQCP in 2015 was 2,212 AF/yr. The quantities projected to be conveyed by District and treated by the City of Riverside over the next 25 years are: 2,290 AF/yr in 2020; 2,310 AF/yr in 2025; 2,320 AF/yr in 2030; 2,330 AF/yr in 2035; and 2,350 SF/yr in 2040.

Wastewater use for the Project was estimated by using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CaEEMod). 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 14.56 million gallons per year which includes wastewater. Assuming (a maximum) that all the water is discharged to the sewer system, the increase in wastewater from the proposed Project would be 4.47 acre feet per year (AFY), 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.

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

3.17(f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project’s solid waste disposal needs?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Sources: Riverside County Waste Management, Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details.
Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

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 February 10, 2019, these landfills receive well below their maximum permitted daily disposal volume and demolition and construction waste generated by the Project is not anticipated to cause these landfills to exceed their maximum permitted daily disposal volume. Furthermore, none of these regional landfill facilities are expected to reach their total maximum permitted disposal capacities during the Project’s construction period. As such, these regional landfill facilities would have sufficient daily capacity to accept construction solid waste generated by the Project.

Operational Related Impacts

Based on solid waste generation rates obtained from the CalRecycle webpage on February 10, 2019, the proposed Project would result in a solid waste generation of approximately 78 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 39 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 20 tons per year.

According to the Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details website accessed on January 29, 2019 the Badlands Sanitary Landfill has a permitted disposal capacity of 4,000 tons per day with a remaining capacity of 14,730,020 cubic yards. The Badlands Sanitary Landfill is estimated to reach capacity, at the earliest time, in the year 2024. The El Sobrante Landfill has a permitted disposal capacity of 16,034 tons per day with a remaining capacity of 145,530,000 tons. The El Sobrante Landfill is estimated to reach capacity, at the earliest time, in the year 2045.

Solid waste generated during long-term operation of the Project would ultimately be disposed of at the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and/or the El Sobrante Landfill. During long-term operation, the Project’s solid waste (without the 50% and 75% reduction described above) would represent less than 0.003% of the daily permitted disposal capacity at the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and less than 0.0009% of the daily permitted disposal capacity at the El Sobrante Landfill.

Because the Project would generate a relatively small amount of solid waste per day, as compared to the permitted daily capacities for Badlands Sanitary Landfill and the El Sobrante Landfill, these regional landfill facilities would have sufficient daily capacity to accept solid waste generated by the Project.

Based on the above analysis, impacts are less than significant.

### 3.17(g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: California Assembly Bill 939 (Sher), Riverside County Waste Resources Management District, Riverside County Integrated Waste Management Plan, Riverside County Waste Management Department, Solid Waste System Study Report, Waste Management “El Sobrante Landfill”*

**Impact Analysis**

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

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to solid waste. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program:

**PPP 3.17-1** The Project shall comply with Section 4.408 of the 2013 *California Green Building Code Standards*, which requires new development projects to submit and implement a construction waste management plan in order to reduce the amount of construction waste transported to landfills. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the City of Jurupa Valley shall confirm that a sufficient plan has been submitted, and prior to final building inspections, the City of Jurupa shall review and verify the Contractor’s documentation that confirms the volumes and types of wastes that were diverted from landfill disposal, in accordance with the approved construction waste management plan.

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

Construction Related Impacts

Waste generated during the construction phase of the Project would primarily consist of discarded materials from the construction of streets, common areas, infrastructure installation, and other project-related construction activities. According to the Riverside County Waste Management Department, solid waste generated within the City of Jurupa Valley is deposited at the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and the El Sobrante Landfill.

According to the Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details website accessed on March 28, 2018, these landfills receive below their maximum permitted daily disposal volume and demolition and construction waste generated by the Project is not anticipated to cause these landfills to exceed their maximum permitted daily disposal volume. Furthermore, none of these regional landfill facilities are expected to reach their total maximum permitted disposal capacities during the Project’s construction period. As such, these regional landfill facilities would have sufficient daily capacity to accept construction solid waste generated by the Project.

Operational Related Impacts

The California Integrated Waste Management Act established an integrated waste management system that focused on source reduction, recycling, composting, and land disposal of waste. In addition, the Act established a 50% waste reduction requirement for cities and counties by the year 2000, along with a process to ensure environmentally safe disposal of waste that could not be diverted. Per the requirements of the Integrated Waste Management Act, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors adopted the Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan which outlines the goals, policies, and programs the County and its cities will implement to create an integrated and cost effective waste management system that complies with the provisions of California Integrated Waste Management Act and its diversion mandates.

The Project’s waste hauler would be required to coordinate with the waste hauler to develop collection of recyclable materials for the Project on a common schedule as set forth in applicable local, regional, and State programs. Recyclable materials that would be recycled by the Project include paper products, glass, aluminum, and plastic.

Additionally, the Project’s waste hauler would be required to comply with all applicable local, State, and Federal solid waste disposal standards, thereby ensuring that the solid waste stream to the landfills that serve the Project are reduced in accordance with existing regulations.

Based on the analysis above, impacts are less than significant.
### 3.19 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, 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)

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)

CR-1 through CR-4, NOI-1, NOI-2, and TCR-1 shall apply.
In instances where impacts have been identified, the Plans, Policies, or Programs were applied to the Project based on the basis of federal, state, or local law currently in place which effectively reduces environmental impacts, or Mitigation Measures are required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, Project does not have impacts that are cumulatively considerable.

**3.19(c) Does the Project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: This Initial Study Checklist.*

**Impact Analysis**

As noted in the analysis throughout this Initial Study Checklist, the following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to this issue. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

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


**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Mitigation Measures (MM)**

NOI-1 and NOI-2 shall apply.

In instances where impacts have been identified, the Plans, Policies, or Programs were applied to the Project based on the basis of federal, state, or local law currently in place which effectively reduces environmental impacts. Therefore, Project does not have impacts which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
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6.0 MITIGATION MONITORING REPORTING PROGRAM

PROJECT NAME: MA 18056 (Kiewit Infrastructure West, Co.)

DATE: February 20, 2019

PROJECT MANAGER: Rocio Lopez, Senior Planner

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Conditional Use Permit No. 18002: The Project proposes to rehabilitate and reconfigure the former Old Castle Precast facility. Improvements include the construction of 2 new buildings totaling 63,000 square feet; new vehicle fuel and wash area; new ramp and scale; new equipment parking and lay-down areas; new landscaping, and reclaim and bring to grade the old mine pit site. The administrative function would utilize the existing approximately 4,300 sf two story office building and accommodate up to 30 people. They would travel to the premises by auto and park in the existing parking lot. The administrative activities include project management, engineering, logistics and back office corporate function such as accounting, human resources, procurement, and legal.

The Project site will serve as an administration, maintenance, construction, and outside storage laydown facility for Kiewit’s Southern California operations. Activities at the site would include construction of precast concrete segments, light manufacturing assembly, repackaging, outside storage of product and materials, forklift operations, warehouse storage and distribution and sales.

Lot Line Adjustment No.1719. A Lot Line Adjustment is required to ensure that the new buildings do not cross property lines.

PROJECT LOCATION: The Project is located on the southeast corner of Rubidoux Boulevard and 24th Street. The Project site is identified by the following Assessor Parcel Numbers: 178-150-008 and 009.

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

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

- **Project Design Features (PDF)** – These measures include features proposed by the Project that are already incorporated into the Project's design and are specifically intended to reduce or avoid impacts (e.g., water quality treatment basins).
**Mitigation Measures (MM)** – These measures include requirements that are imposed where the impact analysis determines that implementation of the proposed Project would result in significant impacts; mitigation measures are proposed in accordance with the requirements of CEQA.

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) and Project Design Features (PDF) were assumed and accounted for in the assessment of impacts for each issue area. Mitigation Measures were formulated only for those issue areas where the results of the impact analysis identified significant impacts. All three types of measures described above will be required to be implemented as part of the Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>AESTHETICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.1-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 9.148-040 (3)(b), Buildings shall not exceed fifty (50) feet unless a height up to seventy-five (75) feet is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.370.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.1-2 As required by General Plan Policy COS 10.1, require outdoor lighting to be shielded and prohibit outdoor lighting that: 1. Operates at unnecessary locations, levels, and times. 2. Spills onto areas off-site or to areas not needing or wanting illumination. 3. Produces glare (intense line-of-site contrast). 4. Includes lighting frequencies (colors) that interfere with astronomical viewing.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a building permit and during project operation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AIR QUALITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PPP 3.3-1 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, “Fugitive Dust.” Rule 403 requires implementation of best available dust control measures during construction activities that generate fugitive dust, such as earth moving and stockpiling activities, grading, and equipment travel on unpaved roads. Measures listed below (or equivalent language) shall appear on all Project grading plans, construction specifications and bid documents, and the City shall ensure such language is incorporated prior to issuance of any grading permits:  

- “All clearing, grading, earth-moving, or excavation activities shall cease when winds exceed 25 mph per SCAQMD guidelines in order to limit fugitive dust emissions.” | Engineering Department | Notes must be on the grading plan prior to the issuance of the grading permit and the project is required to comply with the provisions of “Fugitive Dust” during grading |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • “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.” | Building & Safety Department | During construction | |
| **PPP 3.3-2** The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1186 “PM10 Emissions from Paved and Unpaved Roads and Livestock Operations” and Rule 1186.1, “Less-Polluting Street Sweepers.” Adherence to Rules 1186 and 1186.1 reduces the release of criteria pollutant emissions into the atmosphere during construction. | Building & Safety Department | During construction | |
| **PPP 3.3-3** The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113; “Architectural Coatings” Rule 1113 limits the release of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) into the atmosphere during painting and application of other surface coatings. The measure listed below (or equivalent language) shall appear on all Project grading plans, construction specifications and bid documents, and the City shall ensure such language is incorporated prior to issuance of any building permits:  
• “In order to limit the VOC content of architectural coatings used in the SCAB, architectural coatings shall be no more than a low VOC default level of 50 g/L unless otherwise specified in the SCAQMD Table of Standards (pg. 32-33).” | Building & Safety Department  
Engineering Department  
Planning Department | Notes must be on the plans and documents; the project shall comply with the provisions of “Architectural Coatings” during construction and on-going | |
<p>| <strong>PPP 3.3-4</strong> The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1186 “PM10 Emissions from Paved and Unpaved Roads and Livestock Operations” and Rule 1186.1, “Less-Polluting Street Sweepers.” Adherence to Rule 1186 and Rule 1186.1 reduces the release of criteria pollutant emissions into the atmosphere during construction. | Building &amp; Safety Department | During construction | |
| <strong>PPP 3.3-5</strong> The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 402 “Nuisance.” Adherence to Rule 402 reduces the release of odorous emissions into the atmosphere. | Planning Department | On-going | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTURAL RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM- CR-1: Archaeological Monitoring.</strong> A qualified archaeologist (the &quot;Project Archaeologist&quot;) shall be retained by the Project Applicant prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Project Archaeologist will be on-call to monitor ground-disturbing activities and excavations on the Project site following identification of potential cultural resources by project personnel. If archaeological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project, ground-disturbing activities will be temporarily redirected from the vicinity of the find. The Project Archaeologist will be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading or excavation activities in the vicinity in order to make an evaluation of the find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure CR-2 shall apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM- CR-2: Archeological Treatment Plan.</strong> If a significant archaeological resource(s) is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). The archaeological monitor, the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented by the archaeologist to protect the identified archaeological resource(s) from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the archaeological resource(s) in accordance with current professional archaeology standards (typically this sampling level is two (2) to five (5) percent of the volume of the cultural deposit). At the completion of the laboratory analysis, any recovered archaeological resources shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department and the Eastern Information Center.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**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.

**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.

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

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building &amp; Safety Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of building permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building &amp; Safety Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of building permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 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*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building &amp; Safety Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of building permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

#### PPP 3.8-1
As required by *General Plan* Policy CSSF 1.31-Federal/State Laws, the Project is required to comply with federal and state laws regarding the management of hazardous waste and materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Department Riverside County Department of Environmental Health</th>
<th>On-going as required by the Fire Department and Riverside County Department of Environmental Health per their regulatory oversight duties.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, the Planning Department shall verify with Riverside County Department of Environmental Health if a business plan is required.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY
| PPP 3.9-1 | As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, *Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section B (1)*, any person performing construction work in the city shall comply with the provisions of this chapter, and shall control storm water runoff so as to prevent any likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. The City Engineer shall identify the BMPs that may be implemented to prevent such deterioration and shall identify the manner of implementation. Documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 shall be required when requested by the City Engineer. | Engineering Department | Prior to the issuance of grading permits |
| PPP 3.9-2 | As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, *Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section B (2)*, any person performing construction work in the city shall be regulated by the State Water Resources Control Board in a manner pursuant to and consistent with applicable requirements contained in the General Permit No. CAS000002, State Water Resources Control Board Order Number 2009-0009-DWQ. The city may notify the State Board of any person performing construction work that has a non-compliant construction site per the General Permit. | Engineering Department | Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during construction |
| PPP 3.9-3 | As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, *Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section C*, new development or redevelopment projects shall control storm water runoff so as to prevent any deterioration of water quality that would impair subsequent or competing uses of the water. The City Engineer shall identify the BMPs that may be implemented to 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 | Engineering Department | Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during operation |
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. | Engineering Department | During operation |
The Project will provide a multi-functional infiltration basin with an outlet structure that controls peak flow rates to be equal to or less pre-development peak flow rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOISE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.12-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Building & Safety Department
- On-going 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.

| a) “a) Haul truck deliveries shall be limited to between the hours of 6:00am to 6:00pm during the months of June through September and 7:00am to 6:00pm during the months of October through May.” |
| b) Construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers’ standards. |
| c) All stationary construction equipment shall be placed in such a manner so that emitted noise is directed away from any sensitive receptors adjacent to |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering Department</th>
<th>Verify that plans show the basin prior to the issuance of a building permit,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| PPP 3.12-2 | As required by Jurupa Valley Municipal Code Section 11.05.040, no person shall create any sound, or allow the creation of any sound, on any property that causes the exterior sound level on any other occupied property to exceed the sound level standards set forth in Table 1 of this section or that violates the special sound source standards set forth in Section 11.05.060. |
| Building & Safety Department | On-going during operation |

| 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 | On-going 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 |

| a) “a) Haul truck deliveries shall be limited to between the hours of 6:00am to 6:00pm during the months of June through September and 7:00am to 6:00pm during the months of October through May.” |
| b) Construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers’ standards. |
| c) All stationary construction equipment shall be placed in such a manner so that emitted noise is directed away from any sensitive receptors adjacent to |

| Engineering Department | Verify that plans show the basin prior to the issuance of a building permit, |
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-Forklift Restrictions.</th>
<th>Planning Department Building &amp; Safety Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of a building permit, check plans for compliance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Forklifts shall not be operated on site prior to 7 am or after 8 pm.</td>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td>Installation shall be completed prior to occupancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) All forklifts operating on the Project</td>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC SERVICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
<th>Building &amp; Safety Department</th>
<th>Fire Department</th>
<th>Verified by the Fire Department prior to issuance of a building permit or occupancy permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Per Municipal Code Chapter 3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.14-4 Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Project Applicant shall pay required park development impact fees to the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District pursuant to District Ordinance No. 01-2007 and 02-2008.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

| PPP 3.16-1 Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Project Proponent shall make required per-unit fee payments associated with the Western Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF), and the City of Jurupa Valley Development Impact Fee (DIF) per Title 3 of the Municipal Code. | Building & Safety Department | TUMF shall be paid in accordance to the deadline stated in Chapter 3.70 |
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Native American Monitoring, Treatment of Discoveries, and Disposition of Discoveries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

II. a. MONITORING: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall contact the consulting Native American Tribe(s) that have requested monitoring through consultation with the City during the AB 52 process. The applicant shall coordinate with the Tribe(s) to develop a Tribal Monitoring Agreement(s). A copy of the agreement shall be provided to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

b. TREATMENT OF DISCOVERIES: If a significant tribal cultural resource is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). A representative of the appropriate Native American Tribe(s), the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department & Engineering Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit and during grading.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.17-1</strong> The Project shall comply with Section 4.408 of the 2013 California Green Building Code Standards, which requires new development projects to submit and implement a construction waste management plan in order to reduce the amount of construction waste transported to landfills. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the City of Jurupa Valley shall confirm that a sufficient plan has been submitted, and prior to final building inspections, the City of Jurupa shall review and verify the Contractor’s documentation that confirms the volumes and types of wastes that were diverted from landfill disposal, in accordance with the approved construction waste management plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT B OF ATTACHMENT NO. 1

Recommended Conditions of Approval
EXHIBIT “B”

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR MA18056 (CUP18002)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. PROJECT PERMITTED. MA18056 (CUP18002) is for the approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 18002, authorizing a contractor storage yard with two new industrial buildings totaling 63,000 square feet, including complete site renovation on a 19.5-acre site. On-site advertising signs are not part of this approval. The property is located at 2434 & 2456 Rubidoux Blvd., at the southeast corner of Rubidoux Blvd. and 24th Street (APNs: 178-330-005, 006 & 008).

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. **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.

6. **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.

7. **CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA).** This project is approved subject to the provisions of the Environmental Impact Report. 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 $3,218.00 (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. **APPROVAL PERIOD – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT.** This approval shall be used within two (2) years of the approval date; otherwise, it shall become null and void and of no effect whatsoever. By “use”, it shall mean the beginning of substantial construction contemplated by this approval within two (2) year period which is thereafter diligently pursued to completion or to the actual occupancy of existing buildings or land under the terms of the authorized use. Prior to the expiration of the two (2) year period, the permittee may request up to one (1) year of extension of time in which to begin substantial construction or use of this permit. Should the extension be obtained and no substantial construction or use of this permit be initiated within three (3) years of the approval date this permit, it shall become null and void.

9. **PHASE II TIMING.** Phase II must be under construction within two (2) years of the approval date, unless prior to the expiration of the two (2) year period, the permittee may request up to one (1) year of extension of time in which to begin substantial construction on Phase II. Should the extension be obtained and no substantial construction or use of this permit be initiated within three (3) years of the approval date this permit, Phase II approval shall become null and void.

10. **FEES.** Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall pay any outstanding fees owed for the entitlement of MA18056 (CUP18002).

11. **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:
    1. Architectural Set of Plans (dated 3-13-19) consisting of:
       a. Sheet A1.1 – Site Plan
       b. Sheet A1.2 – Fuel and Wash Areas
       c. Sheet AA2.1 – Bldg. A Floor Plan
       d. Sheet AA3.1 – Bldg. A Exterior Elevations
       e. Sheet AA3.2 – Bldg. A Exterior Elevations
       f. Sheet AB2.1 – Bldg. B Floor Plan
       g. Sheet AB2.2 – Bldg. B Floor Plan
12. **ON-SITE LANDSCAPING. Prior to the issuance of any building permit,** the applicant shall submit a “Professional Services (PROS)” application (with current fees) and the following items for Planning Director review and approval:

   a. The total cost estimate of landscaping, irrigation, and one-year of maintenance.
   b. Completed City Faithful Performance Bond for Landscape Improvements form with original signatures after the City provides the applicant with the required amount of bond.
   c. Completed City Landscape Agreement with original signatures after the City has reviewed the submitted cost estimate.
   d. Final landscape, maintenance, planting, and irrigation plans and digital copies (CD format). which shall:
      i. Demonstrate compliance to the applicable provisions of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code; and
      ii. Address all the comments prepared by City’s Landscape Architect.

Prior to the final inspection of any building permit, the Landscape Architect of Record shall conduct an inspection and submit a letter to the City of Jurupa Valley once s/he has deemed the installation is in conformance to the approved plans. Following the inspection of the Landscape Architect of Record, the applicant shall schedule a City inspection with the City’s landscape architect.

13. **OUTDOOR LIGHTING.** All outdoor lighting fixtures shall be maintained in good condition. Light fixtures shall be shielded to prevent any light to flood onto adjacent properties.

14. **SIGN PERMIT. Prior to the issuance of any building permit,** the applicant shall submit a Site Development Permit for any proposed signage to the City for review and approval of the Planning Director. Signage shall be architecturally integrated with the overall project and shall conform to the zoning code.

15. **ON-SITE DIRECTIONAL SIGNS.** Prior to the issuance of final building approval, the applicant shall install directional signs at each driveway exit along 24th Street which clearly states: “No Right Turn for Trucks over 5 Tons”. Additionally, the Applicant shall
work with the Engineering Department on installing street signs at the intersection of Market Street and 24th Street to prohibit left turns for “Trucks over 5 Tons” onto residential neighborhoods. The on-site directional signs shall be included in the Architectural Set of Plans and a detail of the size shall also be included in the plans. Said signs shall be posted in a place that is clearly visible to truck drivers. The size and placement of all on-site signs shall be determined by the Planning Department and the size and placement of any off-site signs shall be determined by the Engineering Department prior to installation. Persistent failure of vehicles entering and leaving the site to abide by these restrictions shall be subject to revocation of the Conditional Use Permit.

16. DECORATIVE PERIMETER WALLS. Any perimeter masonry walls visible from the public right-of-wall shall consist of splitface masonry material.

17. GRAFFITI PREVENTION AND MAINTENANCE.
   a. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit plans that indicate any proposed perimeter walls and exterior of building walls shall have anti-graffiti coatings to half the height of the structure or 12 feet, whichever is more, for review and approval.
   b. The applicant shall remove any graffiti on the property as soon as possible. In addition, if the applicant is notified by the City, the applicant shall remove the graffiti within 7 days of the City’s notice.

Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a separate wall and fence plan to comply with conditions 15 and 16 to the Planning Department for review and approval.

18. LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall provide proof of Lot Line Adjustment approval and recordation to the Planning Department, in compliance with the City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

19. MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTY. The applicant shall maintain the property free of debris, weeds, abandoned vehicles, code violations, and any other factor or condition that may contribute to potential blight or crime.

20. ROOFTOP EQUIPMENT. All rooftop equipment shall be screened from public view with architectural features consistent with the building design and approved by the Planning Director.

21. 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.

22. MULTIPLE SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN MITIGATION FEE (ORD. NO. 810). The applicant shall pay any required fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 810. In order for the agency to determine if the project qualifies for any exemptions for any of the subject fees, the applicant shall submit sufficient evidence to the City to demonstrate that it qualifies for the exemption.
23. 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 Conditional Use Permit (CUP 18002) for the site located south of 24th Street between Rubidoux Boulevard and Hall Avenue; more particularly Assessor’s Parcels Numbers 178-330-005, 178-330-006, and 178-330-008. Exhibit titled Kiewit Corporation Proposed Warehouse Site Plan, prepared by Broeske Architects & Associates, Inc., dated January 10, 2019; and Kiewit Infrastructure West Preliminary Site & Grading Plan, prepared by SDH and Associates, Inc., dated November 2018, are hereby referenced.

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

1.3. Rubidoux Boulevard is a paved, City maintained street identified as an Urban Arterial Primary Corridor by the City’s General Plan with an ultimate right-of-way width of 152 ft. Dedication and improvements shall be per modified section of 118 ft.

1.4. Hall Avenue is a paved, City maintained street identified as an Industrial Collector by the City's General Plan with an ultimate right-of-way width of 68 ft. Right-of-way dedication to provide half-ultimate right-of-way width from centerline to the property line is required.

1.5. 24th Street is a paved, City maintained street identified as a Local Road by the City’s General Plan with an ultimate right-of-way width of 60 ft. Applicant will be required to provide property line corner cut-back at Rubidoux Boulevard and Hall Street intersections, per Riverside County Standard No. 805.

1.6. New streetlights are required along the project frontage on Hall Avenue and on 24th Street. The project proponent shall cause streetlight plans to be prepared and submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer.

1.7. Owner will be required to annex into Jurupa Valley Landscape & Lighting Maintenance District 89-1-C for maintenance of landscape and streetlights.

2. PRIOR TO GRADING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

2.1. No grading permit shall be issued until all other Planning related cases (if any) are approved and are in effect, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.
2.2. This project will require a grading permit, installation of BMPs, and a hauling permit from the Engineering and Public Works departments.

2.3. A project related preliminary soils evaluation report was previously prepared; report titled Soil Infiltration Study, prepared by NorCal Engineering, dated February 2018. Prior to approval of the grading plan the Developer shall prepare a final geotechnical/soils report for the proposed grading, infrastructure, and post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs) for review and approval of the City Engineer.

2.3.1. Soils report shall address comments on the May 14, 2018 comment memo; including, but not limited to, providing details regarding the grading and construction of the proposed infiltration facility.

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

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

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

2.3.4. The geotechnical/soils, compaction and inspection reports will be reviewed in accordance with the Riverside County "Geotechnical Guidelines for Review of Geotechnical and Geologic Reports."

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

2.4.1. The grading plan shall be prepared under the supervision of a civil engineer licensed in the state of California (Project Civil Engineer) and he/she must sign the plan. The printed name and contact information of the Project Civil Engineer shall be included on the face of the grading plan. The grading plan shall be approved by the City Engineer.

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

2.4.3. Temporary erosion control measures shall be implemented immediately following rough grading to prevent transport and deposition of earthen materials onto downstream/downwind properties, public rights-of-way, or other drainage facilities. Erosion Control Plans showing these measures shall be submitted along with the grading plan for approval by the City Engineer.

2.4.4. Driveway approaches shall be located as shown on the referenced exhibit(s) or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer. The driveway approaches shall be constructed per Riverside County Standard No. 207A. Existing driveway approaches, if any, shall be removed and replaced with full height curb.

2.4.5. Applicant shall provide written proof and authorization from easement holders (if any) for work proposed over easements.
2.5. Prior to approval of the grading plan, Landowner shall prepare, or cause to be prepared, a final WQMP in conformance with the requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements for processing and approval of the City Engineer.

2.5.1. 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.

2.5.2. Prior to issuance of the precise grading permit, the property owner shall enter into a Water Quality Management Plan and Stormwater BMP Operation and Maintenance Agreement with the City. The agreement shall be recorded and a certified copy shall be provided to the City Engineer.

2.6. Prior to issuance of the grading permit, grading agreement and securities shall be in place.

2.7. 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.

2.8. The Applicant is responsible for the preparation of improvement plans. All required plans shall conform to Ordinance 460 and Riverside County Road Improvement Standards (Ordinance 461) and all other relevant laws, rules, and regulations governing grading in the City of Jurupa Valley. Improvement plans shall be approved and securities in place prior to the issuance of any grading.

2.8.1. Developer shall prepare Street Improvement plans for Rubidoux Boulevard, to a modified section of 118 ft. of right-of-way width, for review and concurrence of the City Engineer.

2.8.1.1. Improvements shall include, but are not limited to, curb & gutter, 6-foot curb adjacent sidewalk, and 15-foot landscaped parkway adjacent to property line.

2.8.1.2. Driveway shall provide a 24 ft. minimum width and be restricted to passenger vehicles only.

2.8.1.3. Access gate shall be placed to provide minimum 20 ft. setback.

2.8.1.4. Applicant shall provide right-of-way dedication to obtain an ultimate half width of 59 ft. measured from centerline of the road to the property line.

2.8.2. Developer shall prepare Street Improvement plans for 24th Street for review and concurrence of the City Engineer.

2.8.2.1. Improvements shall include, but are not limited to, curb & gutter, curb-adjacent sidewalk connecting to existing improvements at the northeast corner of Rubidoux Blvd. intersection with 24th Street, and landscaped parkway.

2.8.2.2. Street paving improvements will be required to street centerline. Paving section and improvements shall be shown on Street Improvement plans.

2.8.2.3. Installation of streetlights along the project frontage will be required.
2.8.2.4. Right-of-way dedication to provide property line corner cut-back at Rubidoux Boulevard and 24th Street intersection and, Hall Avenue and 24th Street intersection; per Riverside County Standard No. 805.

2.8.2.5. Access gate(s) shall be placed to provide minimum 20 ft. setback, or as approved by the City Engineer.

2.8.3. Developer shall prepare Street Improvement plans for Hall Avenue for review and concurrence of the City Engineer.

2.8.3.1. Improvements shall include, but are not limited to, curb & gutter, curb-adjacent landscape, and 6 ft. sidewalk within an 11 ft. parkway.

2.8.3.2. Installation of streetlights along the project frontage will be required.

2.8.3.3. Applicant shall provide right-of-way dedication to obtain an ultimate half width of 68 ft. measured from centerline of the road to the property line.

2.8.3.4. Access gate(s) shall be placed to provide minimum 20 ft. setback, or as approved by the City Engineer.

2.8.4. Applicant shall submit for review and approval of the City Engineer, Streetlight Plans.

2.8.5. Applicant is required to provide separate streetlight plans showing all existing and proposed streetlights along the project frontage, for review and approval of the City Engineer.

2.8.6. Developer will be responsible for any utility relocation needed in order to provide the required parkway improvements.

2.8.7. Developer shall prepare Street Improvement plans for Rubidoux Boulevard and 24th Street intersection.

2.8.7.1. Intersection improvements include northbound and southbound left-turn lanes at intersection.

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

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

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

2.10. The grading plan shall provide for protection of downstream properties from damages caused by alteration of the drainage patterns, e.g. increase, concentration or diversion of flow. Protection shall be provided by constructing
adequate drainage facilities including enlarging existing facilities and/or by securing a drainage easement as necessary.

2.11. 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 and grading exhibits.

2.12. 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.

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

2.13. Temporary erosion control measures shall be implemented immediately following any grading to prevent transport and deposition of debris onto downstream properties, public rights-of-way, or other drainage facilities. Erosion Control Plans showing these measures shall be submitted along with the grading plan for approval by the City Engineer.

2.14. Applicant is required to annex into Jurupa Valley Landscape & Lighting Maintenance District 89-1-C for maintenance of the landscape parkway improvements and streetlights. The Developer shall submit landscape and irrigation plans for review and approval of the City Engineer. Prior to Grading permit, applicant shall submit application and plans.

2.14.1. The annexation shall be in a manner approved by the City Engineer and City Attorney.

2.14.2. For landscaping within public road rights-of-way separate landscape and irrigation plans shall be prepared for approval of the City Engineer. The improvements shall comply with City’s preparation guidelines.

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

3. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

3.1. All grading and construction of all infrastructure improvements within the public right-of-way in accordance with approved plans, with Riverside County Ordinance 461, as adopted by the City, and with all other applicable requirements, shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

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

3.3. Street improvement plans for the required improvements along Rubidoux Boulevard, 24th Street, Hall Avenue, and Rubidoux Boulevard & 24th Street intersection must be approved by the City Engineer.
3.4. The Project Proponent is responsible for completing all utility mainline and service line extensions within and serving the project site, including but not limited to, electrical power, telephone, other communication, street lighting, and cable television underground as herein before required, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer in writing. Utility extensions from the mainline or other points of connection within the public right-of-way require that the Project Proponent obtained an Encroachment Permit from the Engineering Department. Correspondence from the respective utility company approving and accepting utility improvements shall be provided from each respective utility company. The City will make a final inspection of work to verify that any impacts that the work might have had to other City owned infrastructure is restored or repaired to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

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

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

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

3.8. Separate sanitary sewer and domestic water system improvement plans shall be prepared for required improvements for approval of the utility purveyor and concurrence of the City Engineer.

4. PRIOR TO OCCUPANCY

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

4.2. The Developer is responsible for the completion of all grading and all improvements in the public rights-of-way and for compliance with all other requirements applicable to the public rights-of-way in accordance with the approved plans and as approved by the City Engineer.

4.2.1. 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.

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

4.2.3. All improvements for Rubidoux Boulevard intersection with 24th Street must be completed.
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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Noise Impact Analysis
NOISE IMPACT ANALYSIS

KIEWIT INFRASTRUCTURE WEST PROJECT

JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA

Prepared by:
Giroux & Associates
1800 E Garry St., #205
Santa Ana, CA 92705

Prepared for:
EPD Solutions
Attn: Jeremey Krout
2030 Main Street, Suite 1200
Irvine, CA 92714

Date:
January 28, 2019

Project No.: P18-042 N
NOISE SETTING

Sound is mechanical energy transmitted by pressure waves in a compressible medium such as air. Noise is generally considered to be unwanted sound. Sound is characterized by various parameters that describe the rate of oscillation of sound waves, the distance between successive troughs or crests, the speed of propagation, and the pressure level or energy content of a given sound. In particular, the sound pressure level has become the most common descriptor used to characterize the loudness of an ambient sound level.

The decibel (dB) scale is used to quantify sound pressure levels. Although decibels are most commonly associated with sound, "dB" is a generic descriptor that is equal to ten times the logarithmic ratio of any physical parameter versus some reference quantity. For sound, the reference level is the faintest sound detectable by a young person with good auditory acuity.

Since the human ear is not equally sensitive to all sound frequencies within the entire auditory spectrum, human response is factored into sound descriptions by weighting sounds within the range of maximum human sensitivity more heavily in a process called “A-weighting,” written as dB(A). Any further reference in this discussion to decibels written as "dB" should be understood to be A-weighted.

Time variations in noise exposure are typically expressed in terms of a steady-state energy level equal to the energy content of the time varying period (called LEQ), or alternately, as a statistical description of the sound pressure level that is exceeded over some fraction of a given observation period. Finally, because community receptors are more sensitive to unwanted noise intrusion during the evening and at night, state law requires that, for planning purposes, an artificial dBA increment be added to quiet time noise levels in a 24-hour noise descriptor called the Ldn (day-night) or the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). The CNEL metric has gradually replaced the Ldn factor, but the two descriptors are essentially identical.

CNEL-based standards are generally applied to transportation-related sources because local jurisdictions are pre-empted from exercising direct noise control over vehicles on public streets, aircraft, trains, etc. The City of Jurupa Valley therefore regulates the noise exposure of the receiving property through land use controls.

For “stationary” noise sources, or noise sources emanating from private property the City does have legal authority to establish noise performance standards designed to not adversely impact adjoining uses. These standards are typically articulated in the Municipal Code. These standards recognize the varying noise sensitivity of both transmitting and receiving land uses. The property line noise performance standards are normally structured according to land use and time-of-day.
**Noise Standards**

For stationary noise sources located proximate to residential uses, Jurupa Valley proposes the noise exposure planning policy contained in Section 11.05.040 of the Municipal Code. These noise standards must be met at the nearest sensitive receptors in the vicinity of any stationary or operational source of noise originating from the project. The policy applies to any on-site activities. The policy allows maximum property line noise level of 65 dBA Leq from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. and 45 dBA Leq from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. for 10-minute periods at any sensitive receiver. These noise standards must be met at the nearest off-site sensitive receptors in the vicinity of any stationary source of noise.

Construction activity noise is restricted by ordinance to occur during hours of lesser sensitivity. Policy NE 3.5 of the General Plan Noise Element provides the following requirement:

- Limit commercial construction activities adjacent to or within 200 feet of residential uses to weekdays, between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., and limit high-noise-generating construction activities (e.g., grading, demolition, pile driving) near sensitive receptors to weekdays between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.

The following conditions are also applied to this project:

- **Construction Noise:** For sensitive residential land uses nearby, the daytime and nighttime 8-hour standards are 80 dBA Leq and 70 dBA Leq, respectively (FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment).
PROJECT BACKGROUND

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project includes a new building to be used for equipment maintenance, and related operations. This 25,000 sq. ft. building (Building “A”) would be located in the western portion of the site, fronting Rubidoux Boulevard. The structure will be concrete tilt up which will absorb much of the interior noise. There are roll-up doors facing north and south, but not to the east which is the where the closest sensitive uses are sited. Equipment used in the shop will include hand tools, air guns and welders.

A vehicle fueling, and wash area is sited in the northwest corner of the site. At most, one fuel delivery vehicle is anticipated per week. Four laydown areas are located in the center of the site. Although equipment and materials are stored at the site, heavy truck movement is sporadic. At most 5-trucks a day are anticipated to either deliver or pick up parts or equipment. A worst case would be one truck per hour.

Trucks accessing Building A will have deliveries on-or-off loaded primarily by hand but occasionally with a forklift. Trucks accessing the laydown areas will primarily use forklifts to on-or-off load parts or materials. As a worst case 3-forklifts are anticipated to be used on-site simultaneously. All forklifts will be equipped with “white noise” backup alarms.

Hours of operation are a start of 5am-6am and end at 2pm-3pm. Pre 7 am activity is almost exclusively administrative and includes a daily morning meeting. Pre 7 am vehicles accessing the site are almost always passenger cars or light pick-ups. In an emergency, a truck could need to access the site pre 7 am. If this were to occur the only available entry or exit point to the site would be along Rubidoux Blvd.

The closest sensitive uses are the residences to the east across Hall Avenue. There will be a 6-foot masonry wall separating the site from these uses. The typical truck route would be to enter the site from Rubidoux Blvd, access either Building A or the laydown area and then exit the site at 24th Street, just north of the laydown areas.

The center of the laydown area is 900 feet from the closest residential and the closest edge of the laydown area is about 800 feet. Building A, the fueling area and wash area have an approximate 1,400 foot distance separation. There is a 6-foot wall at the property line and the closest residence across Hall Avenue is about 60-feet east of the property line.

The exact use of Building B is speculative at this point in time. Building B is sited 40 feet from the eastern property line and the closest façade is 120-feet from the closest sensitive use. All loading docks on Building B will be facing west and are 220 feet from the closest sensitive use. Building B runs almost the entire project width and will assist in blocking noise from the laydown area and activity in the western portion of the site.
**Baseline Noise Levels**

In order to establish an ambient noise level, short term area noise measurements were conducted on Tuesday November 27, 2018 from 2:00 p.m. –2:30 p.m. at two area locations. Measurement locations are shown in Figure 1 and the monitoring results are summarized in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Measured Noise Levels (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meter 1</td>
<td>Leq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter 1</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter 2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meter 1 was located in the front of the house adjacent to the southern site property line and was located approximately 45 feet to the Rubidoux Boulevard centerline. Meter 2 was placed in the northwest corner of the site approximately 75 feet to the Rubidoux Boulevard centerline. The observed truck count was approximately 100 per hour NB and 90 per hour SB along Rubidoux Boulevard.

Monitoring experience shows that 24-hour weighted CNELs can be reasonably well estimated from mid-day noise readings. CNELs are approximately equal to mid-afternoon hour Leq plus 2-3 dB (Caltrans Technical Noise Supplement, 2009). The observed Leqs of 67-68 dBA would translate into CNELs of 70-71 dBA in the southwest quadrant and 69-70 dBA in the northwest quadrant of the site.
Figure 1
Noise Monitoring Locations
LAND USE NOISE IMPACTS

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Three characteristic noise sources are typically identified with land use intensification. Construction activities, especially heavy equipment, will create short-term noise increases near the project site. Such impacts may be important if there are nearby noise-sensitive receptors. Upon completion, project-related traffic will cause an incremental increase in area-wide noise levels throughout the project area. In addition, activities occurring on a private property must conform to the City’s noise standards at adjacent sensitive uses.

For noise occurring at the project site itself, according to the current CEQA Appendix G guidelines, noise impacts are considered potentially significant if they cause:

- 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, i.e.
  - Noise levels exceeding the City Noise Standards (65 dB Leq from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. and 45 dB Leq from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. for 10-minute periods at any sensitive receiver

- Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.
  - A significant vibration-related impact would occur if the Project would expose a vibration-sensitive receptor to vibration levels that exceed 0.2 in/sec PPV during either long-term operation or construction of the Project

  a. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

  b. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

The terms “substantial” or “excessive” are not defined in most environmental compliance guidelines. Noise analysis methodology is accurate only to the nearest whole decibel and the human ear can only clearly detect changes of around 3 dBA; changes of less than 3 dBA, while audible under controlled circumstances, are not readily discernable in an outdoor environment. Thus, a change of 3 dBA is considered as a perceptible audible change. For this project the following noise increases would be considered significant:

- Project Related Traffic Noise Increase of:
  - Residential land use by 3 dBA or more to 65 dBA CNEL or above; or
  - Commercial land use by 3 dBA or more to 70 dBA CNEL or above.
**Construction Thresholds**

Construction activity noise is restricted by ordinance to occur during hours of lesser sensitivity with the following time of day and maximal noise level restrictions:

- Permissible hours of commercial construction activities adjacent to or within 200 feet of residential uses are limited to weekdays, between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., and high-noise-generating construction activities (e.g., grading, demolition, pile driving) near sensitive receptors are limited to weekdays between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.

- For sensitive residential land uses nearby, the daytime and nighttime 8-hour standards are 80 dBA Leq and 70 dBA Leq, respectively (FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment).

**Project Construction**

In 2006, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) published the Roadway Construction Noise Model that includes a national database of construction equipment reference noise emissions levels. In addition, the database provides an acoustical usage factor to estimate the fraction of time each piece of construction equipment is operating at full power during a construction phase. The usage factor is a key input variable that is used to calculate the average Leq noise levels.

**Table 4** identifies highest (Lmax) noise levels associated with each type of equipment identified for use, then adjusts this noise level for distance to the closest sensitive receptor and the extent of equipment usage (usage factor), which is represented as Leq. The table is organized by construction activity and equipment associated with each activity.

Quantitatively, the primary noise prediction equation is expressed as follows for the hourly average noise level (Leq) at distance D between the source and receiver (dBA):

\[
Leq = L_{max \, @ \, 50'} - 20 \log \left( \frac{D}{50'} \right) + 10 \log \left( \frac{U.F.\%}{100} \right) - I.L.(\text{bar})
\]

Where:
- \(L_{max \, @ \, 50'}\) is the published reference noise level at 50 feet
- \(U.F.\%\) is the usage factor for full power operation per hour
- \(I.L.(\text{bar})\) is the insertion loss for intervening barriers

For a construction project such as the proposed project, the construction fleet is expected to include the equipment shown in **Table 2**, which describes the maximal noise level at a reference 50-foot distance and the adjustment to an hourly level.
Table 2
On-Site Construction Equipment Noise Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Name</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Usage Factor¹</th>
<th>Measured Noise @ 50 feet (dB)</th>
<th>Average Noise Level @ 50 feet (dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Loader/Backhoe</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete Saw</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>Loader/Backhoe</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grader</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welder</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forklift</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loader/Backhoe</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>Paver</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving Equip</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixer</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roller</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FHWA’s Roadway Construction Noise Model, 2006
¹Estimates the fraction of time each piece of equipment is operating at full power during a construction operation

The closest receptors to construction noise are the residences across Hall Avenue. These homes are approximately 80 feet from the closest project property line but 120 feet from the closest building façade (Building B). There will not be much grading in the vicinity of Building B. The closest construction activity impacting Hall Avenue residences will be construction activities of Building B which is quieter than demolition and grading. The 120 foot distance separation to the closest façade of Building B will afford approximately -8 dBA of noise attenuation. Although a 6-foot masonry wall is planned along the Hall Avenue property line, no mitigation credit was taken because it is not clear when the wall will be erected. However, erecting the wall before construction begins would lower the residual noise level by about -5 dBA.

The noisiest activity will be filling in the pit. However, when operations begin, equipment will be operating in the bottom of the pit which is about 15 feet lower than grade. Equipment operating in the pit will be about 10 dBA quieter than equipment operating at grade. The center of the pit is about 550 feet from the Hall Avenue residences.

The laydown areas and Building A have a large distance separation to the closest sensitive uses. If Building B is constructed prior to other activity it will provide a large noise barrier with at least 10 dBA of noise attenuation for the Hall Avenue residences.

Table 3 summarizes the distance from the closest sensitive use various construction areas. The table also provides the associated attenuation afforded by the distance separation. Table 4 shows the anticipated construction noise level using the data in Table 3.
Table 3
Distance and Attenuation to Construction Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance at Closest Sensitive Use to:</th>
<th>Distance to Construction Activity (feet)</th>
<th>Distance Attenuation (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building A</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center of Site</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building B</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Point (stationary) source drop off rate of 6.0 dBA per doubling of distance.

Table 4 shows the expected residual noise level at the closest sensitive use:

Table 4
Construction Equipment Noise Levels by Activity Location at Closest Sensitive (dBA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Name</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Building A</th>
<th>Pit</th>
<th>Center of Site</th>
<th>Building B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Loader/Backhoe</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete Saw</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>Loader/Backhoe</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grader</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welder</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forklift</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loader/Backhoe</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>Paver</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving Equip</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixer</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roller</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City’s adopted construction noise threshold is 80 dBA Leq during the day. No nocturnal construction is anticipated. Therefore, construction activities that adheres to permissible hours will be less than significant. If the 6-foot CMU boundary wall is erected prior to demolition and grading the residual noise levels will be up to -5 dBA less. If Building B is erected prior to other activities the residual noise levels will be up to -10 dBA less. Therefore, the noise levels shown in Table 4 represent a worst-case condition.

Construction On-Road Travel

Filling in the pit will require import of 80,000 CY of fill material. Over a 40-day period this would equate to 258 daily one way trips with 16 CY trucks. Assuming a 10-hour work day, this would
equate to 26 trips per hour. The traffic noise level associated with 26 hourly trips is 64 dBA Leq or 60.2 dBA for a daily CNEL (64 dBA per hour for 10/24 hours).

On-site noise measurements observed Leqs of 67-68 dBA or CNELs of 69-71 dBA. The addition of 60.2 dBA to 71.0 dBA is 71.3 due to the logarithmic nature of noise. The increase of 0.3 dBA is less than the +3 dBA traffic noise increase significance threshold.

CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY VIBRATION

Construction activities generate ground-borne vibration when heavy equipment travels over unpaved surfaces or when it is engaged in soil movement. The effects of ground-borne vibration include discernible movement of building floors, rattling of windows, shaking of items on shelves or hanging on walls, and rumbling sounds. Vibration related problems generally occur due to resonances in the structural components of a building because structures amplify ground borne vibration. Within the “soft” sedimentary surfaces of much of Southern California, ground vibration is quickly damped out. Groundborne vibration is almost never annoying to people who are outdoors (FTA 2006).

Groundborne vibrations from construction activities rarely reach levels that can damage structures. Because vibration is typically not an issue, very few jurisdictions have adopted vibration significance thresholds. Vibration thresholds have been adopted for major public works construction projects, but these relate mostly to structural protection (cracking foundations or stucco) rather than to human annoyance.

A vibration descriptor commonly used to determine structural damage is the peak particle velocity (ppv) which is defined as the maximum instantaneous positive or negative peak of the vibration signal, usually measured in in/sec. The range of such vibration is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Response To Transient Vibration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Human Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly perceptible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctly perceptible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barely perceptible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Over the years, numerous vibration criteria and standards have been suggested by researchers, organizations, and governmental agencies. As shown in Table 5, according to Caltrans and the FTA, the threshold for structural vibration damage for modern structures is 0.5 in/sec for intermittent sources, which include impact pile drivers, pogo-stick compactors, crack-and-seat equipment, vibratory pile drivers, and vibratory compaction equipment. Older residential structures have a 0.3 in/sec threshold. Below this level there is virtually no risk of building damage.
Table 5
FTA and Caltrans Guideline Vibration Damage Potential Threshold Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>FTA Criteria</th>
<th>PPV (in/sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reinforced concrete, steel or timber (no plaster)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineered concrete and masonry (no plaster)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-engineered timber and masonry buildings</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings extremely susceptible to vibration damage</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Caltrans Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern industrial/commercial buildings</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New residential structures</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older residential structures</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic old buildings</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragile Buildings</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely fragile ruins, ancient monuments</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of Jurupa Valley considers a vibration-related impact to occur if the project would expose a vibration-sensitive receptor to vibration levels that exceed 0.2 in/sec PPV during either long-term operation or construction of the project. The predicted vibration levels generated by construction equipment anticipated for use for this project are shown below in Table 6.

Table 6
Estimated Vibration Levels During Project Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>PPV at 15 ft (in/sec)</th>
<th>PPV at 25 ft (in/sec)</th>
<th>PPV at 40 ft (in/sec)</th>
<th>PPV at 50 ft (in/sec)</th>
<th>PPV at 60 ft (in/sec)</th>
<th>PPV at 80 ft (in/sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large Bulldozer</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded trucks</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bulldozer</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FHWA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment

The calculation to determine PPV at a given distance is:

\[
PPV_{\text{distance}} = PPV_{\text{ref}} \times (25/D)^{1.5}
\]

Where:

- \(PPV_{\text{distance}}\) = the peak particle velocity in inches/second of the equipment adjusted for distance,
- \(PPV_{\text{ref}}\) = the reference vibration level in inches/second at 25 feet, and
- \(D\) = the distance from the equipment to the receiver.

The closest residence to the project property line is 80 feet from the closest project property line. As shown in Table 6, construction impacts at 80-feet would not create a vibration level greater
than 0.2 in/sec. Vibration from project construction or operation would be below the threshold of human perception.

**Operational Activity Vibration**

The maximal equipment operating at once at the site would be three forklifts and a heavy truck. The primary activity area would be at the laydown areas which is far from any sensitive use. Building B could have a truck unloading but the loading docks are on the western building perimeter and an idling truck would be 220 feet from the closest sensitive use. Only a large bulldozer operating 15 feet from a receptor would possibly be capable or exceeding the 0.2 in/sec threshold.

**Operational Noise Impact**

**Project Traffic**

The project expects to generate a maximum of 5 truck trips per day and 248 employee trips. It takes a doubling of traffic to create a +3 dBA noise impact. The maximally impacted roadway is Rubidoux Blvd, which is a highly trafficked road. A recent traffic count from the Riverside County Transportation Department website showed the existing traffic counts on area roadways as shown in Table 7. Table 7 also shows the calculated traffic noise from 248 cars and 5 trucks. The total traffic noise level assumes that all project traffic (253 vehicles) travels on each roadway which would not be possible as vehicles disperse on various roadways. Nevertheless, if each road were to absorb all project traffic and impacts are less-than-significant then dispersed traffic impacts will be much less.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>Existing Noise Level</th>
<th>Project Traffic*</th>
<th>Total (Existing+Proj)</th>
<th>Project Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rubidoux (S 24th)</td>
<td>16,700</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th St (E Rubidoux)</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Avenue (N 28th)</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximal project related traffic impact is much less than the +3 dBA significance thresholds.

**On-Site Outdoor Activity**

The laydown yards will be accessed infrequently. Typically, only one forklift would be in operation at any one time, but as a worst case it was assumed that three forklifts would be operating simultaneously. All forklifts will be equipped with white noise backup alarms. The published noise
The maximal noise level for a forklift is 75 dBA but that assumes back up alarms. Results show that elimination of the tonal characteristic of the 'beeper' would reduce forklift noise levels by around 3 dBA.¹

Three forklifts with white noise backup alarms operating simultaneously could create a maximal noise level of 77 dBA. However, the project laydown area is 900 feet from the closest sensitive use. There will be a 6-foot high masonry wall at the property line. At 900 feet the noise for three forklifts would decay to 52 dBA Leq. The masonry wall would provide -5 dBA of noise attenuation. Therefore, the resultant noise level would be 47 dBA Leq from 3 forklifts operating at the same time, or 42 dBA from a single forklift. The impact from all three forklifts operating simultaneously would meet the 65 dBA daytime noise standard but exceed the 45 dBA nocturnal standard. However, a single forklift would meet both the daytime and nocturnal standard.

A flat-bed truck pass-by would have a noise level of 50.2 dBA Leq. The closest a flatbed truck would come to the sensitive would be at the laydown area. At 900 feet noise would be attenuated to 33 dBA Leq with distance and the CMU noise wall. A single flatbed truck would not exceed daytime or nocturnal noise standards operating on the western portion of the site.

Although the exact use of Building B is not yet known, it was assumed that Building B would also have 3 forklifts in operation at the same time. The loading docks on Building B are on the west side of the building. This location is 220 feet from the closest sensitive use across Hall Avenue and the building itself would provide at least -10 dBA of noise attenuation and the 6-foot CMU masonry wall would also assist in noise attenuation.

Three forklifts with white noise backup alarms can create a maximal noise level of 77 dBA Leq, Distance alone would provide -13 dBA of noise attenuation and the building and building itself and CMU wall would provide at least -10 dBA of noise attenuation. The resultant noise level of 54 dBA for 3 forklifts or 49 dBA Leq for a single forklift is less than the 65 dBA Leq daytime noise threshold. The nocturnal noise standard of 45 dBA Leq would not be met. Therefore, as long as Building B only operates during daytime hours, noise thresholds will be met.

A flat-bed truck traveling to the loading dock at the Building B would create a noise level of 39 dBA Leq due to attenuation and CMU wall. Both daytime and nocturnal thresholds would be met.

The loading and unloading of metal parts could create a clanging noise, but the noise standard is a 10-minute average and a few seconds of clanging would be diluted by the 9 minutes 58 seconds of no clanging.

On-Site Indoor Activity

Both Building A and Building B will be used for equipment repair and maintenance. Although hand tools would be used, so would air guns. Giroux and Associates has measured air guns on several occasions, most recently (August 10, 2017) at the Great Oaks Costco Tire Center in San Jose, California. The Lmax level for Pneumatic “air guns” was found to be 68 dBA at 70 feet.

This noise level was then adjusted for use time, roll up door orientation and distance from the closest receptors to the east. The roll up doors in Building A face north and south. A -5 dBA credit was taken because of off-axis openings. It was observed that air guns operate continuously for approximately one minute in ten for which a -10 dBA time adjustment was taken. The 6-foot CMU masonry wall at the eastern property line was allocated a -5 dBA adjustment. Finally, the building distance separation of 1,400 feet provided a -26 dBA credit. Therefore, the residual noise from an air gun operating in Building A with the roll-up doors open would be 22 dBA for 10-minutes at a sensitive use. Indoor activity at Building A would meet daytime and nocturnal noise thresholds.

Building B is also a concrete structure but is closer to sensitive uses. The roll up doors in Building B face west and therefore a -10 dBA credit is taken because the building itself will block noise. The roll up doors in Building B are 220 feet from sensitive uses which would provide -10 dBA of noise attenuation and the property line wall would provide -5 dBA of attenuation. The residual noise level of an air gun operating in Building B would be 33 dBA for a 10-minute Leq. This is less than the daytime or nocturnal noise threshold. Therefore, indoor activity in both Building A or B could operate at any time without exceeding the noise standard.

SUMMARY

The daytime 8- hour construction noise standard is 80 dBA Leq. This threshold will be met at the closest sensitive use if time of day restrictions are adhered to. The hours of lesser noise sensitivity are:

- Weekdays, between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., and additionally limit high-noise-generating construction activities (e.g., grading, demolition, pile driving) near sensitive receptors to weekdays between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.

With adherence to these daytime limits construction noise will be less than significant. Nocturnal construction would exceed the 70 dBA Leq noise threshold.

Project-related construction traffic noise resulting from infill haul vehicles will not exceed daytime ambient noise.

Project-related construction vibration will be less than the threshold of perception at the closest sensitive use.

Forklifts should not be operated on site prior to 7 am.
A truck can access the loading dock at either Building A or B pre 7 am without causing an exceedance of the 10 minute daytime or nocturnal noise standards.

Indoor activity in both Building A or B will not exceed the daytime or nocturnal noise standards.
**Direction Photo Taken:**

South

**Description:**

View of the northern portion of the subject property, 2434 Rubidoux Boulevard.

---

**Date:**

3/6/18

**Direction Photo Taken:**

West

**Description:**

View of the office building located on the northwestern portion of the property. This building is currently occupied by two customer service representatives.
**Direction Photo Taken:**

East

**Description:**

View of former sheds used to store raw product materials, located in the north central portion of the property.

---

**Date:**

3/6/18

**Direction Photo Taken:**

North

**Description:**

View of the abandoned batch plant/former concrete manufacturing area located in the north-central portion of the property.
**Direction Photo Taken:**

West

**Description:**

View of the abandoned batch plant/former concrete manufacturing area located in the north-central portion of the property.

---

**Date:** 3/6/18

**Direction Photo Taken:**

East

**Description:**

View of the gravel pit located in the central/southeastern portion of the subject property with leftover concrete casts from Inland Concrete Enterprises, Inc.
### Direction Photo Taken:
South

### Description:
View of leftover concrete product from Oldcastle Precast, and adjacent carnival storage in the background.

---

### Direction Photo Taken:
North

### Description:
View of the concrete pouring ramp located in the central portion of the subject property.

---

Date: 3/6/18
**Description:**

View of the adjacent Engelauf Processing and Recycling Base Materials located adjacent to the northeast of the subject property.

**Date:**

3/6/18

**Direction Photo Taken:**

Northeast
Direction Photo Taken:
West

Description:
View of the former Belltown Sanitary Landfill (inactive) with monitoring well and stormwater channel (yellow arrow) pictured, located adjacent to the southwest of the subject property.

Date: 3/6/18

Direction Photo Taken:
West

Description:
View of the adjacent Rubidoux Boulevard and StorAmerica Self Storage (2431 Rubidoux Boulevard) to the northwest of the subject property.
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Typical Kiewit Storage Equipment
ATTACHMENT NO. 5

Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. Brochures
Kiewit is one of North America's largest and most respected construction and engineering organizations, with 2017 revenues of $8.7 billion. Kiewit's size and experience provide the stability, predictability and know-how our clients and partners expect — and the flexibility and overall best value they deserve.

**KIEWIT'S EQUIPMENT FLEET**

Our work demands require we employ the most modern and technologically advanced equipment available. Boasting 14,200 units with a replacement value of $2.3 billion, our fleet helps build some of the most remarkable work in North America and Australia.

**EQUIPMENT SUCCESS**

We're proud to have one of the largest and most diverse equipment fleets in North America, supported by a thorough equipment management program.

As equipment drives nearly all of our operations, the Kiewit equipment team is dedicated to ensuring:

- Safe and compliant equipment operations
- Maximum equipment reliability
- Cost-effective equipment operations
- Access to the most modern and technologically advanced fleet available
FOREFRONT OF TECHNOLOGY

Dating back to the 1930s and the first use of the LeTourneau scraper, Kiewit has always been at the forefront of new equipment technology.

Kiewit has deployed nearly 11,300 telematics devices within its equipment fleet to date to collect and transmit real-time machine information. This information is effectively used to improve the safety and productivity of our equipment operations, as well as overall fleet management. Our personnel are also enabled through app-based mobility tools that allow instant field communications.

Through proactive maintenance programs and real-time health monitoring, we help projects stay on schedule with a reliable and productive fleet.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENT

Kiewit is committed to being an environmental steward in all aspects of our work—including equipment operations. Through the use of technology and sound operational practices, our areas of focus are:

- Reducing engine idling
- Maximizing fuel efficiency
- Eliminating leaks and spills

Kiewit's equipment fleet boasts 14,200 UNITS with a replacement value of $2.3 BILLION.
Kiewit's roots can be traced back to 1884, when two brothers took a dream, some bricks and a little bit of mortar and built the foundation for what would become one of the largest and most respected construction, mining and engineering organizations in North America and beyond.

**THE KIEWIT COMMITMENT**

Kiewit's commitment to safety, quality and environmental stewardship is engrained in everything we do. It's visible in our core values, the work that we build and in our people.

- *Nobody Gets Hurt:* Safety comes above all else. To us, nothing is more important than the safety of the men and women on our project sites and the surrounding public.
- *Right the first time:* We stake our reputation on it. Kiewit has a formal quality program that enables us to build work right the first time and allows us to use continuous improvement to meet or exceed our clients' expectations.
- *What we do matters.* Because of this, our employees realize they have a responsibility to build our work like the corporate citizens that we are — and with the highest regard to environmental compliance. After all, we build in our own backyards as much as we do yours.

**OUR CORE VALUES**

People. Integrity. Excellence. Stewardship. Our strong and meaningful values have defined Kiewit's success and longevity. Kiewit's leaders and workforce continue to ensure that our values remain at the core of everything we do.

**QUALITY PEOPLE**

Kiewit people are defined by a willingness to take on challenges, explore new ideas and perform at their best.

- The Kiewit workforce includes 9,500 core staff and 12,500 skilled craft workers.
- Kiewit is owned by active employees, creating a level of motivation that keeps the company on top.
- Our people make Kiewit a career. The average tenure is an impressive 26 years for executives, 24 years for district managers, 16 years for project managers and 11 years for superintendents.
- Kiewit has LEED®-accredited professionals who are trained to achieve green objectives and support green designs.
### Market Diversity

Kiewit offers services in a variety of markets, successfully delivering some of the most challenging projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil, gas &amp; chemical</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/wastewater</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on 2017 construction and design operating revenues as reported to ENR.

No job is too large or too small. We deliver world-class solutions to projects of every size.

### Financial Stability

In 2017, Kiewit had revenues of $8.7 billion. With no operational long-term debt, our strong balance sheet offers clients the assurance that their projects will get completed.

### Resources

You can’t accomplish what we do every day without one of the largest and most modern privately-owned equipment fleets in North America. It boasts 14,200 units with a replacement value of $2.3 billion.

---

Kiewit’s ability to **Self-Perform Our Work** is a fundamental differentiator for many of our clients.

---

*Based on 2017 contract values.*
ATTACHMENT NO. 6

Detailed Project Description and Public Hearing Notice
NOTICE OF A PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING
INFORMATION SHEET FOR THE “KIEWIT” PROJECT MA18056 (CUP18002)

INTRODUCTION

The City of Jurupa Valley will consider an application for a contractor's storage yard requested by Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. which would redevelop the former Old Castle Precast site located near your neighborhood. The subject site is located at 2434 & 2456 Rubidoux Blvd. at the southeast corner of Rubidoux Blvd. and 24th Street (APNs: 178-330-005, 006 & 008).

In addition to the contractor storage yard, this project proposes two new industrial buildings (25,000 and 38,000 square feet), complete site renovation including public right-of-way improvements (i.e. new sidewalk, curb and gutter and landscaped parkways), fencing, perimeter walls and increased landscaped buffering setbacks along Rubidoux Blvd., 24th Street and Hall Avenue.

The City welcomes any comments from the public on this project. If you have any comments or need assistance, please contact Rocio Lopez, who can also provide assistance in Spanish.

City Contact: Rocio Lopez, Senior Planner / email: rlopez@jurupavalley.org
City Address: 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA
City Telephone: 951-332-6464 x 212

“KIEWIT” PROJECT LOCATION AND SKETCH OF PROJECT
PROJECT INFORMATION

The subject site consists of a combined 19.5 acre property which will be developed in two phases. Phase 1 includes the construction of a 25,000 square foot building (Bldg. A) located near the western portion of the site, close to Rubidoux Blvd. on Parcel 1. The building will be used to equipment storage, maintenance and related operations. The project includes a vehicle fueling and wash area for Kiewit’s vehicles only, a ramp, scale and contactor storage yard for equipment parking and laydown areas.

Phase 1 also includes all perimeter public right-of-way improvements, fencing, walls and landscaped buffered setbacks along Rubidoux Blvd., 24th Street and Hall Avenue.

Phase 2 includes the construction of a 38,000 square foot industrial building (Bldg. B) located along the eastern portion of the site, on Parcels 2 and 3. This building will serve to screen operations from the site from residential land uses located east of Hall Avenue. Kiewit anticipates that Phase 2 will be developed after the completion of Phase 1 and uses within Bldg. B must comply with zoning code.

Kiewit Corporation is a heavy civil and industrial contractor. Throughout Southern California the company is active building and engineering power, water/wastewater and road/bridge/rail transportation projects. Kiewit states that they focus on environmentally focused and renewable projects and that they have a reputation for project safety and quality and are active corporate partners where they live and work.

CITY PROCESS AND PUBLIC HEARING

This project requires a public hearing by the Planning Commission which will take place on March 27, 2019 (detailed information about the hearing time, date and place is shown on the following page). This notice is to notify you of the Planning Commission’s public hearing and provide you with the project’s information. At the hearing, the Planning Commission will make the decision to approve, deny or continue this project to a future date.

The City welcomes your comments on this project. Please submit all written comments on the proposed Project by (1) mail to City Hall or (2) email Rocio Lopez, Senior Planner, no later than 12:00 p.m., March 27, 2019. If you challenge this Project in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised during the public review period on the propose Mitigated Negative Declaration or at the future public hearings.

Property owners and residents whose property is outside of the mailing list area are also welcome to attend the hearing or submit their comments to the City. You may invite others in your neighborhood who may not have received a notice. More information about the project is on the next page.

City Contact: Rocio Lopez, Senior Planner / email: rlopez@jurupavalley.org
City Address: 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA
City Telephone: 951-332-6464 x 212
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT INFORMATION &amp; PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASE NUMBER(S)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPLICANT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT LOCATION(S)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **PROJECT**                                   | • Property zoned M-SC (Manufacturing, Service Commercial)  
• Property within the LI (Light Industrial) land use  
• Kiewit proposes contractor storage yard with two new industrial buildings (25,000 and 38,000 square feet) on combined 19.5 acre site  
• Complete site renovation  
• New perimeter fencing, walls, increased landscape setback buffering from 25 to 40 feet  
• New public right-of-way improvements (i.e. new sidewalk, curb and gutter and landscaped parkways) |
| **CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)** | The City of Jurupa Valley has prepared and intends to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Project. The public review period for the environmental document began on March 7, 2019 and will end on March 26, 2019. Copies of the MND and supporting documents are available for public review and inspection during the City’s normal working hours (Mon. – Fri., 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., excluding City holidays). |
| **ADDRESS WHERE DOCUMENTS MAY BE VIEWED**    | City Hall at 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509 |
| **DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF HEARING**          | March 27, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. at:  
City of Jurupa Valley, City Council Chambers  
8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509 |
INTRODUCCIÓN

La Ciudad de Jurupa Valley considerará una aplicación para una área de almacenamiento de un contratista solicitado por Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. en el antiguo sitio de Old Castle Precast ubicado cerca de su vecindario. El sitio del sujeto se encuentra en 2434 y 2456 Rubidoux Blvd. en la esquina sureste de Rubidoux Blvd. y la calle 24 (APN: 178-330-005, 006 y 008).

Además de la área de almacenamiento del contratista, este proyecto propone dos nuevos edificios industriales (25,000 y 38,000 pies cuadrados), una renovación completa del sitio que incluye mejoramiento del derecho de paso público (es decir, una nueva acera, bordillo y canaletas y vías verdes ajardinadas), cercos, muros perimetrales y mayores contratiempos de amortiguación de búferes a lo largo de Rubidoux Blvd., 24th Street y Hall Avenue.

La Ciudad agradece cualquier comentario del público sobre este proyecto. Si tiene algún comentario o necesita ayuda, comuníquese con Rocio López, quien también puede brindarle asistencia en español.

Contacto de la Ciudad: Rocio Lopez, Senior Planner / Correo electrónico: rlopez@jurupavalley.org
Dirección de la Ciudad: 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley
Teléfono: 951-332-6464 x 212

“KIEWIT” LOCALIZACIÓN Y DISEÑO DEL PROYECTO
INFORMACIÓN DEL PROYECTO

El sitio del sujeto consiste en una propiedad combinada de 19.5 acres que se desarrollará en dos fases. La Fase 1 incluye la construcción de un edificio de 25,000 pies cuadrados (Edif. A) ubicado cerca de la parte oeste del sitio, cerca de Rubidoux Blvd. en la parcela 1. El edificio se utilizará para el almacenamiento de equipos, el mantenimiento y las operaciones relacionadas. El proyecto incluye un área de carga y lavado de vehículos para los vehículos de Kiewit, un patio de almacenamiento de rampas, básculas y contactores para el estacionamiento de equipos y áreas de colocación.

La Fase 1 también incluye todos los periféricos de derecho de paso públicos, cercas, muros y contratiempos en zonas verdes a lo largo de Rubidoux Blvd., 24th Street y Hall Avenue.

La Fase 2 incluye la construcción de un edificio industrial de 38,000 pies cuadrados (Edificio B) ubicado a lo largo de la parte este del sitio, en las Parcelas 2 y 3. Este edificio servirá para proteger las operaciones del sitio desde los usos de los terrenos residenciales ubicados al este del Hall Avenida. Kiewit anticipa que la Fase 2 se desarrollará después de la finalización de la Fase 1 y se utilizará dentro de Bldg. B debe cumplir con el código de zonificación.

La Corporation Kiewit es un contratista de proyectos civiles e industriales pesados. A lo largo del sur de California, la empresa está trabajando activamente en proyectos de construcción, ingeniería, energía / aguas residuales y transporte por carretera / puente / ferrocarril. Kiewit afirma que se centran en proyectos renovables y centrados en el medio ambiente y que tienen una reputación de seguridad y calidad de proyecto y son socios corporativos activos donde viven y trabajan.

PROCESO DEL AYUNTAMIENTO Y AUDIENCIA PÚBLICA

Este proyecto requiere una audiencia pública por parte de la Comisión de Planificación que se llevará a cabo el 27 de Marzo del 2019 (la información detallada sobre la hora, la fecha y el lugar de la audiencia se muestra en la página siguiente). Este aviso es para notificarle de la audiencia pública de la Comisión de Planificación y proporcionarle la información del proyecto. En la audiencia, la Comisión de Planificación tomará la decisión de aprobar, denegar o continuar este proyecto a una fecha futura.

La Ciudad agradece su comentario para el proyecto Kiewit. Por favor envíe todos los comentarios escritos sobre el Proyecto propuesto por (1) correo al Ayuntamiento o (2) correo electrónico a Rocio López, Planificador Senior, a más tardar a las 12:00 p.m. 27 de Marzo de 2019. Si impugna este Proyecto en la corte, puede estar limitado a plantear solo los problemas que usted u otra persona planteó durante el período de revisión pública en la Declaración Negativa Mitigada propuesta o en las futuras audiencias públicas.

Los propietarios de propiedades y los residentes cuya propiedad se encuentra fuera del área de la lista de correo también pueden asistir a la audiencia o enviar sus comentarios a la Ciudad. Puede invitar a otras personas de su vecindario que no hayan recibido una notificación. Más información sobre el proyecto está en la página siguiente.

Contacto de la Ciudad: Rocio Lopez, Senior Planner / Correo electrónico: rlopez@jurupavalley.org
Dirección de la Ciudad: 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA
Teléfono: 951-332-6464 x 212
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMACIÓN DEL PROYÉCTO Y INFORMACIÓN SOBRE LA AUDIENCIA PÚBLICA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NÚMERO DE CASO(S)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOLICITANTE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UBICACIÓN DEL PROYECTO(S)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **PROPUESTA** | • Propiedad zonificada M-SC (Manufactura, Servicio Comercial)  
• Propiedad dentro del uso del suelo LI (Light Industrial)  
• Kiewit propone un patio de almacenamiento con dos nuevos edificios industriales (25,000 y 38,000 pies cuadrados) en un sitio combinado de 19.5 acres  
• Renovación completa del sitio  
• Nuevo cercado perimetral, paredes, aumento del amortiguamiento del retroceso del paisaje de 25 a 40 pies  
• Nuevas mejoras públicas del derecho de paso (es decir, nuevas aceras, bordillos y canaletas y parques) |
| **LEY DE CALIDAD AMBIENTAL DE CALIFORNIA (CEQA)** | La Ciudad de Jurupa Valley ha preparado y tiene la intención de adoptar una Declaración Negativa Mitigada (MND) para el Proyecto. El período de revisión pública para el documento ambiental comenzó el 7 de Marzo del 2019 y finalizará al 26 de Marzo del 2019. Las copias de la MND y los documentos de respaldo están disponibles para su revisión e inspección pública durante las horas normales de trabajo de la Ciudad (lunes a viernes). 8:00 am a 5:00 pm, excluyendo los días festivos de la ciudad). |
| **DIRECCIÓN DONDE DOCUMENTOS PUEDEN SER VISTOS** | Ciudad de Jurupa Valley en 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509 |
| **FECHA, HORA Y LUGAR DE LA AUDIENCIA** | 27 de Marzo del 2019 a las 7:00 de la tarde en:  
Ciudad de Jurupa Valley, Cámara del Consejo  
8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509 |
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1,000 foot radius map
EXPANDED INFLUENCE PARCELS - GO TO END OF BLOCK
ATTACHMENT NO. 8

Development Plans
(Architectural Set; Civil Set and Concept Landscape Plan Set)
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS STORED:

- Motor Oils
- Vehicle and Equipment Lubricants
- Diesel Fuel
- Gasoline
- Spray Paint for Touching Up Equipment
- WD40
- Brake Cleaner
- Safety Solvent
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CONCRETE TILT-UP WALL, PAINT
HOLLOW METAL DOOR
2" REVEAL, AND AT PANEL

STOREFRONT:
DARK BRONZE

WINDOW GLAZING:
DARK GRAY

CONCRETE WALLS PAINT:
DUNN EDWARDS PAINT:
DE6362 - STORM CLOUD

CONCRETE WALLS PAINT:
DUNN EDWARDS PAINT:
LRV 10 - CHERRY COLOR

WALK DOORS, ROLLING DOORS:
DUNN EDWARDS PAINT:
DE6364 - CAVERNOUS

CONCRETE WALLS, BOLLARDS PAINT:
DUNN EDWARDS PAINT:
DE5384 - SPICY MUSTARD

CONCRETE WALLS PAINT:
DUNN EDWARDS PAINT:
DE6360 - FOIL
1. Irrigation plans shall comply with the County of Riverside Ordinance for Water Efficient Landscaping.

2. All planter areas shall utilize a drip watering system for low volume application of water.

3. All valves shall have pressure regulation and flow sensing devises for flow-monitored irrigation will be used.

4. Controllers shall be "smart" controllers utilizing the latest technology for water control and monitoring. All controllers shall also have evapotranspiration managers or similar devices for weather based adjustments.
EXISTING SITE ALONG 24TH ST.

BLDG. "B" LANDSCAPE AT 24TH ST. FRONTAGE (FACING SOUTH)

CIVIL ENG.- SECTION AT 24TH ST.
EXISTING SITE ALONG HALL AVE.

BLDG. "B" LANDSCAPE AT HALL AVE. FRONTAGE (FACING WEST)

CIVIL ENG. - SECTION AT HALL AVE.