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.

STUDY SESSION

1. 6:00 P.M. – Call to Order and Roll Call for Study Session
   - Corey Moore, Chair
   - Arleen Pruitt, Chair Pro Tem
   - Mariana Lopez
   - Penny Newman
   - Guillermo Silva

2. Public Appearance/Comments
3. Commission Business – Study Session


The pre-application review of a proposed project is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act.

RECOMMENDATION

Receive an introduction of the project design and identify concerns or requests for additional information for staff to address at the public hearing(s). No action will be taken on this item

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

3A. Public Appearance/Comments (30 minutes)

3B. Continued Study Session (If necessary)


The pre-application review of a proposed project is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act.

RECOMMENDATION

Receive an introduction of the project design and identify concerns or requests for additional information for staff to address at the public hearing(s). No action will be taken on this item

4. Approval of Agenda

5. Approval of Minutes

   5.1 March 27, 2019 Regular Meeting

   5.2 April 10, 2019 Regular Meeting

   5.3 April 24, 2019 Regular Meeting
6. Public Hearings

6.1 MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 19070: 2ND REQUEST FOR A ONE (1) YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 36827 – SCHEDULE “A” SUBDIVISION NORTH OF 45TH STREET, EAST OF GOLDEN WEST AVENUE AND WEST OF OPAL STREET (APN: 182-361-009)

The analyses and the conclusions in the Mitigated NegativeDeclaration (MND) adopted by the City on April 22, 2015, remain valid and that by extending the time of approval, the project does not create new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously analyzed impacts as compared to those identified previously and that the project currently under review is “within the scope” of the earlier MND pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 (a).

RECOMMENDATION

By motion, adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-05-08-01 granting the 2nd issuance of a one (1) year Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 36827, subject to the previously adopted Conditions of Approval.

7. Commission Business

7.1 CONFORMANCE OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY’S THREE-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020 THROUGH 2021-2022 WITH THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY GENERAL PLAN

Pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), Chapter 3, Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 15378(b)(4), City staff determined that the City of Jurupa Valley’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Year 2019/2020 through Fiscal Year 2021/2022 are not a project as defined by CEQA.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 2019-05-08-02 finding that the City of Jurupa Valley’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Year 2019-2020 (FY 19/20) is consistent with the City of Jurupa Valley’s General Plan.

8. Public Appearance/Comments

9. Planning Commissioner's Reports and Comments

10. Planning Department Report

11. Adjournment to the May 22, 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.
STAFF REPORT

DATE: MAY 8, 2019
TO: CHAIR MOORE AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR
BY: ANNETTE TAM, SENIOR PLANNER
SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 3.1
MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 18186 [PAR18006]
PROPOSAL: “LA RUE APARTMENTS” – 66-UNIT MULTI-FAMILY COMPLEX ON 3.75 ACRES
LOCATION: SOUTHEAST CORNER OF CANAL STREET & LA RUE STREET (APNS: 179-021-001 AND 179-051-001)
APPLICANT: LZ DEVELOPMENT, LLC

RECOMMENDATION
Receive an introduction of the project design and identify item (concerns or request for additional information) that staff will need to address prior to the public hearing(s).

INTRODUCTION OF PROJECT
The applicant proposes a 66-unit apartment complex on the southeast corner of La Rue Street and Canal Street. Exhibit A presents the vicinity map. The surrounding area is mostly vacant except for Paramount Estates. Paramount Estates is located approximately 140 feet north of the project site. The project site and Paramount Estates are separated by Canal Street, La Canada and Union Pacific Railroad tracks.

Last year, the applicant had proposed a four-story 80-unit apartment complex. The applicant has reduced it to three stories and a total number of 66 units due to the following reasons:

- Reduce the visual impact of four-story apartment building
- New information: The applicant received new information that the width of the railroad easement along Canal Street is wider. As a result, the property is much shallower. There is less land to accommodate required parking spaces for 80-units while maintaining the same amount of amenities.

The original proposed density was 21.3 dwelling units per acre and current proposed density is 17.6 dwelling units per acre. The proposed project will require the following entitlement applications:

1. Change of Zone (CZ): Change the underlying zoning classification from R-1 (One-Family Dwelling) to R-3 (General Residential)
2. Site Development Permit (SDP): Apartments
The proposed 66-unit apartment complex is intended to be rental units. The proposed density is 17.6 dwelling units per acre and the General Plan allows a maximum of 25 dwelling units per acre for this project site.

**TABLE 1: GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

| TOTAL ACREAGE OF PROJECT SITE | Total: 3.75 acres  
| APN 179-051-001 – 0.69 acres (proposed landscaping)  
| APN 179-021-001 – 3.06 acres (proposed apartments) |
| EXISTING GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION | Highest Density Residential (HHDR) – maximum of 25 dwelling units per acre (location of proposed apartments)  
| Light Industrial (LI) (location of proposed landscaping) |
| EXISTING ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS | R-1 (One-Family Dwelling) |

**EXHIBIT A. LOCAL VICINITY MAP (SOURCE: GOOGLE)**
PROJECT DETAILS. This section will cover the following two topics: (A) overall project and (B) core developmental issues.

A. OVERALL PROJECT. The proposed project is for a 66-unit apartment complex on 3.75 acres. The project site abuts La Rue Street on the westerly property line and Canal Street on the northerly property line. It is an irregularly-shaped parcel. The parcel is shallow and it is very narrow on the easterly portion of the parcel. The easterly portion will remain as an open space area. See Exhibit B “Project Site.”

The apartment building is three-stories at 35 feet in height. The building is 86,985 square-feet. It is located 55'-10" from La Rue Street, 10'-0" from Canal and 55'-5" from State Route 60 (SR-60). Most of the building is surrounded by parking area (total 144 parking spaces) as shown on the site plan. The parking spaces located along Canal Street, La Rue Street, and SR-60 is covered parking spaces (carports). There is on-site landscaping surrounding the perimeter of the project site.

Of the total 66 units, there are 12 one-bedroom units, 42 two-bedroom units, and 12 three-bedroom units. Table 2 presents the size of the unit and the estimated rental rates. The applicant is expecting a portion of the tenants to be students from University of California, Riverside. A few students may rent one unit together and could have a combined income of $72,000.00. The targeted household income is considered moderate level household income.

The City’s median household income is $62,286.00 in 2017 and the County’s median household income is $60,807.00 (United States Census Bureau). Based on the County’s median household income of $60,807.00, the monthly household income is approximately $5,000.00. An affordable housing cost of a rental unit is considered 30% of the household income. Thus, a rental rate of not more than $1,500.00 per month is considered affordable for moderate level income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2. ESTIMATED SIZE OF UNIT &amp; RENTAL RATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF UNIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-bedroom unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-bedroom unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-bedroom unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If this project is for ownership of each unit (instead of rental units), the code only requires an additional application for a condominium map.

CORE ISSUES.
There are several core issues for this project: (1) density, (2) freeway buffer, (3) amenities, and (4) architecture.

1. Density. As part of the 2017 General Plan adoption, the City Council changed this project site’s land use designation to Highest Density Residential (HHDR) from Medium Density Residential (MDR).

HHDR allows a minimum density of 20 dwelling units per acre and a maximum density of 25 dwelling units per acre on this project site. The project proposes a density of 17.6 dwelling units per acre. Thus, the project must provide at least an additional 9 units, for a total of 75 units, in order to be consistent with the density range.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)
In the 2017 adopted Housing Element, the General Plan program HE.1.1.1 required the City to redesignate at least 32.4 acres of land to HHDR to meet the 438 dwelling units for the extremely low/very low categories of the City’s Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation. However, California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has agreed that the City can reduce the total number of additional acres from 32.4 acres to 16 acres assuming the HHDR land is built to the maximum density of 25 dwelling units per acre.

In March 2019, the City Council initiated amendments to the General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map to implement the redesignation to HHDR and consistent zoning for the additional 16 acres. The staff has identified 55 sites (total 196.2 acres) that may be suited for higher density. Staff is evaluating each site and will bring forward a recommendation to the Planning Commission for redesignating and rezoning a minimum of 16 acres.

If the density of this project is not increased to 25 dwelling units per acre, it will not be included in the 16 acres needed to provide housing for extremely low/very low income categories.

Surrounding Area
The surrounding area has a mixture of land use designations: Medium Density Residential (5 du/acre), Medium High Density Residential (8 du/acre), and Highest Density Residential (25 du/acre). See Exhibit D for the General Plan Land Use Map.

Paramount Estates is a single-family neighborhood with a land use designation of MDR (5 dwelling units / acre). This neighborhood is north of La Canada Drive. Directly to the north, location of the Rio Vista Specific Plan, the open space land is designated as Conservation.

To the east of this project site, the currently vacant land has land use designations are Light Industrial, Medium Density Residential (“Emerald Ridge North”) and Highest Density Residential (“Emerald Ridge South” project). This area used to be entirely Light Industrial but it has changed to residential as part of the 2017 General Plan adoption.
2. **Amenities.** The applicant has proposed the following amenities for the residents:
   a. Indoor gym
   b. Outdoor patio area
   c. Open space / passive parks with picnic benches

Most of the open space / passive park area are located in the eastern portion of the site where it is a challenge to develop. Staff will further evaluate if the proposed amenities are sufficient for the residents.

3. **Buffer from Freeway and Roadways.** The project site is located adjacent to State Route 60 (SR-60) to the south, La Rue to the west, and Canal Street to the north. The project would be required to buffer from the freeway and the abutting roadways. Staff is concerned of noise and air quality adjacent to the freeway and aesthetics from La Rue Street and Canal Street. Additionally, staff’s intent is for this project to beautify La Rue Street and Canal Street.

   **State Route-60 (SR-60).** There is an existing chain link fence between the project site and the freeway. Along the chain link fence on the freeway, there is a row of trees on the Caltrans side (not on project site). Certain places along this row are gaps between trees. Staff is considering recommending the requirement of a sound wall along the property line next to SR-60. The carport must have a back wall along SR-60 for further mitigation and buffer. Further analysis of the project and possible solutions to address staff’s concerns will be completed during the entitlement process.
La Rue Street & Canal Street. The applicant has proposed landscaping and carports along La Rue Street and Canal Street. The apartment is approximately 55 feet away from La Rue Street and partially on Canal Street. The eastern apartment building is setback approximately 10 feet away from Canal Street. There is a landscape planter between the apartment building and the curb.

Staff will further evaluate solutions to beautify the streetscape and provide buffers from the street for the residents. The carports must have a back wall along the streets to screen the vehicles from public view and enhance the streetscape.

4. Architecture. The proposed architecture for the apartments is a good start. The architecture includes several earth-tone colors and different textures to define the base of the structure and provide stronger vertical elements of the façade. It is appropriately proportionate and the balconies break up the long blank walls. Staff is considering recommending that the applicant improve the architecture by adding more details between the balconies and roof lines. Additionally, staff would recommend that the architecture of the carports and trash enclosures be designed to be compatible with the architecture of the apartments.
DISCUSSION TOPICS FOR PLANNING COMMISSION

Feedback from Individual Planning Commissioners:

1. Density
2. Amenities
3. Freeway Buffer
4. Architecture
5. Other items or information to be addressed at the workshop

NEXT STEPS

Generally, the next steps consist of the following (some steps are concurrent):

• Submit entitlement applications for processing
• Review of applications
• Public hearings by the Planning Commission and the City Council. The City Council takes the action on this project and there are no appeals.

Prepared by: Annette Tam
Senior Planner

Submitted by: Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director

Reviewed by:

//s// Serita Young
Deputy City Attorney

ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed Plans (29 pages) that includes conceptual site plans, elevations, and floor plans
1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The Regular Session of the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. on March 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. Pledge of Allegiance – Commissioner Lopez

3. Public Appearance/Comments - None

4. Approval of the Agenda

Chair Pro Tem Pruitt moved, and Commissioner Lopez seconded, a motion to approve the March 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 Silva moved and Commissioner Newman seconded, a motion to approve the February 27, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes with corrections. The motion was approved 5:0

Ayes: Lopez, Moore, Newman, Pruitt, Silva
Noes: None
Abstained: None
Absent: None
Commissioner Lopez moved and Commissioner Silva seconded, a motion to approve the March 13, 2019 Lack of Quorum Planning Commission Minutes. The motion was approved 5:0

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

6. PUBLIC HEARING


Ms. Rocio Lopez, Senior Planner, provided a PowerPoint presentation and summarized the background and project description. The applicant, Kiewit Infrastructure West Co., proposes to redevelop the 19.5-acre property from the former Old Castle Precast construction site. The project proposed consists of the following:

- 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.

Ms. Lopez stated public outreach had been conducted by the applicant, who stated it resulted in support of the proposal. An Environmental Review had been directed with staff recommending a condition which requires that all mitigation measures of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program be incorporated into the Conditions of Approval.

Mr. Tim Jeffery and Mr. Steve Clem from Kiewit presented a PowerPoint detailing the proposed site and the improvements as well as noting approximate number of employees to be at the site and hours of operation.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

No Public Speakers

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED
COMMISSIONER DELIBERATION

- Staff confirmed that previous on-site tanks were removed
- Concern with arsenic contamination levels – staff confirmed that levels did not exceed CEQA thresholds and Applicant confirmed that arsenic area was limited to the western portion of the site.
- Truck Traffic enforcement
- Current use of existing buildings
- Suggestion to use local Landscapers for renovations
- Use of local employment for future growth
- Condition 9 changed from Phase II to Buildings A and B
- Four Engineering conditions modified
- Commissioners thanked staff for a clear report and presentation

Chair Pro Tem Pruitt moved and Commissioner Newman seconded, a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2019-03-27-01 with modified conditions. The motion was approved 5:0

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

7. Commission Business – None

8. Public Appearance/Comments – None

9. Planning Commissioner’s Reports and Comments – Commissioner Lopez announced she attended the City of Fontana’s public hearing for the Logistics Center proposal and made reference to the city’s Mayor’s statement regarding Vehicle License Registration support and asked Mr. Merrell to clarify.

10. Planning Department Report – Planning Director Mr. Merrell discussed the City of Fontana’s West Valley Logistics Center Public Hearing and noted issues with how the traffic will impact the City of Jurupa Valley and the city’s review of options to be considered. Mr. Merrell discussed upcoming agenda items and noted to the Commissioners there will not be an April 10th meeting.

There being no further business before the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission, Chair Moore adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m. to the April 24th, 2019 Planning Commission meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director
Secretary of the Planning Commission
1. Call to Order and Roll Call
Due to the prior cancelation of the Regular Session, the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission meeting was called to order by the Secretary of the Planning Commission at 7:00 p.m. on April 10, 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
1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Due to the prior cancelation of the Regular Session, the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission meeting was called to order by the Secretary of the Planning Commission at 7:00 p.m. on April 24, 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: MAY 8, 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. 19070: 2ND REQUEST FOR A ONE (1) YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 36827 – SCHEDULE “A” SUBDIVISION

LOCATION: NORTH OF 45TH STREET, EAST OF GOLDEN WEST AVENUE AND WEST OF OPAL STREET (APN: 182-361-009)

APPLICANT: RIXON KEIN, INVESTMENT CITY, LLC
REPRESENTATIVE: SPB ENGINEERING, INC.

RECOMMENDATION
By motion, adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-05-08-01 granting the 2nd issuance of a one (1) year Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 36827, subject to the previously adopted Conditions of Approval.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The Applicant (“Applicant” or “Rixon Kein”) requests a 2nd one (1) year Extension of Time (EOT) for TTM36827, a Schedule “A” subdivision of a 3.35 acre parcel into 13 single-family residential lots with a public street labeled “Lot A” and a water quality basin labeled “Lot B”. Individual parcels will contain a minimum 7,200 square feet with average lot widths of 60 feet and average lot depths of 100 feet. No changes are proposed to the design or layout of the subdivision of land.

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

LOCATION
As shown on Exhibit 1, the site is located between Golden West Avenue and Opal Street, north of 45th Street and at the terminus of Ridgewood Drive. The property is surrounded by single-family homes to the north, south, east and west. Exhibit 2 provides zoning and land use designations of the site and surrounding parcels.
EXHIBIT 1: SITE LOCATION MAP

EXHIBIT 2: LAND USE AND ZONING MAPS

MDR – Medium Density Residential

R-1 (One Family Dwellings)
BACKGROUND
The City’s Planning Commission originally approved TTM36827 and Variance No. 1501 on April 22, 2015, with an expiration date of April 22, 2018, see Attachment 3. The tentative map was then received and filed by the City Council on May 7, 2015.

While TTM36827 was set to expire on April 22, 2018, the Applicant submitted an application for the 1st Extension of Time (EOT) prior to the expiration date. On May 23, 2018, on a 4-0 vote, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2018-05-23-01, approving a one (1) year Extension of Time (EOT) for Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 to April 22, 2019, see Attachment 2.

TTM36827 was approved to allow for the subdivision of a 3.35 acre parcel into 13 single-family residential lots with a public street labeled “Lot A” and a water quality basin labeled “Lot B”. Individual parcels will contain a minimum 7,200 square feet with average lot widths of 60 feet and average lot depths of 100 feet. Variance No. 1501 was approved for a 2.90-foot deviation from the required average lot depth of 100 feet for Lot 13. Lot 13 is proposed with an average lot depth of 97.10 feet. The Tentative Tract Map is provided as an attachment to this report.

TITLE 7 – SUBDIVISIONS / CHAPTER 7.15. - TENTATIVE MAPS

Section 7.15.230.A. of Chapter 7.15 of the City’s Municipal Code provides that the Planning Commission may extend an approved or conditionally approved tentative map for a period or periods not exceeding a total of six (6) years upon application of the subdivider filed prior to the expiration of the tentative map.

While TTM36827 was set to expire on April 22, 2019, the Applicant submitted an application for an EOT on March 13, 2019, prior to the expiration date. This application is therefore the 2nd one (1) year EOT request with a future expiration date of April 22, 2020, if approved. There are no changes proposed to the previously approved map design or layout. The purpose of the EOT is to allow the applicant enough time to process the final map.

With respect to approved Variance No. 1501, Section 9.240.270. (Variances) states:

E. Use of variance. Any variance that is granted shall be used within one (1) year from the effective date thereof, or within such additional time as may be set in the conditions of approval, which shall not exceed a total of three (3) years, except that a variance in connection with a land division may be used during the same period of time that the land division approval may be used.

As such, the approval of the 2nd one (1) year EOT for TTM36827 concurrently extends the life of Variance No. 1501 for the same period of time.

ANALYSIS

Planning and Engineering staff reviewed the City issued conditions of approval for TTM36827, (see Exhibit A of Attachment 1). Staff determined that TTM36827 and the City’s conditions of approval are consistent with the City’s Municipal Code and newly adopted General Plan Land Use designation. Additionally, the map is consistent with the goals and policies within the City’s Housing Element including, but not limited to:

HE 1: Encourage and where possible, assist in the development of quality housing to meet the City’s share of the region’s housing needs for all income levels and for special needs populations; and

HE 4: Maintain and enhance residential neighborhoods and remove blight.
Additionally, the map was circulated to various internal and external agencies for review and comment, with no agency or department having concerns with the EOT.

The processing of the EOT and subsequent processing and recording of TTM36827, as determined by staff, would be consistent with the Title 7, Subdivisions, of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and with the State’s Subdivision Map Act. Previously adopted conditions of approval from TTM36827 would still apply and remain unchanged.

Status of Final Map

The Applicant indicates that the final map with improvement and grading plans will be submitted to the City within 60 days from approval of this 2nd EOT request. The Applicant anticipates having the final map recorded by April 22, 2020.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

On April 22, 2015, the City adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the project in compliance with CEQA. The EOT request has been evaluated against the previous analysis in the MND to ensure that extending the approval time does not create new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously analyzed impacts as compared to those identified previously.

The City’s CEQA Administrator finds that that the analyses and the conclusions in the MND adopted by the City on April 22, 2015, remain valid and that by extending the time of approval, the project does not create new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously analyzed impacts as compared to those identified previously and that the project currently under review is “within the scope” of the earlier Mitigated Negative Declaration pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 (a), see Attachment 4.

CONCLUSION

Staff has found the proposed extension of time for TTM36827 to be in conformance with the City’s Municipal Code and General Plan. The subject site is physically suitable for the type of development and proposed land use. The design of the project will not cause substantial environmental damage, harm any wildlife, nor cause serious public health problems, as demonstrated in the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted for this project and as further analyzed by the city’s CEQA Administrator.

Prepared by: Rocio Lopez
Senior Planner

Submitted by: Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director
ATTACHMENTS

2. Adopted Planning Commission Resolution No. 2015-04-22-01 with Conditions of Approval
3. Planning Commission Staff Report (dated April 22, 2015 w/o exhibits)
4. Previous Environmental Document Review Determination (4-24-19)
5. TTM36827 (Dated 1-20-15)
ATTACHMENT NO. 1

Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-05-08-01
A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY APPROVING A SECOND ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 36827 FOR A SCHEDULE “A” SUBDIVISION OF APPROXIMATELY 3.35 GROSS ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED NORTH OF 45TH STREET, EAST OF GOLDEN WEST AVENUE, AND WEST OF OPAL STREET (APN: 182-361-009) IN THE ONE FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1) ZONE, AND DETERMINING NO FURTHER CEQA REVIEW REQUIRED

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

Section 1. Project. Rixon Kein (the “Applicant”) has applied for a second one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 (Master Application No. 19070 or MA No. 19070) for a Schedule “A” subdivision of 3.35 acres into 13 single family residential lots with a public street labeled “Lot A” and a water quality basin labeled “Lot B” on real property located north of 45th Street, east of Golden West Avenue, and west of Opal Street (APN: 182-361-009) in the One Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone and designated Medium Density Residential (MDR) - Country Neighborhood (the “Project”).

Section 2. Extension of Time.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of a second one-year extension of time for Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 to subdivide approximately 3.35 acres of real property located north of 45th Street, east of Golden West Avenue, and west of Opal Street (APN: 182-361-009).

(b) The Planning Commission approved Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 on April 22, 2015, with an expiration date of April 22, 2018.

(c) On May 23, 2018, the Planning Commission approved a one year Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 (Master Application No. 18064), extending the life of Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 to April 22, 2019.

(d) The Applicant filed an application for a second one-year extension of time for Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 on March 13, 2019, prior to the April 22, 2019 expiration date.

(e) Section 7.15.230.A. of Chapter 7.15 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and Government Code Section 66452.6(e) provide that the Planning Commission may extend an approved or conditionally approved tentative map for a period or periods not exceeding a total of six (6) years upon application of the subdivider filed prior to the expiration of the tentative map. Further, Government Code Section 66452.6(e) provides that prior to the expiration of an
approved or conditionally approved tentative map, and upon an application by the subdivider to extend that map, the tentative map shall be automatically extended for sixty (60) days or until the application for the extension is approved, conditionally approved, or denied, whichever occurs first.

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. 19070 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 May 8, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 19070, 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.**

(a) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and the City’s local CEQA Guidelines, City staff has considered the potential environmental impacts of the second one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 36827. City staff has also reviewed the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) prepared for Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 and approved by the Planning Commission on April 22, 2015, including the impacts and mitigation measures identified therein, and prepared a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination in accordance with CEQA for the Project. Based on that review, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department has determined that the Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the prior IS/MND. All potential environmental impacts associated with Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 and the second one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 are adequately addressed by the prior IS/MND, and the mitigation measures contained in the prior IS/MND will reduce those impacts to a level that is less than significant.

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

1) The Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the prior IS/MND; and
2) All potential environmental impacts associated with Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 and the second one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 are adequately addressed by the prior IS/MND, and the mitigation measures contained in the prior IS/MND will reduce those impacts to a level that is less than significant.

(c) The custodian of records for the prior IS/MND, and all other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Planning Commission determination is based, is the Planning Department of the City of Jurupa Valley. Those documents are available for public review in the Planning Department located at 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509.

Section 5. Findings for Approval of Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 36827. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that the proposed second one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 should be granted because:

(a) The proposed second one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 continues to be consistent with the Jurupa Valley 2017 General Plan including, but not limited to, Housing Element Primary Goal HE 1 - “Encourage and where possible, assist in the development of quality housing to meet the City’s share of the region’s housing needs for all income levels and for special needs populations”;

(b) The design or improvement of the land division continues to be consistent with the Jurupa Valley 2017 General Plan including, but not limited to, Housing Element Primary Goal HE 4 - “Maintain and enhance residential neighborhoods and remove blight”;

(c) The site of the land division continues to be physically suitable for the type of development in that the Project, as previously approved, does not create new significant impacts and is consistent with the zoning and land use designation;

(d) The site of the land division continues to be physically suitable for the proposed density of the development in that the subdivision is within the allowable 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre as required within the MDR land use designation and is consistent with the development standards within the R-1 Zone;

(e) The design of the land division or improvements is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage nor substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat, as demonstrated in the prior IS/MND adopted for this Project on April 22, 2015;

(f) The design of the land division or the type of improvements is not likely to cause serious public health problems, as demonstrated in the prior IS/MND adopted for this Project on April 22, 2015; and

(g) The design of the land division or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed land division in that the location of the easements will not conflict in the development of the future single family development.
Section 6. Approval of Master Application No. 19070. Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby approves a second one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 (Master Application No. 19070 or MA No. 19070) for the subdivision of 3.35 acres into 13 single family residential lots with a public street labeled “Lot A” and a water quality basin labeled “Lot B” on real property located north of 45th Street, east of Golden West Avenue, and west of Opal Street (APN: 182-361-009) in the One Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone and designated Medium Density Residential (MDR) - Country Neighborhood. Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 shall expire on April 22, 2020, unless within that period of time the expiration date of April 22, 2020 shall have been extended or a final map shall have been approved and filed with the County Recorder.

Section 7. Certification. The Planning Director shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 8th day of May, 2019.

__________________________
Corey Moore
Chair of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission

ATTEST:

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

I, Thomas G. Merrell, Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-05-08-01 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 8th day of May, 2019, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

NOES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

_________________________________________
THOMAS G. MERRELL
PLANNING DIRECTOR
ATTACHMENT NO. 2

Adopted Planning Commission Resolution No. 2015-4-22-01 with Conditions of Approval
RESOLUTION NO. 2015-4-22-01


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

Section 1. City of Jurupa Valley Land Use Regulatory Authority. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that:

(a) The City of Jurupa Valley incorporated on July 1, 2011.

(b) On July 1, 2011, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2011-01. This Ordinance provides that pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 57376, all ordinances of the County of Riverside that have been applicable within the territory now incorporated as the City of Jurupa Valley, to the extent that they applied before incorporation, shall remain in full force and effect as ordinances of the City of Jurupa Valley, including the Riverside County General Plan. Additionally, Ordinance No. 2011-01 provides that the resolutions, rules and regulations of the County of Riverside that have been applicable in the implementation of the aforesaid ordinances and State laws (including, but not limited to, the California Environmental Quality Act and regulations pertaining to traffic) to the extent that they applied before incorporation shall remain in full force and effect as resolutions, rules and regulations, respectively, of the City of Jurupa Valley. On September 15, 2011, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2011-10, effective October 15, 2011, continuing in effect all ordinances of the County of Riverside that have been applicable within the territory now incorporated as the City of Jurupa Valley, to the extent that they applied before incorporation. These ordinances and resolutions as well as the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code shall be known as “Jurupa Valley Ordinances.”

(c) On September 15, 2011, the City Council also adopted Ordinance No. 2011-09, effective October 15, 2011, adopting Chapter 2.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code establishing the Planning Commission for the City of Jurupa Valley. Chapter 2.35 provides that the Planning Commission shall perform the planning agency functions described in Government Code Section 65100 et seq. and shall fulfill the functions delegated to the Planning Commission for the County of Riverside under the relevant ordinances and resolutions, which
the City has adopted as required upon incorporation. Chapter 2.35 further provides that the Planning Commission shall perform the functions of any and all planning, zoning or code enforcement appeals board created by the relevant County of Riverside ordinances and resolutions, which the City has adopted by reference as required by law.

Section 2. Project. Charlie Kien (the “Applicant”) has applied for Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 and Variance No. 1501 (collectively, Master Application No. 14112 or MA No. 14112) to allow the subdivision of approximately 3.35 acres into 13 single-family residential parcels, a common public street labeled “Lot A” and a water quality basin labeled “Lot B” on real property located north of 45th Street, west of Golden West Avenue and east of Opal Street (APN: 182-361-009-4) in the One-Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone and designated Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR) (the “Project”).

Section 3. Tentative Tract Map.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 36827, a Schedule “A” residential subdivision, to subdivide approximately 3.35 acres into 13 single-family residential parcels, a common public street labeled “Lot A” and a water quality basin labeled “Lot B” on real property located north of 45th Street, west of Golden West Avenue and east of Opal Street (APN: 182-361-009-4).

(b) Section 7.1 of Riverside County Subdivision Ordinance No. 460, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, requires denial of a Tentative Tract Map if it does not meet all of the requirements of Riverside County Subdivision Ordinance No. 460, or if any of the following findings are made:

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

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

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

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

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

6) That the design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements are likely to cause serious public health problems.

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

Section 4.  **Variance.**

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Variance No. 1501 for Lot 13 from the minimum average lot depth requirement of 100 feet set forth in Section 6.2. c. of Riverside County Zoning Ordinance No. 348, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(b) Section 18.27. a. of Riverside County Zoning Ordinance No. 348, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, provides that variances from the terms of Ordinance No. 348 may be granted when, because of special circumstances applicable to a parcel of property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, the strict application of Ordinance No. 348 deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity that is under the same zoning classification. A variance may not be granted for a parcel of property that authorizes a use or activity that is not otherwise expressly authorized by the zone regulation governing the parcel of property, but must be limited to modifications of property development standards, such as lot size, lot coverage, yards, and parking and landscape requirements.

(c) Section 18.27. d. of Riverside County Zoning Ordinance No. 348, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, provides that any variance granted shall be subject to such conditions as are necessary so that the adjustment does not constitute a grant of special privileges that is inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which the property is situated, and which are necessary to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the community.

(d) Section 18.27. c. of Riverside County Zoning Ordinance No. 348, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, provides that all public hearings on variances that require approval of a land division shall be heard by the hearing body that has jurisdiction of the principal application.

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

(a) The application for MA No. 14112 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 April 22, 2015, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 14112, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing.

(c) All legal preconditions to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.
Section 6. **California Environmental Quality Act Findings for Adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.** The Planning Commission makes the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Project:

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

(b) Thereafter, City staff provided public notice of the public comment period and of the intent to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration as required by law. The public comment period commenced on March 26, 2015 and expired at 5:00 p.m. on April 14, 2015. Copies of the documents have been available for public review and inspection at City Hall, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509.

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

1) The Mitigated Negative Declaration 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 Mitigated Negative Declaration 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 Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared for the Project.

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

Section 7. **Findings for Approval of Tentative Tract Map.** The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that the proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 should be granted because:

(a) The proposed Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 meets all requirements of Riverside County Subdivision Ordinance No. 460, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.
(b) The proposed land division is consistent with the City’s General Plan.

(c) The design or improvement of the proposed land division is consistent with the City’s General Plan.

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

(e) The site of the proposed land division is physically suitable for the proposed density of the development.

(f) The design of the proposed land division or proposed improvements is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage nor substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.

(g) The design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements is not likely to cause serious public health problems.

(h) The design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed land division.

Section 8. Findings for Approval of Variance. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that Variance No. 1501 should be approved because:

(a) Due special circumstances applicable to Lot 13, including the layout of the proposed curvilinear street and to the irregular shape of the subject property, the strict application of Ordinance No. 348 will deprive the subject property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity in the One-Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone.

(b) Variance No. 1501 does not constitute a grant of special privileges that is inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and the One-Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone, and which are necessary to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the community.

(c) There are existing parcels that are deficient in the required average lot depth within the project vicinity. Parcels with substandard lot depth occur along Via Curva Way and Via Calorin Way to the immediate west of the subject site. These existing substandard lots establish a precedence that also serves to support the granting of a variance in the minimum average lot depth requirement for Lot 13.

Section 9. Findings for Approval of Master Application No. 14112. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley finds that the City is proceeding in a timely fashion with preparation of the City of Jurupa Valley Interim General Plan. Accordingly, the Planning Commission does hereby find, determine and declare that Master Application No. 14112 should be approved, based on substantial evidence in the record, because:
(a) There is a reasonable probability that the Project will be consistent with the future adopted City of Jurupa Valley Interim General Plan, including a housing element that is consistent with state housing element law, in that:

1) The Project will be consistent with the housing element’s policy in identifying areas in the City where urban infill is appropriate based on General Plan land use policy and Area Plans and encourages infill development; and

(b) There is little or no probability that the Project will be detrimental to or interfere with the implementation of the future adopted Interim General Plan, including a housing element that is consistent with state housing element law, in that:

1) The Project will enhance the quality of the existing residential neighborhood by including the construction of new single family homes of design and quality that will help increase the adjacent property values. The Project will also help the City meet its required RHNA (Regional Housing Needs Assessment) residential units as mandated by the state.

Section 10. Approval of Master Application No. 14112 with Conditions. Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission hereby approves Master Application No. 14112 (Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 and Variance No. 1501) to permit the subdivision of approximately 3.35 acres into 13 single-family residential parcels, a common public street labeled “Lot A” and a water quality basin labeled “Lot B” on real property located north of 45th Street, west of Golden West Avenue and east of Opal Street (APN: 182-361-009-4) in the One-Family Dwellings (R-1) Zone and designated Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR) (the “Project”), subject to the recommended conditions of approval attached hereto as Exhibit “B”.

Section 11. Certification. The Planning Director shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 22nd day of April, 2015.

George Ruiz
Chair of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director to the Planning Commission
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

I, Thomas Merrell, Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2015-4-22-01 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 22nd day of April, 2015 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

NOES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

[Signature]

THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP
PLANNING DIRECTOR
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR MA14112 (TTM36827 & VAR1501)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. **PROJECT PERMITTED.** MA14112 (TTM36827 & VAR1501) is for the approval of a residential subdivision of 13 single family lots and one (1), water quality basin. The project includes a common public street.

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 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. **CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA).** This project is approved subject to the provisions of a Mitigated Negative Declaration. Within forty-eight (48) hours of final approval for this project, the owner or designee shall deliver to the Planning Department a check payable to the County Clerk in the amount of $2,280.00 (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.

5. **MITIGATION MEASURES.** This project shall be subject to the mitigation measures adopted with the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the project and included with these conditions of approval.
6. **FEES.** The approval of MA14112 (TTM36827 & VAR1501) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

7. **APPROVAL PERIOD.** An approved or conditionally approved tentative tract map shall expire 36 months after such approval unless within that period of time a final map shall have been approved and filed with the County Recorder. Prior to the expiration date, the land divider may apply in writing for an extension of time pursuant to Ordinance No. 460.

8. **CONFORMANCE TO APPROVED EXHIBITS.** The project shall be in conformance to the approved map. The approved map includes the following:
   
   a. Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 (prepared by SPB Engineering, Inc. dated September, 2014 and signed by J. Guzman January 20, 2015)

9. **SUBMITTAL AND APPROVAL OF A SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT.** Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit an application for a Site Development Permit that includes the following plans to the City for review and approval: site plan, floor plan, elevations, landscape plan, and a wall and fence plan. The plans must be in substantial conformance with the R-1 (One Family Dwellings) Development Standards and with the County of Riverside’s Design Guidelines. Each set of plans may be submitted separately with a Site Development Permit application.

10. **ON-SITE LANDSCAPING.**

    Prior to the issuance of any Building permit, the applicant shall submit the following items for City review and approval:

    a. A Landscape Plan showing that the two existing Coast Live Oak trees will be replaced at a ratio of 5:1 per tree, with a minimum size 48-inch box Coast Live Oak tree (*Quercus agrifolia*) species. The location of the trees shall be at the discretion of the Planning Director.

    b. The replacement trees shall be monitored for a period of time as recommended by the City’s Landscape Consultant.

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

    d. Initial deposit for PROS application.

    e. Three (3) sets of final landscape and irrigation plans and digital copies (CD format) that demonstrates compliance with the landscape provisions of Section 18.12 (Off-Street Vehicle Parking) of Ordinance 348 and Ordinance 859.

    f. The total cost estimate of landscaping and irrigation.

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

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

11. STREET TREES. Street trees and related security and agreements are required pursuant to Section 14 of Ordinance No. 460.

12. DECORATIVE PERIMETER WALLS. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, a six (6) foot high decorative block wall shall be constructed along the project's exterior boundary lines for Lots 1 – 9 and the northerly boundary line of Lots 9 and 10.

13. MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF SOLID FENCING AND WALLS WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK. No solid fencing or wall shall exceed 42 inches in height within the front setback.

14. BLOCK WALL FOR INTERIOR REAR AND SIDE LOT LINES. Block walls shall be used for interior side and rear lot lines.

Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a Wall and Fence plan that is consistent to this condition to the City for review and approval.

15. TWO-CAR GARAGE PER DWELLING UNIT. All residential units shall have a two-car garage with automatic sectional roll-up doors.

16. JURUPA AREA RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit proof of satisfying any fees, dedications, or requirements by the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District to the Building Official.

17. MULTIPLE SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN MITIGATION FEE (ORD. NO. 810). The applicant shall pay any owed fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 810. In order for the agency to determine that the project qualifies for any exemptions for any of the subject fees, the applicant needs to submit sufficient evidence to the City to demonstrate that it qualifies for the exemption.

18. SINGLE FAMILY HOMES. Lots 10, 11, 12 and 13 shall all be single story homes.

19. BLOCK WALLS. Block wall along Golden West Avenue and Opal Street shall have anti-graffiti coating or landscaping to deter graffiti.

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (ENGINEERING)

20. The use hereby conditioned is for a Schedule “A” subdivision, Tentative Tract Map No. 36827, a subdivision of Parcel 2 and a portion of Lot “D” of Parcel Map No. 27437 as filed in Book 180, Pages 78 to 79, inclusive, of Parcel Maps, Records of Riverside County into 13 numbered residential lots and 2 lettered lots, one for street and public utility purposes and one for a water quality basin. Exhibit titled Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 prepared by SPB Engineering, Inc. dated September, 2014 and signed by J. Guzman January 20, 2015 is referenced.
21. This land division shall comply with the State of California Subdivision Map Act and with all requirements of Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley, for a Schedule “A” subdivision, unless modified by the conditions listed herein.

22. It is assumed that easements shown on the tentative tract map exhibit are shown correctly and include all the easements that encumber the subject property. The Project Proponent shall secure approval from all easement holders for all grading and improvements which are proposed over the respective easement or provide evidence that the easement has been relocated, quitclaimed, vacated, abandoned, easement holder cannot be found, or is otherwise of no affect. Should such approvals or alternate actions regarding the easements not be provided, the Project Proponent may be required to amend or revise the tentative map as may be necessary to allow a finding on the final map of substantial conformance.

23. The Project Proponent shall obtain “will serve” letters from the natural gas provider (SCG) and the electrical power provider (SCE). The water purveyor, Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD), has provided a “will serve” letter for sewer and water services.

24. No grading or other improvements shall be permitted until a grading plan for this subdivision, has been approved by the City Engineer. Grading plans and all grading shall conform to the California Building Code, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley and Riverside County Ordinance 457, and all other relevant laws, rules, and regulations governing grading in the city of Jurupa Valley.

25. Lots on which retaining walls are proposed will require separate permits(s). The walls shall be designed by a Registered Civil Engineer unless they conform in all respects to the Riverside County Standard Retaining Wall designs shown on the Riverside County Building and Safety Department form 284-197 or as shown on “Greenbook” standard plans.

26. All landscaping, irrigation and maintenance systems shall comply with the Guide to California Friendly Landscaping and Riverside County Ordinance No. 859.

27. All utility extensions within the subdivision and within individual lots shall be placed underground. This requirement to underground existing overhead electrical lines applies also to lines which are 33.6 kilovolts or below along the project frontage and between the nearest poles offsite in each direction of the project site.

28. The Project Proponent shall dedicate to the city lot “B” for the purposes of a water quality basin and form, or annex into if one already exists, a Community Facilities District (CFD) for the purposes of maintaining the water quality basin to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

29. The applicant shall annex to the Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) for operation and maintenance of street lights.
30. Cross-lot drainage will be permitted as shown on the tentative map exhibit subject to these conditions of approval and the Project Proponent providing adequate provisions, by means of individual lot deed restrictions, for continued and perpetual maintenance of these areas, shown on the Final (Tract) Map as "Private Drainage Easement", to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

31. A Traffic Impact Analysis/Study was not required for this project.

32. A Cultural Resources (Archeological) Report was not prepared for this project. However the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for this project includes mitigation measure(s) which must be complied with in implementing the project.

33. A Paleontological Report was not prepared for this project. However the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for this project includes mitigation measure(s) which must be complied with in implementing the project.

PRIOR TO GRADING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

Grading and Drainage

34. No grading permit shall be issued until the related cases associated with this subdivision are approved and are in effect.

35. The Project Proponent shall prepare a rough grading plan for the entire site. The rough grading plan shall be approved by the city engineer and securities shall be in place prior to commencement of grading.

36. The project is not located within a Flood Hazard Zone or Floodway, thus the site can be considered to be free from ordinary flood hazards. A Drainage Report dated December 2014 was prepared for this project by SP's Technical Services and accepted by the City Engineer for tentative subdivision planning purposes. Prior to approval of the grading plan the Project Proponent shall prepare a detailed Drainage Report, corresponding with the proposed improvements, for approval of the City Engineer.

37. All drainage and storm drain improvements shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District's standards. Drainage shall be designed to accommodate 100 year storm flows. An encroachment permit from RCFC&WCD is required for connection to its facilities, if any. Minimum drainage grade shall be 1% except on Portland Cement Concrete where 0.5% shall be the minimum.

38. Where grading involves import or export the project proponent shall obtain approval for the import/export location, from the Engineering and Planning departments if located in the City. If an Environmental Assessment did not previously approve the import/export location, a Grading Environmental Assessment shall be submitted to the Engineering Department for comment and to the Planning Director for review and approval. If import/export location is outside the City the Project Proponent shall provide evidence that the jurisdictional agency has provided all necessary approvals for import/export to/from the site.

39. If import/export involves the movement of more than 2,000 cubic yards of material using city streets, review and approval of the haul route by the Engineering Department will be required.
40. The conceptual grading shown on the tentative map exhibit provides for cross lot drainage. Cross-lot drainage will be permitted as shown provided that appropriate easements be shown on the final map and noted as follows: "Private Drainage Easement - no building, obstructions, or encroachments by landfills are allowed."

41. The grading plan shall provide for acceptance and proper disposal of all off-site drainage flowing onto or through the site. Should the quantities exceed the street capacity, the Project Proponent shall provide adequate drainage facilities and/or appropriate easements as approved by the City Engineer. All drainage easements shall be shown on the final map and noted as follows: "Drainage Easement - no building, obstructions, or encroachments by landfills are allowed". Such protection shall be as approved by the city engineer.

42. The grading plan shall provide for protection of downstream properties from damages caused by alteration of the drainage patterns, i.e., concentration or diversion of flow. Protection shall be provided by constructing adequate drainage facilities including enlarging existing facilities and/or by securing a drainage easement. All drainage easements shall be shown on the final map and noted as follows: "Drainage Easement - no building, obstructions, or encroachments by landfills are allowed". Such protection shall be as approved by the city engineer.

43. It shall be the sole responsibility of the Project Proponent to obtain any and all proposed or required easements and/or permissions necessary to perform the grading shown on the tentative map exhibit.

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

45. If grading is required offsite, the project proponent shall obtain written permission from the property owner(s) to grade as necessary and provide a copy to the Engineering Department.

46. Lots on which retaining walls are proposed will require separate permits(s). Permits shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any grading permit unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer and Building Official.

**Water Quality**

47. It is assumed that the conceptual grading and the provisions for water quality management shown on the tentative map exhibit can comply with all requirements for a final Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) without substantial change from that shown. Prior to approval of the grading plan Landowner shall prepare, or cause to be prepared, a final WQMP in conformance with the requirements of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFC&WCD) for approval of the City Engineer.

48. 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.
Geotechnical Report

49. Prior to approval of the grading plan the Project Proponent shall prepare a geotechnical/soils report for the proposed grading, infrastructure and post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs) improvements for review and approval of the City Engineer. All recommendations of the geotechnical/soils report shall be incorporated in the grading plan. The title and date of the geotechnical/soils report and the name and contact information of the Project Geotechnical Engineer shall be included on the face of the grading plan. The geotechnical engineer must sign the grading plan.

50. The geotechnical/soils, compaction and inspection reports will be reviewed in accordance with the Riverside County "Geotechnical Guidelines for Review of Geotechnical and Geologic Reports". All processing is through the City of Jurupa Valley.

Archeological Monitor

51. As required by the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project a qualified archaeological monitor shall be retained by the Project Proponent to conduct monitoring of all grading and trenching activities and the archaeological monitor has authority to halt and redirect earthmoving activities in the event that suspected archaeological resources are unearthed during Project construction. Project Proponent shall provide evidence to the City Engineer that a Project Archaeological Monitor has been retained. The name and contact information of the Project Archaeological Monitor shall be included on the face of the grading plan.

PRIOR TO MAP RECORDATION (ENGINEERING)

Final (Tract) Map

52. No Final (Tract) Map shall be recorded until the related planning cases associated with this tentative subdivision are approved.

53. After approval of the tentative map and prior to the expiration of said map, the Project Proponent shall cause the real property included within the tentative map exhibit, or any part thereof, to be surveyed and a Final (Tract) Map thereof prepared in accordance with the City Engineer's current requirements, conditions of approval of the tentative map, and in accordance with Article IX of Riverside County Ordinance 460 as adopted by the city. All processing is through the City of Jurupa Valley.

54. Street rights-of-way shall be shown on the final map and be dedicated for street and public utility purposes.

55. The existing right-of-way for the cul-de-sac of Ridgewood Drive exceeds that which is required for the circulation and design of the proposed project. The City is prepared to abandon this excess right-of-way which is unnecessary for the orderly development of the subdivision as shown. The Project Proponent shall clearly show the excess right-of-way to be abandoned on the Final (Tract) Map.
56. Where drainage is shown on the grading plan to occur across lot or property lines the area shall be delineated and designated on the final map as "Private Drainage Easement no building, obstructions, or encroachments by landfills are allowed".

57. Any easement not owned by a public utility, public entity or subsidiary, which is not relocated or eliminated, prior to final map approval, shall be delineated on the final map and additionally the name of the easement holder, and the nature of its interests shall be shown.

58. No unit phases of this subdivision are proposed. No unit phases will be permitted without further consideration of the phase designations and limits.

Improvement Plans

59. Ridgewood Drive northeasterly of the project is an improved city-maintained street with AC paved roadway and concrete curb and gutter. Opal Street northerly and southerly of the project is an improved city-maintained street with AC paved roadway, concrete curb and gutter, and sidewalk. Both are classified as a local streets. Except as shown on the tentative map exhibit and as a condition of approval of the Final (Tract) Map no additional right-of-way or street improvements are required for the streets except for modifications that may be required to match the required improvements for this subdivision.

60. The Project Proponent shall provide improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer for all public improvements including, but not limited to, street improvements, including sidewalk; signing and striping; street lighting; landscape and irrigation system; water system; and sanitary sewer system. Rights-of-way for streets and public utilities shall be dedicated and shown on the Final (Tract) Map in accordance with these conditions of approval, Riverside County Ordinance 460 and Riverside County Ordinance 461 ("Riverside County Road Improvement Standards and Specifications") as adopted by the City. All plans shall be prepared in accordance with the Riverside County Transportation Department "Improvement Plan Check Policies and Guidelines" as adapted by the City Engineer. All improvement plans shall be processed through the City.

It is understood that the tentative map exhibit correctly shows acceptable centerline elevations, all existing easements, traveled ways, and drainage courses with appropriate Q’s, and that the omission or unacceptability may require that the Project Proponent amend or revise the tentative map as may be necessary to allow a finding that the Final (Tract) Map is substantial conformance with the tentative conformance.

61. Separate street improvement plans for the required improvements must be prepared based on a design plan and profile extending a minimum of 300 feet beyond the project limits at a grade and alignment as approved by the City Engineer. The Project Proponent shall be responsible for any match up asphalt concrete (AC) paving, and reconstruction or resurfacing of existing paving as determined by the City Engineer.

62. The improvements in the street right-of-way shall meet the requirements for public streets per Riverside County Ordinance 461, as adopted by the city, and all corner cutbacks shall be designed per Riverside County Standard 805, or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer.
63. Within the subdivision the street improvements shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Standard 105, Section “A” (36-foot curb-to-curb in a 56-foot right-of-way with a 5-foot wide sidewalk adjacent to the right-of-way line), “Local Streets”, and modified as shown on the tentative map exhibit or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

64. The plans shall provide for the construction ADA compliant depressed curbs and access ramps at the intersection of Opal Street with “A” Street.

65. Driveway approaches shall be located as shown on the tentative map and or as otherwise approved by the City Engineer. Driveway approaches shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Standard No. 213.

66. Traffic signing, striping and marking for the required improvements may be shown on the street improvement plans and must be prepared based on extending a minimum of 300 feet beyond the project limits, or the limits of striping removal necessary to join existing, as approved by the City Engineer. The Project Proponent shall be responsible for any additional paving and/or removal of existing striping that might be required by the approved signing, striping and marking plan.

67. Separate streetlight plans must be prepared for required improvements for approval of the City Engineer and approval of the Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD). Street lighting shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance 460 and Street Light Specification Chart found in Specification Section 22 of Riverside County Ordinance 461, as adopted by the City and the requirements of RCSD. Street lighting shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Standard No. 1000.

68. Separate plans must be prepared for the water quality basin improvements for the approval of the city engineer. The water quality basin shall be designed in accordance with the applicable requirements of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCF&WCD) and the City Engineer. The water quality basin shall be designed for public passive use. A short fence or shrub is required between the sidewalk and the basin along Stone St. If the basin slope is greater than 4:1 a 6’ tubular steel fence will be required around the entire basin with a DG path to the bottom to accommodate the passive use.

69. For landscaping within public road rights-of-way and the water quality basin (Lot “B”) the Project Proponent shall prepare separate landscape and irrigation plans for each for approval of the City Engineer. Landscaping and irrigation shall be designed within the water quality basin that is compatible with the primary function of this facility. The improvements shall comply with Riverside County Ordinance 461, as adopted by the City, “Comprehensive Landscaping Guidelines & Standards”, and Riverside County Ordinance 859, as adopted by the City. Landscaping and irrigation plans shall be submitted with the street improvement plans. If landscaping maintenance is to be included in a Community Facilities District (CFD), or Landscaping and Lighting Maintenance District (LLMD), landscaping plans shall depict ONLY such landscaping, irrigation and related facilities as are to be placed within the public rights-of-way.

70. Separate sewer and water system plans must be prepared for required improvements for approval of the City Engineer and Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD). Water system improvement plans showing the locations of fire hydrants (see County Standard 400 and RCSD standards) must also be approved by RCSD. In addition to fire
hydrants that are required to be constructed within the project area a fire hydrant shall be constructed at the intersection of Opal Street and 45th Street.

71. Separate street light plans are required. Street lighting shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance 460, as adopted by the city, and Street Light Specification Chart found in Specification Section 22 of Riverside County Ordinance 461, as adopted by the city and the requirements of Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD). The design shall use Standard No. 1000. The plans shall be approved by the City Engineer and RCSD.

72. The Project Proponent shall provide plans for landscape and irrigation improvements in public rights-of-way prepared accordance with the current Riverside County Lighting and Landscape Maintenance District (L&LMD) standards and submitted to the City Engineer for approval.

73. An Environmental Constraints Sheet (ECS) is required to be prepared for this subdivision for approval of and filing with the City Engineer. The exact wording of the ECS note thereon shall be as follows:

"NOTICE OF CROSS-LOT DRAINAGE: Surface water runoff occurs across property lines within this subdivision. Individual property owners are responsible for regular, continued and perpetual maintenance of the areas in and through which surface water runoff occurs such that these areas are kept free of debris, trash and deleterious material. No building, obstructions, or encroachments by landfills are permitted."

The ECS shall be prepared in accordance with Section 2.2. E. & F. of Riverside County Ordinance No. 460, as adopted by the city, and submitted as part of the plan check review of the Final (Tract) Map.

L&LMD and Special Districts

74. Initiate formation of, or annexation to if one already exists, a community Facilities District (CFD) for Public Safety Services.

75. Initiate formation of, or annexation to if one already exists, a Community Facilities District (CFD) for operation and maintenance of landscaping and irrigation along the Lot "A" and Opal Street project frontages and publicly owned post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs) within Lot "B".

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

Utilities

77. Electrical power, telephone, communication, street lighting, and cable television lines shall be designed to be placed underground in accordance with Riverside County Ordinances 460 and 461, as adopted by the City. The project proponent is responsible for coordinating the work with the serving utility company. This requirement applies to underground existing overhead electrical lines which are 33.6 kilovolts or below along the project frontage and between the nearest poles offsite in each direction of the project site. A disposition note describing the above shall be reflected on design improvement plans whenever those plans are required. Written proof confirming
initiation of the design and/or application or the relocation, issued by the utility 
company, shall be submitted to the Engineering Department for verification purposes.

78. Project proponent shall obtain approval of Rubidoux Community Services District 
(RCSD) for water system, sewer system and street lighting improvement plans.

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMIT

79. Rough grading must be completed as shown on the approved grading plans.

   i. The Project Geotechnical Engineer shall certify to the completion of grading in 
      conformance with the approved grading plans and the recommendations of the 
      geotechnical report approved for this project.

   ii. A licensed land surveyor shall certify to the completion of grading in conformance 
       with the lines and grades shown on the approved grading plans.

80. The Project Proponent shall prepare a precise grading plan for each of the lots. The 
precise grading plan shall be approved by the City Engineer and securities shall be in 
place.

81. The required water system, including fire hydrants, shall be installed and accepted by 
the Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) prior to any combustible building 
materials being placed on an individual lot.

82. All utility extensions within the subdivision shall be placed underground, or as otherwise 
approved in writing by the City Engineer.

83. The Project Proponent shall take the steps necessary to form, or, if one already exists, 
annex to a Community Facilities District (CFD) in order to provide funding for City Public 
Safety Services from each existing and/or new lot in the proposed development.

84. The Project Proponent shall take the steps necessary to form, or, if one already exists, 
annex to a Community Facilities District (CFD) in order to provide funding for City 
operation and maintenance of the landscaping and irrigation along the Lot “A” and Opal 
Street project frontages and publicly owned post-construction BMPs (water quality 
basin) from each existing and/or new lot in the proposed development.

85. The agreement to form or annex to a CFD for operation and maintenance shall be in a 
manner to be approved by the City Attorney. Participation in a CFD is intended to fully 
mitigate the incremental impact of new development on City maintenance costs and 
maintain such levels service at the standards established in the City’s MS4 permit.

The agreement to form or annex to a CFD for Public Safety Services shall be in a 
manner to be approved by the 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.

Project Proponent shall pay all cost for formation of or annexation to CFD.

86. If for any reason applicant does not take the necessary steps to have the development 
included within a CFD as required, applicant shall, in a manner approved by the City 
Council and City Attorney, provide for alternative means of fiscal mitigation at a level 
equal to the special taxes established in the Rate and Method of Apportionment 
applicable to the CFD, as they may be adjusted from time to time.
PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION

87. The Project Proponent is responsible for the completing all grading and construction of all infrastructure improvements to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, except the top course of AC pavement, within the public right-of-way, for which plans are required and shall comply with all other applicable requirements within public rights-of-way, in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance 461, as adopted by the city. The top course of AC pavement shall be constructed no later than the time of final building inspection of the last lot on which building improvements are proposed or sooner as may be directed by the City Engineer.

88. Prior to completion and acceptance of infrastructure improvements or prior to the final building inspection, whichever occurs first, assurance of maintenance of public improvements is required by completion or annexation into a Community Facilities District (CFD) for operation and maintenance of:
   i. Landscaping and irrigation in the public right-of-way along "A" Street and Opal Street frontages
   ii. Post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs) within Lot "B"

89. Electrical power, telephone, communication, street lighting, and cable television lines shall be placed underground, or as otherwise approved in writing by the City Engineer. This also applies to existing overhead lines that are 33.6 kilovolts or below along the project frontage, including Opal Street, and between the nearest poles offsite in each direction of the project site. Correspondence accepting improvements shall be provided from each respective utility company.

90. The Project Proponent shall install street name sign at the intersection of Opal Street and "A" Street (street name to be as shown on the Final (Tract) Map as Ridgewood Drive) in accordance with Riverside County Standard No. 816, as approved by the Engineering Department.

91. Project Proponent shall ensure that streetlights are energized along "A" Street and at the intersection of "A" Street and Opal Street.

92. The Project Proponent shall comply with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 (Development Impact Fees, DIF), as adopted by the City, which requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in the Ordinance in accordance with the fee schedule in effect at the time of the final inspection. The fee shall be paid for each residential unit to be constructed within this land division.

93. The project proponent shall pay the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) in accordance with the fee schedule in effect at the time of the final inspection.
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

__________________________________________
Date
ATTACHMENT NO. 3

Planning Commission Staff Report
(dated April 22, 2015 w/o exhibits)
DATE: APRIL 22, 2015
TO: CHAIR RUIZ AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR
BY: ROCIO LOPEZ, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 6.1
MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 14112 (TTM36827 AND VAR1501)
PROPOSAL: REQUEST TO SUBDIVIDE A 3.35 ACRE PARCEL INTO 13 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS
LOCATION: NORTH OF 45TH ST., EAST OF GOLDEN WEST AVENUE AND WEST OF OPAL STREET
APPLICANT: CHARLIE KIEN (PROPERTY OWNER)

RECOMMENDATION
By motion, adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2015-4-22-01 approving Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 36827 and Variance No. 1501 subject to the Conditions of Approval and adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS
The Applicant, Charlie Kien, submitted a request to subdivide a 3.35-acre parcel into 13 single-family residential lots with a public street labeled “Lot A” and a water quality basin labeled “Lot B”. Individual parcels will contain a minimum 7,200 square feet with average lot widths of 60 feet and average lot depths of 100 feet. Variance No. 1501 is requested for a 2.90-foot deviation from the required average lot depth of 100 feet for Lot 13. Lot 13 is proposed with an average lot depth of 97.10 feet.

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

As shown on Exhibit 1, the site is located between Golden West Avenue to the west, Opal Street to the east, 45th Street to the north and at the end of Ridgewood Drive. The property is surrounded by single-family homes to the north, south, east and west.
Required Entitlements

Subdivisions are regulated by the Riverside County Subdivision Ordinance No. 460, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley pursuant to Chapter 1.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. This is a Schedule “A” subdivision per Ordinance 460 (Subdivision Regulations) defined as: “Any division of land into 5 or more parcels, where any parcel is less than 18,000 square feet in net area”. Article VI, Section 6.6A, establishes that the action of the Planning Commission on a tentative “Schedule A” map shall be final unless appealed by the Applicant or any interested party.

A variance is requested to create a parcel with less than the minimum average lot depth requirement of 100 feet, with a deviation of 2.90 feet. Lot 13, if approved, would have an 80.10-foot lot depth along the southern property line and a 114.11-foot lot depth along the northern property line for an average lot depth of 97.10 feet. The project is therefore subject to Section 18.27 (Variances) of the Riverside County Zoning Ordinance, as adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley.

The applicant requests approval to subdivide a 3.35 acre parcel into 13 single-family residential lots. The subdivision also includes the creation of a public street (shown as Lot “A”) and a water quality basin (shown as “Lot B”). Exhibit 2 provides an illustration of the proposed subdivision.
A larger version of the proposed subdivision map has been provided under separate cover and is also shown on Attachment 7.

EXHIBIT 2: TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 36827

The map includes building pad elevations (noted as “P.E.”) on the individual parcels in an effort to analyze future construction of single-family homes for hydrological calculations. Staff proposes a condition that will require a Site Development Permit for the subsequent construction and location of homes. Proposed pad elevations will be deemed approximate only and future construction will be further evaluated for appropriate design, size and architecture.

A concrete canal, owned by “North Riverside Jurupa Canal”, borders the site along its western boundary. The canal separates the site from directly abutting Golden West Avenue. Therefore, the proposed parcels along Golden West are not considered “through lots” and are not subject to increased setbacks.

Parcels within the R-1 (One Family Dwellings) zone require a minimum lot size of 7,200 square feet, a minimum average lot width of 60 feet and a minimum average lot depth of 100 feet. Lots 1 through 13 of the TTM range in size from 7,227 square feet to 10,002 square feet and comply with the minimum square-footage requirements for new lots within the R-1 zone. The average lot size is 8,405.5 square feet. See Table 2 for a comparison of the subdivision proposal and required development standards.

Lots 1 through 13, with the exception of Lots 3 and 4, have a lot frontage range from 60 to 80 feet in width. The minimum lot frontage width is 60 feet, except for lots fronting on “knuckles”
which are allowed frontages of 35 feet. Lot 3 is situated on a knuckle and has a frontage of
49.97 feet, which is permitted by the development standards. Lot 4 is situated onto a portion of
the curvilinear street and as such, the lot frontage may be measured at the building setback
(also in accordance with development standards). At building setback, Lot 4 has a lot frontage
of 60 feet.

Parcel depths range from 114 to 202 feet, with the exception of Lot 13. Lot 13 is located
adjacent to a curvilinear street, and therefore has a reduced lot depth on one side. The lot
depth of parcel 13 has a lot depth of 80.10 feet along the southern property line and 114.11 feet
along the northern property line. The average lot depth is 97.10 feet but the code requires a
minimum of 100 feet. Variance No. 1501 is requested to allow the 2.90-foot deviation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2: APPLICABLE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum lot size: 7,200 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum average lot-width: 60’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum average lot-depth: 100’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum frontage of a lot on fronting knuckles may have a minimum frontage of 35’, and lot frontage along curvilinear streets may be measured at the building setback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tentative Tract Map

The proposed subdivision is consistent with the requirements of Ordinance No. 460 (Subdivision Regulations) and the City’s Zoning Ordinance, with the exception of the minimum lot depth requirement for Lot 13. With the granting of Variance No. 1501 however, the project could comply with all applicable development standards. The General Plan Land Use Designation of “Medium Density Residential (MDR)” permits up to five (5) dwelling units per acre. The project proposes 13 residential dwelling units at a density of 3.9 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density.

The surrounding properties are also zoned R-1 and are located within General Plan Land Use Districts of MDR. The proposed subdivision is consistent with the development pattern of the neighborhood, including lot sizes and configuration.

On-Site Street Improvements

The proposed public street, identified as “Lot A”, is a continuation of Ridgewood Drive from the north and connects to Opal Street to the east. Opal Street is an existing two (2) lane street with curb, gutter and sidewalk within a 60 foot right-of-way. The proposed street will connect with Opal Street and street improvements along Opal Street will include the extension of existing sidewalk and street improvements.

The extension of Ridgewood Drive, (designated a local street in the City’s General Plan), will contain a 50-foot wide right-of-way consisting of 32 feet of paved roadway, curb and gutter. The remaining 18 feet will be developed with a landscaped parkway and sidewalk along the north and south sides (9 feet per side), per Article XIV (Street Trees) of Ordinance No. 460.
(Subdivision Regulations). Underground utilities will be provided within the dedicated right-of-way.

Proposed 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 neighborhood. The project will be conditioned to annex into a Landscape Lighting Maintenance District (L & LMD) or a Community Facilities District (CFD) in order to collect fees for the continual maintenance of the landscaping and lighting services within the tract. See Exhibit 3 for a view of the street section.

**EXHIBIT 3 - RIDGEWOOD DRIVE TYPICAL SECTION**

![Ridgewood Drive Typical Section](image_url)

**Dedication of Public Street/Right-of-Way/Water Quality Basin**

As depicted on the map, Lot "A", the street extending Ridgewood Drive; the public right-of-way and the water quality basin shown as Lot "B" are being dedicated to the City and will be maintained by the City through a CFD (Community Facilities District). In addition, the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District has determined that this project does not have any identified potential trail improvements or connections as identified in its Local Trails Area Master Plan.

**On-Site Utility and Drainage Improvements**

Water and sewer service to the project site will be provided by the Rubidoux Community Services District. These services are available to the project site from an existing eight (8) inch diameter water line located along Opal Street and an eight (8) inch diameter sewer line located within Ridgewood Drive. All street, utility and drainage improvements will therefore connect to existing systems located adjacent to the project boundaries. The Rubidoux Community Services District has prepared the required “Will Serve” letter for this subdivision, see Attachment 4.

The project’s drainage system is designed to capture on-site and off-site runoff that will be conveyed through the proposed street from north to south leading to the proposed water quality basin adjacent to the Opal Street entrance. The water quality basin contains a 300 cubic-foot infiltration pit which serves to clarify the water before discharging into the existing storm drain system on Opal Street. As depicted on the map, the water quality basin will be dedicated to the City and will be maintained by the City through a CFD (Community Facilities District). The 8,530 square-foot basin is intended for water quality purposes and does not provide for dual use...
such as recreation. The basin is approximately four (4) feet deep with 2:1 slopes and has a low flow gravel pit bottom. The basin will be surrounded by a six (6) foot high wrought iron fence, per Section E-E on the TTM.

Tree Preservation

The proposed subdivision results in the removal of two mature coastal live oaks. Due to concerns with the tree removal and General Plan policies encouraging tree preservation, staff required an Arborist’s Report. The report (Attachment 5) states that the site is highly disturbed and occupied by ruderal, floral species and citrus trees. It identifies the two coastal live oak trees as mature and well-developed. No other indication was found suggesting the potential presence of any sensitive species.

The following General Plan policies apply to the two oak trees:

- **Open Space Policy 9.3** - Maintain and conserve superior examples of native trees, natural vegetation, stands of established trees, and other features for ecosystem, aesthetic, and water conservation purposes; and

- **Open Space Policy 9.4** - Conserve the oak tree resources within in the County (City).

These policies are meant to preserve the continued viability of habitat communities within the County (City) as the coast live oaks are a California native tree species endemic to Southern California. Currently, however, neither the City nor County have a specific ordinance requiring the preservation of native trees or vegetation and as such, the County recommends mitigating the loss of the trees by requiring replacement trees.

The Arborist’s report presents two possible mitigating alternatives:

- **Alternative A:** Preservation of the two oak trees at their current location and installation of a wrought iron fence outside of the drip line as shown on Attachment 6. The arborist indicated that even with the wrought iron fencing, the roots are likely to extend beyond the fence line and therefore larger lots would be recommended if preservation is required.

- **Alternative B:** If trees are to be removed, require their replacement. Recommended replacement includes five (5), 15-gallon trees (5:1 ratio) for the larger tree and three (3), 15-gallon trees (3:1 ratio) of the same species for the smaller tree.

Staff considered a condition requiring relocation of the two oak trees, however, the Arborist indicated that these types of oaks do not typically survive after relocation. Staff also considered requiring the preservation of the two oak trees and asking for a complete redesign of the subdivision (including the relocation of Ridgewood Drive). However, given the existing street layout and proposed street extension onto the subject site, the options for shifting the street location are limited.

Planning staff, the Arborist and the City’s Environmental Consultant recommend that the Applicant replace the two (2) oak trees at the ratio noted in Alternative B. However, staff believes that 24-inch box sized trees are more appropriate given the extent of losing the existing large, mature trees. Fifteen (15) gallon-sized trees are quite small in comparison and will require a very long growing period to provide any shade and air quality benefits.

Grading

Grading of the subject property proposes 12,200 cubic yards of cut and 1,650 cubic yards of fill. As the site slopes easterly at an average rate of 4%, approximately 10,550 cubic yards of soils will be exported to grade building pads and slopes to an appropriate 1% slope. Lots will not
contain a slope greater than 2:1 and will be graded, cut and filled to comply with Ordinance No. 460 (Subdivision Regulations).

Map Distribution
The Subdivision Map Act requires a local agency to circulate proposed subdivision maps to the service providers (Fire, Sheriff, School District, etc.) and utility companies. This allows each entity the opportunity to review the proposal and determine the impacts of the subdivision relative to their services. Staff circulated the TTM on September 23, 2014 to aforementioned agencies and internal agencies such as Jurupa Valley’s Departments of Engineering, Building and Safety, Public Works and Code Enforcement. Staff received comments and recommended conditions from several external and internal agencies. Comments from these agencies have been considered and incorporated as modifications and/or conditions to this project as deemed necessary by Planning staff.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT
No residential development is being proposed with the TTM at this time, however, within the next several months the Applicant intends to submit plans to the Building Department for the development of the proposed 13 single family homes. Per the R-1 (One Family Dwellings) zone, a Site Development Permit is not required for the development of single-family homes. However, to ensure neighborhood compatibility and consistency with the County of Riverside’s Design Guidelines, staff recommends a condition requiring the submittal of a Site Development Permit prior to the issuance of a building permit. Such plans shall include, but not be limited to, site and floor plans, elevations, fencing and wall plans, and landscape plans for the individual homes.

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. It is estimated that approximately 5 to 20 employees will be expected at the site during the various phases of construction. Vehicular traffic associated with 5 to 20 employees is considered minimal and is not expected to result in any adverse effects to the local roadway system.

FINDINGS FOR GRANTING A VARIANCE (SECTION 18.27 OF ORDINANCE NO. 348)
The Planning Commission may approve a Variance based on the following section of Ordinance 348:

“Variances from the terms of this ordinance may be granted when, because of special circumstances applicable to a parcel of property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, the strict application of this ordinance deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity that is under the same zoning classification.” In addition, “any variance granted shall be subject to such conditions as are necessary so that the adjustment does not constitute a grant of special privileges that is inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which the property is situated, and which are necessary to protect the health, safety, and general welfare of the community.”

Planning staff has evaluated the lot configuration of Lot 13 and recommends that the Planning Commission consider the following findings to grant Variance No. 1501, allowing a reduction from the required 100 foot average lot depth to 97.10 feet. As indicated by the following facts, there are unique or special circumstances that exist for Lot 13:

1. Lot 13 meets the minimum lot size requirement of 7,200 square feet, the minimum average lot width of 60 feet, and contains the minimum average lot depth of 100 feet
along the northern property line. However, since Lot 13 is located along a curvilinear street, it has an irregular shape which creates a maximum lot depth of 80.10 feet along the southern property line. As a result, the average lot depth is reduced by 2.9 feet. The location of Lot 13 creates a special circumstance where strict application of the 100 foot standard for average lot depth creates a hardship for the Applicant to develop the land and maintain consistency with the General Plan due to the configuration of the existing shape of the land and configuration of the proposed curvilinear street.

2. There are existing parcels that are deficient in the required average lot depth within the project vicinity. Parcels with substandard lot depth occur along Via Curva Way and Via Calorin Way to the immediate west of the subject site. These existing substandard lots establish a precedence that also serves to support the granting of a variance in the minimum average lot depth requirement for Lot 13.

3. In order for the tract to comply with the required standards (such as minimum average lot size, minimum average lot width together with standards for public streets) and being able to create access for services to this tract, it is necessary for Lot 13 to have a lot depth (along the southern property line) that is less than the required minimum average of 100 feet.

4. The granting of this variance will allow the property owner privileges enjoyed by other property owners in the vicinity that is under the same zoning classification in that other property owners have properties with average lot depths that are less than the required 100-foot average.

**FINDINGS FOR TENTATIVE LAND DIVISION MAPS (SECTION 7.1 OF ORDINANCE NO. 460)**

Pursuant to Ordinance No. 460 (Subdivision Regulations), the Planning Commission may approve a tentative map if the following findings can be made:

A. That the proposed land division is consistent with applicable general and specific plans.

   The proposed map is consistent with the requirements of the General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) which permits up to five (5) dwelling units per acre. The map will facilitate the future construction of 13 single family homes at a density of 3.9 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density. Furthermore, the map complies with Ordinance No. 460 (Subdivision Regulations) and the City’s Zoning Ordinance, with the exception of the minimum average lot depth requirement for Lot 13. With the granting of Variance No. 1501 however, the project will comply with all Zoning Ordinance development standards.

B. That the design or improvement of the proposed land division is consistent with applicable General and Specific Plans.

   The proposed layout of the 13 parcels is consistent with the City’s General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. All proposed parcels meet the following development standards: 1) minimum 7,200 square foot lot size; 2) minimum average lot width of 60 feet; and, 3) minimum average lot depth of 100 feet (with the exception of Lot 13). Approval of Variance No. 1501 however, will establish compliance with all development standards.

C. That the site of the proposed land division is physically suitable for the type of development.

   The 3.35-acre site is a relatively flat, undeveloped, vacant lot adjacent to other single-family residential land uses. The site is physically suitable to accommodate the
subdivision and future development of 13 single family residential homes as there is adequate water and sewer connections and public services are available to the site.

D. That the site of the proposed land division is physically suitable for the proposed density of the development.

The project proposes 13 residential dwelling units at a density of 3.9 dwelling units per acre which is below the maximum allowable density under the General Plan designation.

E. That the design of the proposed land division or proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.

The project site was highly disturbed and occupied by ruderal, floral species and citrus trees. Because of the existing degraded site condition, the absence of special-status plant communities, and overall low potential for most special-status species to utilize or reside on-site, the proposed project would not be expected to directly impact federal or state-listed threatened or endangered species.

F. That the design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements are not likely to cause serious public health problems.

A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment was conducted on the subject property to assess existing conditions. The Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment did not reveal evidence of a recognized environmental condition in connection with this project site. The proposed land division and development of 13 single family homes is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Furthermore, the findings of the Initial Study determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. As such, the project will not cause serious public health problems.

G. That the design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed land division. A land division may be approved if it is found that alternate easements for access or for use will be provided and that they will be substantially equivalent to ones previously acquired by the public.

There are no on-site easements within the subject site and therefore the project does not conflict with any on-site easements. The project will connect to existing water and sewer lines located on Ridgewood Drive and Opal Street and all proposed utilities will be required to be undergrounded.

Staff has found the subdivision to be in conformance with above findings and in conformance with the City’s Zoning Ordinance, General Plan and Ordinance No. 460 (Subdivision Regulations). The land division is physically suitable for the type of the development and the proposed density. The design of the project will not cause substantial environmental damage, harm any wildlife, nor cause serious public health problems.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The City's Environmental Consultant prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for adoption which is attached as Exhibit A of the Resolution. The proposed MND is supported by an Initial Study that evaluated potential effects with respect to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forest Resources, Traffic, 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, and Utilities and Service Systems. The proposed MND determined that although the
proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions have been made or agreed to by the Applicant. The City’s decision to prepare an MND should not be construed as a recommendation of either approval or denial of this Project.

Public Review Period

The public review period for the environmental document began on March 26, 2015 and ended on April 14, 2015. To date, no comments have been received regarding the MND.

Staff received a letter from an adjoining property owner expressing concern that the future construction of homes could have a negative impact on views of local mountains. The letter has been included as Attachment 8. It should be noted that staff has included a condition of approval that will require a “Master” Site Development Permit for the future construction of homes. During the review of the “Master” Site Development Permit, staff will notify all property owners within a 300-foot radius of the site that specific development plans for individual homes have been received. Adjoining property owners will have the opportunity to evaluate potential view impacts at that time.
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(951) 332-6464
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Applicant:

Investment City, LLC

April 24, 2019
1.0 INTRODUCTION

A. Document Purpose.

This document is a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including all criteria, standards, and procedures of CEQA (California Public Resource Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Section 15000 et seq.).

This document has been prepared to determine if the Extension of Time request is within the scope of the analysis contained in the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley on April 22, 2015, and to ensure that by extending the time of approval the project does not create new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously analyzed impacts as compared to those identified previously.

B. Project Location

North of 45th Street between Opal Street and Golden West Avenue. APN: 182-361-009.

C. Project Description

Tentative Tract Map No. 36827 proposes a subdivision of a 3.35-acre parcel into 13 single-family residential lots with a public street labeled “Lot A” and a water quality basin labeled “Lot B”. 7,200 square foot lots with average lot widths of 60 feet and average lot depths of 100 feet. Variance No. 1501 is requested for a 2.90-foot deviation from the required average lot depth of 100 feet for Lot 13. Lot 13 is proposed with an average lot depth of 97.10 feet. The Variance will be automatically extended with the approved EOT. The applicant requests a second 1 year extension of time until April 22, 2020.

2.0 USE OF PREVIOUS MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

CEQA allows a previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration to be used as the environmental assessment for a project if it is determined that the project currently under review is “within the scope” of the earlier Mitigated Negative Declaration pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 (a) which states:

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

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

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

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

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

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

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative."

Mitigated Negative Declaration for MA 14112 ("MND") is on file with the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department (8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509) and is hereby incorporated by reference pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15150.

3.0 ANALYSIS

As required by CEQA, an extension of time request is based on any physical changes to the project site or its immediate environs that would result in any potentially new significant impacts that were not identified in the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration (2015).

The adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration. Environmental determined that the following environmental issues were "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated."

1a. Biological Resources (Burrowing Owls)

Findings of Fact: The project site is almost entirely covered by disturbed, ruderal vegetation. Sporadic ornamental plant and tree species were also found on site. No indication of habitat conducive to sensitive species was noted due to the highly disturbed nature of the site. No large burrows were found in the area and the particularly dense ruderal vegetation suggest poor habitat for burrowing owl. However, their presence cannot be ruled out because burrowing owls have been known to occupy disturbed sites. Mitigation is required.

Mitigation: MM-BIO-1: Pre-Construction Burrowing Owl Survey. Within 30 calendar days prior to grading, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey of the Project's proposed impact footprint and make a determination regarding the presence or absence of the burrowing owl. The determination shall be documented in a report and shall be submitted, reviewed, and accepted by the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit and subject to the following provisions:
a. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies no burrowing owls in the impact area, a grading permit may be issued without restriction.

b. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies the presence of at least one individual but less than three (3) mating pairs of burrowing owl, then prior to the issuance of a grading permit and prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities on the property, the qualified biologist shall passively or actively relocate any burrowing owls. Passive relocation, including the required use of one-way doors to exclude owls from the site and the collapsing of burrows, will occur if the biologist determines that the proximity and availability of alternate habitat is suitable for successful passive relocation. Passive relocation shall follow California Department of Fish and Wildlife relocation protocol. If proximate alternate habitat is not present as determined by the biologist, active relocation shall follow California Department of Fish and Wildlife relocation protocol. The biologist shall confirm in writing to the Planning Department that the species has fledged or been relocated prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

1b. Biological Resources (Protected Trees)

Findings of Fact: Two trees were assessed onsite, both of the coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia) species. These trees appeared healthy and well developed. They did not show indication of significant pest damage or nutrient deficiency, and their location was appropriate for their species. The City of Jurupa Valley includes provisions for the protection and conservation of oak and other native tree and floral species within the City to protect the natural diversity.

Mitigation:

**MM-BIO-2. Dedication of Open Space Lot and Tree Maintenance.** If the tree(s) are to be preserved, prior to the recodration of the Final Map, a lettered or numbered lot shall be provided for each tree to be preserved. This lot shall be dedicated to the City in order to allow for continued maintenance of the tree(s) by the City or approved maintenance entity as follows:

- Construction of a wrought iron fence is necessary positioned just outside of the dripline around Tree #598 to reduce the risk of injury in the event of failure.

- Landscape design must integrate the existing oak trees on site in a way that diverts excess water runoff or irrigation from accumulating and pooling within the tree’s dripline. This final design must be reviewed by a certified landscape architect and approved by the Planning Director.

- Strategic crown thinning to reduce loading on the stem. Heavier pruning of coast live oaks should occur during July-August and not more than 25% of the crown can be removed during any single year. All pruning should be performed or directed by an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) Certified Arborist or Tree Worker in accordance with the Best Management Practices for Pruning by the International Society of Arboriculture, 2002 and adhere to the most recent editions of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for Tree Care Operations Z133.1 and Pruning A300. Any oak tree maintenance activity onsite...
should be done at the direction of an ISA Certified Arborist or American Society of Consulting Arborists (ASCA) Registered Consulting Arborist.

- Oak tree pruning must be kept to a minimum (except initially as described in Item 4 above); it typically involves removing dead or diseased wood, hazardous branches, or limb structures and providing clearance.

- Pruning should be done early during branch development to avoid cuts greater than 4 inches in diameter. The smaller wound size will reduce the chance of infection.

- Excessive and injurious pruning is defined as the removal of more than 25 percent of the functioning leaf, stem, or root system of a tree in any 24-month period.

- Disinfected pruning tools must be used at all times and in between trees to reduce the spread of sudden oak death and other contagious diseases.

- Annual surveys by a certified arborist are recommended once the development is completed.

If the trees cannot be preserved in place, mitigation for their removal is replacement with 15-gallon, nursery-grown stock at various ratios depending on the size of the oak tree pursuant to Mitigation Measure BIO-3.

**BIO-3. Oak Tree Replacement:** Prior to the issuance of any tree removal or the issuance of a grading permit, the following trees as identified in the Tree Survey and Arborist Report prepared by Golden State Land and Tree, February 13, 2015 shall be replaced as follows:

- Coast Live Oak # 598: Replacement by five, 15-gallon trees (5:1 ratio) of the same species at the discretion of the City’s Planning Director.

- Coast Live Oak # 599: Replacement by three 15-gallon trees (3:1 ratio) of the same species at the discretion of the City’s Planning Director.

**Conclusion:** The project site remains in substantially the same physical condition as it was in 2015. With implementation of the above described mitigation measures, impacts will remain less than significant.

### 2. Cultural Resources

**Findings of Fact:**

a. During grading activities, it is possible that subsurface archaeological resources may be uncovered.

b. According to the Riverside County Land Information System, the Project Site is located in a “High Sensitivity (High A) area for paleontological resources.

**Mitigation:**
MM- CR-1: Archaeological Monitoring. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project Proponent shall implement the following program:

a) A qualified archaeological monitor shall be retained by the Project Proponent to conduct monitoring of all grading and trenching activities and has the authority to halt and redirect earthmoving activities in the event that suspected archaeological resources are unearthed during Project construction.

b) During grading operations, a professional archaeological monitor shall observe the grading operation until such time as monitor determines that there is no longer any potential to uncover buried cultural deposits. If the monitor suspects that an archaeological resource may have been unearthed, the monitor shall immediately halt and redirect grading operations in a 100-foot radius around the find to allow identification and evaluation of the suspected resource. If the monitor determines that the suspected resource is potentially significant, the archaeologist shall notify the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) and invite a tribal representative to consult on the resource evaluation. In consultation with the appropriate Native American Tribe(s), the archaeological monitor shall evaluate the suspected resource and make a determination of significance pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure CR-2 shall apply.

MM- CR-2: 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 and 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 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). The treatment plan shall require monitoring by the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during data recovery excavations of archaeological resource(s) of prehistoric origin, and shall require that all recovered artifacts undergo laboratory analysis. 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, or, the artifacts may be delivered to the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) if that is recommended by the City of Jurupa Valley. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department and the Eastern Information Center.

MM- CR-3: Paleontological Monitoring. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Proponent shall implement the following program:

a) A qualified paleontologist shall be on-site at the pre-construction meeting to discuss monitoring protocols.

b) The qualified paleontologist shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect grading activities paleontological resources are discovered.
c) In the event of a paleontological discovery the monitor shall flag the area and notify the construction crew immediately. No further disturbance in the flagged area shall occur until the qualified paleontologist has cleared the area.

d) The qualified paleontologist shall quickly assess the nature and significance of the find. If the specimen is not significant it shall be quickly removed and the area cleared.

e) If the discovery is significant the qualified paleontologist shall notify the Project proponent and the City immediately.

f) 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.

Conclusion: The project site remains in substantially the same physical condition as it was in 2015). With implementation of the above described mitigation measures, impacts will remain less than significant.

3. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Findings of Fact: Hazardous wastes that may be present during construction of the Project may include DDT, pesticides, or herbicides.

Mitigation: MM-HAZ-1: Work Plan. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project Proponent shall submit to the City a work plan that includes soil sampling to address potential exposure concerns to construction workers to DDT, pesticides, or herbicides, or arsenic. The work plan shall identify soil disposal options if necessary.

Conclusion: The project site remains in substantially the same physical condition as it was in 2015. With implementation of the above described mitigation measure, impacts will remain less than significant.

4. Land Use and Planning

Findings of Fact: The Project is located within the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The project site is almost entirely covered by disturbed, ruderal vegetation. Sporadic ornamental plant and tree species were also found on site. No indication of habitat conducive to sensitive species was noted due to the highly disturbed nature of the site. No large burrows were found in the area and the particularly dense ruderal vegetation suggest poor habitat for burrowing owl. However, their presence cannot be ruled out because burrowing owls have been known to occupy disturbed sites. Mitigation is required.

Mitigation: Mitigation Measure BIO-1 above is required (MM-BIO-1: Pre-Construction Burrowing Owl Survey).
Conclusion: The project site remains in substantially the same physical condition as it was in 2015. With implementation of the above described mitigation measure, impacts will remain less than significant.

4.0 DETERMINATION:

On the basis of the evaluation in Section 3.0 this document, I find that although the Proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier Mitigated Negative Declaration, pursuant to all applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier Mitigated Negative Declaration, nothing further is required.

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

City of Jurupa Valley
Agency

April 24, 2019
Date
RECOMMENDATION

That the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 2019-05-08-02 finding that the City of Jurupa Valley’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Year 2019-2020 (FY 19/20) is consistent with the City of Jurupa Valley’s General Plan.

BACKGROUND

California Government Code Section 65401 requires that “If a general plan or part thereof has been adopted, within such time as may be fixed by the legislative body, each county or city officer, department, board, or commission, and each governmental body, commission, or board, including the governing body of any special district or school district, whose jurisdiction lies wholly or partially within the county or city, whose functions include recommending, preparing plans for, or constructing, major public works, shall submit to the official agency, as designated by the respective county board of supervisors or city council, a list of the proposed public works recommended for planning, initiation or construction during the ensuing fiscal year. The official agency receiving the list of proposed public works shall list and classify all such recommendations and shall prepare a coordinated program of proposed public works for the ensuing fiscal year. Such coordinated program shall be submitted to the county or city planning agency for review and report to said official agency as to conformity with the adopted general plan or part thereof.”

The conformity determination or consistency analysis of the City’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) with the General Plan determines the listed projects are intended to accomplish the following:

1. Implement and accomplish an adopted City goal, policy or program.
2. Determine the proposed action will not obstruct or preclude the achievement of other General Plan goals, policies or programs.
The City Engineer has prepared the City of Jurupa Valley three-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for FY 19/20 through FY 21/22. A copy of the three-year CIP is included as Attachment 1.

ANALYSIS

Staff has reviewed the proposed CIP and concludes that its components are consistent with the existing Land Use and Mobility Element and related goals and policies of the City of Jurupa Valley’s General Plan.

On May 16, 2019, staff will present the Jurupa Valley CIP for FY 19/20 through FY 21/22 and recommend the approval of the CIP to City Council.

The CIP includes 33 projects with an estimated budget of $18,119,039 for FY 19/20. Although all sources are applicable for the CIP, not all funds are utilized in the current fiscal year. Revenue sources include the following:

- Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA)
- Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax (Gas Tax)
- Measure “A” Local Streets and Roads (County ½ cent sales tax for transportation)
- Developer Impact Fees (DIF)
- Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF)
- Mira Loma Road and Bridge Benefit District (Mira Loma RBBD)
- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
- Active Transportation Projects (ATP)
- Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
- SB 821 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Program State Grant through RCTC
- MARA (Measure A Regional Arterials grant through RCTC)

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

Pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), Chapter 3, Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 15378(b)(4), City staff determined that the City of Jurupa Valley’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Year 2019/2020 through Fiscal Year 2021/2022 are not a project as defined by CEQA.
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Attachments:

1) Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Year 2019/2020 through Fiscal Year 2021/2022

2) Resolution No. 2019-05-08-02, a Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley Finding the City of Jurupa Valley Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Year 2019/20 in Conformance with the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan
ATTACHMENT NO. 1

Capital Improvement Program
## PROJECT SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>SOURCE OF FUNDS</th>
<th>PROJECTED CARRYOVER</th>
<th>15/20 PROJECTED</th>
<th>20/21 PROJECTED</th>
<th>21/22 PROJECTED</th>
<th>FUTURE YEARS</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-04</td>
<td>LIMONITE AVE. WIDENING, ETIWANDA TO BAIN - DEBT SERVICE</td>
<td>Measure 'A'</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 183,500</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 183,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-H.1</td>
<td>MARKET ST. BRIDGE, CROSSING SANTA ANA RIVER</td>
<td>TUMF</td>
<td>$ 443,750</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>$ 1,750,000</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td>$ 5,193,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-H.2</td>
<td>MISSION BLVD. BRIDGE, CROSSING SANTA ANA RIVER</td>
<td>Measure 'A'</td>
<td>$ 171,197</td>
<td>$ 265,000</td>
<td>$ 265,000</td>
<td>$ 265,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 966,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-A.2</td>
<td>BAIN ST. PAVEMENT REHABILITATION, JURUPA TO BELLEGRAVE</td>
<td>Measure 'A'</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>$ 36,463</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 36,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 36,463</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,076,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-B.1</td>
<td>PEDLEY RD. IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, LIMONITE TO JURUPA</td>
<td>DIF (Transportation)</td>
<td>$ 39,377</td>
<td>$ 106,150</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 145,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure 'A'</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>$ 135,000</td>
<td>$ 955,250</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,090,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 174,377</td>
<td>$ 1,136,500</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,310,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-C.2</td>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL INSTALLATION, PEDLEY AND JURUPA</td>
<td>DIF (Signals)</td>
<td>$ 260,114</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 260,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 260,114</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,760,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-F</td>
<td>CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION (COP) SERIES 2016A - DEBT SERVICE</td>
<td>Measure 'A'</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,057,350</td>
<td>$ 1,059,400</td>
<td>$ 1,057,800</td>
<td>$ 5,294,050</td>
<td>$ 8,468,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-B.1</td>
<td>VAN BUREN BLVD. WIDENING, SANTA ANA RIVER TO LIMONITE</td>
<td>TUMF</td>
<td>$ 384,070</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>$ 4,525,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 5,909,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DIF (Transportation)</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 534,070</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>$ 4,525,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 6,059,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-B.2</td>
<td>LIMONITE AVE. WIDENING, BAIN TO HOMESTEAD</td>
<td>TUMF</td>
<td>$ 445,081</td>
<td>$ 850,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,295,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DIF (Transportation)</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 7,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 595,081</td>
<td>$ 850,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 8,945,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-B.3</td>
<td>RUBIDOUX BLVD. AND SR60 INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>DIF (Rialto)</td>
<td>$ 1,792,317</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,792,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TUMF</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 617,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 617,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 40,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 1,792,317</td>
<td>$ 617,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 42,409,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-B.4</td>
<td>LIMONITE AVE. AND I-15 INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>SB 132</td>
<td>$ 20,283</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 20,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-B.5</td>
<td>JURUPA RD. AND VAN BUREN BLVD. GRADE SEPARATION</td>
<td>SB 132</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-C.1</td>
<td>HORSE CROSSING SIGNAL, LIMONITE AVE.</td>
<td>DIF (Trails)</td>
<td>$ 50,419</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 50,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DIF (Signals)</td>
<td>$ 140,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 190,419</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 190,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-C.2</td>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL MODIFICATIONS (PROTECTED PERMISSIVE)</td>
<td>DIF (Signals)</td>
<td>$ 150,117</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 150,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-F.1</td>
<td>DOWNEY ST. AND 64TH ST. PARK IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>DIF (Parks)</td>
<td>$ 738,627</td>
<td>$ 1,500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,238,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-A.2</td>
<td>RUBIDOUX BLVD. PAVEMENT REHABILITATION, MISSION TO SR-60</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>$ 41,975</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 41,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>$ 650,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 731,975</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 731,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-B.1</td>
<td>2018-2019 ADA IMPROVEMENTS, MISSION BLVD. - RIVERVIEW TO MISSION BLVD.</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>$ 166,405</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 166,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-C.1</td>
<td>MISSION BLVD. AND VALLEY WAY INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>DIF (Signals)</td>
<td>$ 188,579</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 188,579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROJECT SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>SOURCE OF FUNDS</th>
<th>PROJECTED CARRYOVER (As of 04/05/19)</th>
<th>15/20 PROJECTED</th>
<th>20/21 PROJECTED</th>
<th>21/22 PROJECTED</th>
<th>FUTURE YEARS</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.D.1</td>
<td>FILLY LN. DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>$132,218</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$132,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19101</td>
<td>2019-2020 PAVEMENT MAINTENANCE (SLURRY/CRACK SEAL), LOCATIONS TBD</td>
<td>Measure ‘A’</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19102</td>
<td>2019-2020 PAVEMENT REHABILITATION, LOCATIONS TBD</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19103</td>
<td>GRANITE HILL DR. PAVEMENT REHABILITATION, PYRITE TO EDgewater POINT</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19104</td>
<td>COREY ST. AND KENNEDY ST. PAVEMENT REHABILITATION</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19105</td>
<td>2019/20 CDBG - PONTIAC AVE. NEIGHBORHOOD PAVEMENT REHABILITITION</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$678,697</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$678,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19106</td>
<td>PACIFIC AVE. SR25 SIDEWALK PROJECT, MISSION TO 45TH</td>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$154,000</td>
<td>$453,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$607,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$256,000</td>
<td>$453,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$709,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19107</td>
<td>SUNNYSLIDE AREA SR25 SIDEWALK GAP CLOSURE</td>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$388,000</td>
<td>$2,466,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,855,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measure ‘A’</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>$274,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$318,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19108</td>
<td>MARKET ST. WIDENING, SANTA ANA RIVER TO RUBIDOUX</td>
<td>TUMF</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$227,000</td>
<td>$566,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$793,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$227,000</td>
<td>$566,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$4,793,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19109</td>
<td>MISSION BLVD. AND RUBIDOUX BLVD. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>DIF (Signals)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19110</td>
<td>MASTER PLAN OF STREETS</td>
<td>DIF (Transportation)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19111</td>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL INSTALLATION, BEN NEVIS AND PEDLEY</td>
<td>DIF (Signals)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19112</td>
<td>CITYWIDE GUARDRAIL REPLACEMENT</td>
<td>Measure ‘A’</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$509,200</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$509,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$574,200</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$654,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19113</td>
<td>OVERHEAD STREET BANNER POLES</td>
<td>General Fund/Gas Tax</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19114</td>
<td>CITYWIDE RETROREFLECTIVITY TESTING</td>
<td>Measure ‘A’</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20101</td>
<td>2020-2021 PAVEMENT REHABILITATION, LOCATIONS TBD</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20102</td>
<td>2020-2021 CDBG IMPROVEMENTS, LOCATIONS TBD</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20103</td>
<td>MISSION BLVD. PAVEMENT REHABILITATION - PH. 1, BEN NEVIS TO BELLEGRAVE</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measure ‘A’</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20104</td>
<td>VAN BUREN BLVD. PAVEMENT REHABILITATION - PH. 3, BELLEGRAVE TO ETIWANDA</td>
<td>Measure ‘A’</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

**FY 2019-2020 TO FY 2021-2022**
## Capital Improvement Program

**FY 2019-2020 to FY 2021-2022**

### Project Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Projected Carryover (As of 04/05/19)</th>
<th>19/20 Projected</th>
<th>20/21 Projected</th>
<th>21/22 Projected</th>
<th>Future Years</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20105</td>
<td>2020-2021 Pavement Maintenance (Slurry/Crack Seal), Locations TBD</td>
<td>Measure ‘A’</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$250,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20106</td>
<td>Misc. Traffic Signal Upgrades, Locations TBD</td>
<td>DIF (Signals)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$150,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20107</td>
<td>2021-2022 Drainage Repairs, Locations TBD</td>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$100,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20108</td>
<td>Sierra Ave., Armstrong to City Limits and/or Armstrong Rd.,</td>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$250,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra to City Limits Roundabout Study and Installation</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$750,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$1,400,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21101</td>
<td>2021-2022 Pavement Rehabilitation, Locations TBD</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$300,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21102</td>
<td>2021-2022 CDBG Improvements, Locations TBD</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$250,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21103</td>
<td>Mission Blvd. Pavement Rehabilitation - Ph. 2, Bellegrave to Pyrite</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$1,750,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure ‘A’</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$400,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$332,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$332,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21104</td>
<td>2021-2022 Pavement Maintenance (Slurry/Crack Seal), Locations TBD</td>
<td>Measure ‘A’</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$250,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21105</td>
<td>Misc. Traffic Signal Upgrades, Locations TBD</td>
<td>DIF (Signals)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$150,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21106</td>
<td>2021-2022 Drainage Repairs, Locations TBD</td>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$76,000 $</td>
<td>$320,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$408,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21107</td>
<td>Cantu Galleano Ranch Rd. Gap Closure</td>
<td>TUMF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$1,400,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT. A</td>
<td>Mission Blvd. Pavement Rehabilitation - Ph. 3, Pyrite to Valley Way</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$300,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure ‘A’</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$500,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$1,900,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT. B</td>
<td>Valley Way and Jurupa Rd. Realignment</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$1,500,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT. C</td>
<td>5th St. Gap Closure</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$1,500,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT. D</td>
<td>Camino Real Widening/Intersection Improvements, Jurupa Rd. To 700’ South</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$3,000,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT. E</td>
<td>Daly Ave. Storm Drain Improvements</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$1,500,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT. F</td>
<td>Pacific Ave. Storm Drain Improvements</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$1,000,000 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $9,725,992 $11,793,047 $12,279,400 $10,363,000 $76,276,050 $117,037,489
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-05-08-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY FINDING THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020 IN CONFORMANCE WITH CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY GENERAL PLAN

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

Section 1. City of Jurupa Valley Land Use Regulatory Authority. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that:

(a) The City of Jurupa Valley incorporated on July 1, 2011.

(b) On July 1, 2011, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2011-01. This Ordinance provides that pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 57376, all ordinances of the County of Riverside that have been applicable within the territory now incorporated as the City of Jurupa Valley, to the extent that they applied before incorporation, shall remain in full force and effect as ordinances of the City of Jurupa Valley, including the Riverside County General Plan. Additionally, Ordinance No. 2011-01 provides that the resolutions, rules and regulations of the County of Riverside that have been applicable in the implementation of the aforesaid ordinances and State laws (including, but not limited to, the California Environmental Quality Act and regulations pertaining to traffic) to the extent that they applied before incorporation shall remain in full force and effect as resolutions, rules and regulations, respectively, of the City of Jurupa Valley. On September 15, 2011, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2011-10, effective October 15, 2011, continuing in effect all ordinances of the County of Riverside that have been applicable within the territory now incorporated as the City of Jurupa Valley, to the extent that they applied before incorporation. These ordinances and resolutions as well as the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code shall be known as “Jurupa Valley Ordinances.”

(c) On September 15, 2011, the City Council also adopted Ordinance No. 2011-09, effective October 15, 2011, adopting Chapter 2.35 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code establishing the Planning Commission for the City of Jurupa Valley. Chapter 2.35 provides that the Planning Commission shall perform the planning agency functions described in Government Code Section 65100 et seq., and shall fulfill the functions delegated to the Planning Commission for the County of Riverside under the relevant ordinances and resolutions, which the City has adopted as required upon incorporation. Chapter 2.35 further provides that the Planning Commission shall perform the functions of any and all planning, zoning or code enforcement appeals board created by the relevant County of Riverside ordinances and resolutions, which the City has adopted by reference as required by law.

(d) California Government Code Section 65401 requires that “[i]f a general plan or part thereof has been adopted, within such time as may be fixed by the legislative body, each county or city officer, department, board, or commission, and each governmental body,
commission, or board, including the governing body of any special district or school district, whose jurisdiction lies wholly or partially within the county or city, whose functions include recommending, preparing plans for, or constructing, major public works, shall submit to the official agency, as designated by the respective county board of supervisors or city council, a list of the proposed public works recommended for planning, initiation or construction during the ensuing fiscal year. The official agency receiving the list of proposed public works shall list and classify all such recommendations and shall prepare a coordinated program of proposed public works for the ensuing fiscal year. Such coordinated program shall be submitted to the county or city planning agency for review and report to said official agency as to conformity with the adopted general plan or part thereof.”

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

(a) The City Engineer of the City of Jurupa Valley has prepared a draft Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Year 2019-2020 and is prepared to submit same to the City of Jurupa Valley City Council.

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

Section 3. California Environmental Quality Act Findings and Recommendation for Determination of Exemption. The Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley make the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Year 2019-2020:

(a) City staff has determined that the City of Jurupa Valley’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Year 2019-2020 is exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and the City’s CEQA Guidelines pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(b)(4) because the Plan is not a “project” as defined by CEQA but involves the creation of government funding mechanisms or other government fiscal activities that do not involve any commitment to any specific project that may result in a potentially significant physical impact on the environment. The City Council has reviewed City staff’s determination of exemption, and based on its own independent judgment, concurs with staff’s determination of exemption.

Section 4. Findings for Recommendation of Approval of Plan. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby recommend that the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley find and determine that the proposed Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Year 2019-2020 should be adopted because:

(a) The City of Jurupa Valley’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Year 2019-2020 is consistent with the City of Jurupa Valley’s General Plan.

Section 5. 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 8th day of May, 2019.

______________________________
Corey Moore
Chair of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission

ATTEST:

______________________________
Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

I, Thomas G. Merrell, Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-05-08-02 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 8th day of May, 2019 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

NOES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

___________________________
THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP
PLANNING DIRECTOR