MEETING AGENDA
OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, July 10, 2019
Regular Meeting: 7:00 P.M.
City of Jurupa Valley City Hall
City Council Chambers
8930 Limonite Ave., Jurupa Valley, CA 92509

A. As a courtesy to those in attendance, we ask that cell phones be turned off or set to their silent mode and that you keep talking to a minimum so that all persons can hear the comments of the public and Planning Commission. The Commission Rules of Order require permission of the Chair to speak with anyone at the staff table or to approach the dais.

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

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

D. As a courtesy to others and to assure that each person wishing to be heard has an opportunity to speak, please limit your comments to 5 minutes.

REGULAR SESSION

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

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Public Appearance/Comments (30 minutes)

4. Approval of Agenda
5. Approval of Minutes

5.1 June 12, 2019 Regular Meeting

5.2 June 26, 2019 Regular Meeting

6. Public Hearings

6.1 MASTER APPLICATION NO. 18172 (MA18172) FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 18005 (CUP18005) TO ALLOW A 70-FOOT TALL MONOPOLE WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITY WITHIN A 435 SQUARE-FOOT EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE ON A .95 ACRE LOT AT 3125 PROGRESS CIRCLE (APN: 156-310-028)

The project is categorically exempt from CEQA review pursuant to Section 15303 (New Construction of Conversion of Small Structures) of the CEQA Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION

By motion, adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-07-10-01 granting the approval of a 70-foot tall monopole wireless communication facility located within a 435 square-foot equipment enclosure with associated equipment.


The City prepared an Initial Study in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and determined that the project could have potential environmental impacts but that through mitigation measures, the impacts could be reduced to levels of non-significance. The project will be subject to a condition that requires all mitigation measures of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) be incorporated as Conditions of Approval

RECOMMENDATION

1) By motion, accept the applicant’s request to withdraw the appeal (MA19146).

2) By motion, adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-07-10-02 (MA18091) granting approval of the 4-parcel commercial subdivision.

7. Commission Business

8. Public Appearance/Comments

9. Planning Commissioner’s Reports and Comments
10. Planning Department Report

11. Adjournment to the July 24, 2019 Regular Meeting

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

Agendas of public meetings and any other writings distributed to all, or a majority of, the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission in connection with a matter subject to discussion or consideration at an open meeting of the Planning Commission are public records. If such writing is distributed less than 72 hours prior to a public meeting, the writing will be made available for public inspection at the City of Jurupa Valley, 8930 Limonite Ave., Jurupa Valley, CA 92509, at the time the writing is distributed to all, or a majority of, the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission. The Planning Commission may also post the writing on its Internet website at www.jurupavalley.org.
1. 7:00 P.M. – Call to Order and Roll Call
   - Corey Moore, Chair
   - Arleen Pruitt, Chair Pro Tem
   - Mariana Lopez, Commission Member
   - Guillermo Silva Commission Member

   Members absent:
   - Penny Newman, Commission Member

2. Pledge of Allegiance – Commissioner Pruitt led the Pledge of Allegiance

3. Public Appearance/Comments – None

4. Approval of Agenda
   Commissioner Moore moved, and Commissioner Pruitt seconded, a motion to approve the June 12, 2019 agenda. The motion was approved 4:0
   Ayes: Lopez, Moore, Pruitt, Silva
   Noes: None
   Abstained: None
   Absent: Newman

5. Approval of Minutes
   Commissioner Pruitt moved and Commissioner Silva seconded, a motion to approve the May 22, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes. The motion was approved 4:0
   Ayes: Lopez, Moore, Pruitt, Silva
   Noes: None
   Abstained: None
   Absent: Newman
6. PUBLIC HEARING

6.1 MASTER APPLICATION NO. 19092: REQUEST FOR A ONE (1) YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME (EOT) FOR TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 36702 – TO SUBDIVIDE 10.48 ACRES OF VACANT LOT INTO 17 SINGLE-FAMILY PARCELS EASTERLY OF STONE AVENUE AND SOUTHERLY OF MARTINGALE DR. APN: 166-070-018 APPLICANT: GID TIFFERET 1, LLC.

Rocio Lopez, Senior Planner, provided a PowerPoint presentation to the Commission regarding the request for a one (1) year extension of time to finalize the tentative tract map for the new owner.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Pruitt asked if notice would be given to the surrounding homeowners if a revision to the map is requested by the new owner to put in a trail/walkway on the northern border of the property. She had concerns for the privacy of the existing families around the property. Ms. Lopez assured the Commission that notice would be given to all residences within the 1,000-foot radius of the project.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Chair Moore opened the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

There being no other persons wishing to address the Commission, Chair Moore closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Lopez moved, and Chair Silva seconded, a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2019-06-12-01 recommending that the City Council approve the one (1) year extension of time for TTM No. 36702 subject to the previously adopted Conditions of Approval

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

6.2 MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 19107: REQUEST FOR ONE (1) YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME (EOT) FOR TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 36283 – TO SUBDIVIDE 24.63 ACRES INTO 107 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL PARCELS LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LIMONITE AVENUE AND DOWNEY STREET (APN’S 162-230-001, 162-230-006) APPLICANT: LANSING COMPANIES

Planning Director Tom Merrell provided background information and stated that the City Attorney had determined the timing for recordation of the map was dictated by the Development Agreement and not the City’s Subdivision Ordinance or State law. The typical approval period for such a map is 3 years but the Development Agreement indicates the map is approved for the life of the Development Agreement. Mr. Merrell included this item on the agenda since it was noticed and he recommends the Planning Commission receive public comments and table the item.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Ms. Jacqueline Lee, resident, stated she is opposed to the project
Ms. Victoria Kirkman, resident, stated she is opposed to the project
PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED
Commissioner Silva moved, and Chair Pro Tem Pruitt seconded, a motion to table the item to provide time for staff to review the provisions of the Development Agreement requirements for TTM No. 36283
Ayes: Lopez, Moore, Pruitt, Silva
Noes: None
Abstained: None
Absent: Newman

7. Commission Business – None

8. Public Appearance/Comments - None


10. Planning Department Report – Planning Director Mr. Merrell discussed upcoming agenda items.

There being no further business before the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission, Chair Moore adjourned the meeting at 7:35 p.m. to the June 26, 2019 Planning Commission meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director
Secretary of the Planning Commission
MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY
June 26, 2019

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 June 26, 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
BACK TO AGENDA

DATE: JULY 10, 2019
TO: CHAIR MOORE AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR
BY: ROB GONZALEZ, ASSISTANT PLANNER
SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 6.1

MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 18172 (CUP NO. 18005) : TO ALLOW A NEW 70-FOOT HIGH MONOPOLE WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITY WITHIN A 435 SQUARE-FOOT EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE ON A .95 ACRE LOT LOCATED AT 3125 PROGRESS CIRCLE (APN: 156-310-028)

APPLICANT: AT&T
CONTACT: GUNJAN MALIK

RECOMMENDATION

By motion, adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-07-10-01 granting approval of MA18172 and allowing the construction of a 70-foot monopole wireless communication facility located within a 435 square-foot equipment enclosure with associated equipment.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Applicant ("Applicant" or AT&T) submitted a request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) approving a 70-foot high undisguised monopole wireless communication facility within the paved area of an existing industrially developed parcel. The unmanned facility would be a monopole tower within a 435 square-foot equipment enclosure. The proposed tower would be located at the rear portion of the lot.

The entire project site has an existing 6-foot high solid concrete wall along the side and rear property lines which adds additional screening of the equipment enclosure from adjacent properties. The plans for the tower are attached to this staff report and the following table provides a summary of the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: PROJECT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessor's Parcel Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Policy Area and Land Use Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Land Uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOCATION

The property is located north of Inland Avenue, west of Progress Circle, south of Philadelphia Avenue and east of Venture Drive; approximately 667 feet from the City Boundary. The majority
of the property is developed with an industrial building. The property is surrounded by warehousing and distribution uses 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: Zoning Map: Manufacturing Medium (M-M)
Exhibit 3: Land Use Map: Light Industrial (LI)

ANALYSIS

The proposed project meets the definition of "Other Wireless Communication Facility" as set forth in the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. These types of facilities are not disguised, concealed, nor are they co-located wireless communication facilities. Pursuant to Chapter 9.275 (Wireless Communication Facilities) "Other Wireless Communication Facilities" are permitted uses subject to an approved CUP.

The location of the tower is within a fully developed industrial area and situated in the interior of the lot. Visibility of the structure would be screened from public view by buildings and distance. In addition, the equipment enclosure will not be visible from any public streets. Parking requirements and/or loading areas for the existing industrial uses will not be impacted.

The tower is consistent with uses typically found within the "Medium-Manufacturing (M-M)" zone and consistent with the intent of the "Light Industrial" General Plan Land Use Designation. In addition, given the tower's distance from any residential areas, the structure is considered compatible with the surrounding area. Exhibit 4 shows the site plan and elevation view of the tower.

The site was evaluated for compliance with original conditions of approval for the industrial building and no inconsistencies between existing conditions and approved provisions were found. All required landscaping, mechanical equipment screening and parking and loading areas were found to be as approved.

Staff has worked with the applicant to ensure the project meets municipal code requirements and that with proposed setbacks and screening, any potential negative impacts have been minimized. The photo simulations provided as Exhibits 5, 6, and 7 are representative of how the structure will look from various vantage points.
EXHIBIT 4 – SITE PLAN AND TOWER ELEVATION
EXHIBIT 5, 6 and 7 – PHOTOSIMULATIONS

Looking north from Inland Ave. toward subject site.

Proposed AT&T panel antennas mounted new 70' monopole

Looking south from adjacent parking lot toward subject site.

Proposed AT&T panel antennas mounted new 70' monopole
Findings for Approval

No Conditional Use Permit application for an “Other Wireless Communication Facility” may be approved unless findings are made pursuant to Section 9.275.070 (Other Wireless Communication Facilities) and Section 9.240.280 (Conditional Use Permits). Staff believes that the required findings for approval can be made for the reasons discussed below:

1. The facility is not located within a sensitive viewshed.
   - Since the structure is setback significantly from property lines and screened from public view by large industrial buildings, any view impacts are mitigated.

2. Supporting equipment is located entirely within an equipment enclosure that is architecturally compatible with the surrounding area or is screened from view.
   - The existing building along with landscaping adequately screens the equipment enclosure from view.

3. The application has met the processing requirements set forth in this chapter.
   - All processing regulations pertaining to conditional use permits (including public noticing) have been satisfied.

4. The application has met the location and development standards set forth in this chapter.
• **Area Disturbance** – The proposal will not cause any disturbance to natural landscaping. The project is to construct a new wireless communication facility and install ancillary equipment within an existing paved rear yard behind large and massive industrial buildings.

• **Fencing and Walls** – The project proposes an 6-foot tall chain link fence with landscaping as shown in the project's conceptual landscape plan. Staff has applied Condition of Approval No. 8 requiring the applicant to enclose the wireless communication facility with a 6-foot decorative block wall. Staff has concerns that chain link fencing will not screen the equipment area and that such fencing is subject to damage from cars/delivery trucks.

• **Height** – The wireless communication facility is required to be compatible with the height limitations per Sec. 9.275.110 which stipulate a maximum height of 105 feet. The height limit of the proposed tower is 70 feet.

• **Landscaping** – The applicant has worked with staff to revise the conceptual landscaping plan per municipal code requirements, and the applicant has submitted an appropriate conceptual landscape plan with a landscape estimate of cost.

• **Lighting** – The project does not propose any outside lighting and the FAA or the California Building Code do not require any marking or lighting for the project.

• **Parking** – Service vehicles will utilize the existing on-site parking. The project does not propose additional, nor eliminates, parking spaces.

• **Paved Access** – The municipal code does not include requirements for facilities located in nonresidential zones.

• **Power & Communication Lines** – There will not be any proposed above ground power or communication lines.

• **Setbacks** - The code requires that these types of towers be setback from habitable dwellings a distance equal to one thousand (1,000) feet. The nearest habitable dwellings are located approximately 3,558 ft. west of the project site.

• **Support Facilities** – the tallest support equipment is a 6- foot tall generator located within the enclosure. A condition has been included that will require all equipment to be painted with neutral earth-toned colors which will blend with the surrounding setting.

5. The application has met the requirements for approval set forth in Section 9.240.280.

• In addition to satisfying the requirements of the above section, the project is also found to be consistent with the General Plan and all applicable requirements of State law and the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. The project is designed for the protection of the public health, safety, and general welfare of the community and conforms to the logical development of the land. It will be compatible with present and future logical development of the surrounding property.

**DESIGN GUIDELINES**

The City of Jurupa Valley adopted the County second district design guidelines. The design guidelines include provisions for all wireless communication facilities. The design features
included in the design guidelines reduce visual impacts to surrounding properties to the maximum extent possible. Table 2 includes a summary of applicable design guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Does the Project Comply with the Standards</th>
<th>Supporting Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monopole antenna array shall be &quot;stealthed in a manner which is acceptable to the site.&quot;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project complies with this provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic equipment shelter shall be on a concrete slab and painted in earth-toned colors which blend.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project complies with this provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility shall be enclosed by a minimum 6 foot decorative block wall with landscaping</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project complies with this provision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

Staff reviewed the project in comparison with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and determined that it qualifies for an exemption per section 15303 (New Construction of Conversion of Small Structures). This exemption includes projects that involve the construction and location of limited numbers of new, small facilities or structures.

**NOTIFICATION**

Pursuant to Section 9 240.250 (Permit Applications), a notice of hearing was sent to all owners of real property located within one-thousand (1,000) feet of the exterior boundaries of the subject property. This public notice was sent on June 27, 2019 and was included as a legal notice in the Press Enterprise newspaper on June 29, 2019. As of the date of this staff report no comments have been received regarding the project.

**CONCLUSION**

The wireless communication facility is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. Based upon the findings and conclusions set forth above, staff recommends approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 18005 (Master Application Nc. 18172).

Prepared by:

Rob Gonzalez
Assistant Planner

Submitted by:

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director
Reviewed by:

///s/// Serita Young
Serita Young
Deputy City Attorney

Attachments
2. Exhibit B: Conditions of Approval
3. Exhibit C: Architectural Plans
4. Exhibit D: Conceptual Landscape Plans
ATTACHMENT NO. 1

Exhibit A: Planning Commission Resolution
No. 2019-07-10-01
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-07-10-01

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY APPROVING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 18005 TO PERMIT THE INSTALLATION OF A 70-FOOT TALL MONOPOLE WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITY WITHIN A 435 SQUARE-FOOT EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE ON APPROXIMATELY .95 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT 3125 PROGRESS CIRCLE (APN: 156-310-028) IN THE MANUFACTURING MEDIUM (M-M) ZONE, AND MAKING A DETERMINATION OF EXEMPTION UNDER CEQA GUIDELINE SECTION 15303

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

Section 1. Project. AT&T (the “Applicant”) has applied for Conditional Use Permit No. 18005 (Master Application No. 18172 or MA No. 18172) to permit the installation of a 70-foot tall monopole wireless communication facility within a 435 square-foot equipment enclosure on approximately .95 acres of real property located at 3125 Progress Circle (APN: 156-310-028) in the Manufacturing Medium (M-M) Zone and designated Light Industrial (LI) (the “Project”).

Section 2. Conditional Use Permit.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 18005 to permit the installation of a 70-foot tall monopole wireless communication facility and 435 square-foot equipment enclosure on approximately .95 acres of real property located at 3125 Progress Circle (APN: 156-310-028) in the Manufacturing Medium (M-M) Zone.

(b) Sections 9.275.070.A.-B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provide that other wireless communication facilities may be located in the M-M Zone provided a conditional use permit has been granted pursuant to Section 9.240.280 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(c) Section 9.275.070.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that public hearing on the Conditional Use Permit application is required and all the procedural provisions of Section 9.240.280 must apply to the Conditional Use Permit application.

(d) Section 9.275.070.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that no Conditional Use Permit for any other wireless communication facility shall be approved unless: (1) The facility is not located within a sensitive viewed; (2) Supporting equipment is located entirely within an equipment enclosure that is architecturally compatible with the surrounding area or is screened from view; (3) The application has met the processing requirements set forth in Chapter 9.275 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code; (4) The application has met the location and development standards set forth in Chapter 9.275 of the
Jurupa Valley Municipal Code; and/or (5) The application has met the requirements for approval set forth in Section 9.240.280.

(e) Section 9.240.280.(4) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that a conditional use permit shall not be granted unless the applicant demonstrates that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of the community. Any permit that is granted shall be subject to such conditions as shall be necessary to protect the health, safety, or general welfare of the community.

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

(a) The application for MA No. 18172 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 July 10, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 18172, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing.

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

Section 4. **California Environmental Quality Act Findings.** The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find and determines, in connection with the approval of the Project, that the Project is exempt from the requirements of 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.*). Pursuant to Guideline Section 15303, the proposed Project is categorically exempt from environmental review as it consists of construction and location of limited numbers of new, small facilities or structures. A notice of exemption will be prepared.

Section 5. **Findings for Approval of Conditional Use Permit.** The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the proposed Conditional Use Permit No. 18005 should be granted because the proposed 70-foot tall monopole wireless communication facility within a 435 square-foot equipment enclosure will not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of the community in that:

(a) The facility is not located within a sensitive viewshed;

(b) Supporting equipment for the proposed 70-foot tall monopole wireless communication facility is located entirely within a 435 square-foot equipment enclosure that is architecturally compatible with the surrounding area or is screened from view by a 6 foot fence and adjacent landscaping as well as a 6 foot solid concrete wall enclosing the Project site;

(c) The Applicant’s Conditional Use Permit application has met the processing requirements set forth in Chapter 9.275 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code;
(d) The Applicant’s Conditional Use Permit application has met the location and development standards set forth in Chapter 9.275 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code as detailed in the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission staff report dated July 10, 2019, for Agenda Item No. 6.1;

(e) The Applicant’s Conditional Use Permit application has met the requirements for approval set forth in Section 9.240.280 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, as detailed in paragraphs (f) through (i) of this Section 5 of this Resolution; and

(f) The proposed 70-foot tall monopole wireless communication facility within a 435 square-foot equipment enclosure will not be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of the community;

(g) The proposed 70-foot tall monopole wireless communication facility within a 435 square-foot equipment enclosure is consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and all applicable requirements of state law and the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code;

(h) The proposed 70-foot tall monopole wireless communication facility within a 435 square-foot equipment enclosure has been designed for the protection of the public health, safety, and general welfare of the community and conforms to the logical development of the land; and

(i) The proposed 70-foot tall monopole wireless communication facility within a 435 square-foot equipment enclosure is compatible with the present, and will be compatible with the future logical, development of the surrounding property.

Section 6. **Approval of Master Application No. 18172 with Conditions.** Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby approves Conditional Use Permit No. 18005 to permit the installation of a 70-foot tall monopole wireless communication facility within a 435 square-foot equipment enclosure on approximately .95 acres of real property located at 3125 Progress Circle (APN: 156-310-028) in the Manufacturing Medium (M-M) Zone and designated Light Industrial (LI), subject to the recommended conditions of approval attached hereto as Exhibit “A”.

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

**PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED** by the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 10th day of July, 2019.

______________________________
Corey Moore
Chair of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission
ATTEST:

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

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY

I, Thomas Merrell, Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-07-10-01 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 10th day of July, 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

Exhibit B: Conditions of Approval
EXHIBIT B
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
MA18172 – CUP18005

1. PROJECT APPROVAL. MA18172 is an approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP18005) to allow a 70 foot-high monopole wireless communication facility located within a 435 square-foot equipment enclosure with associated equipment and project related site improvements as shown on EXHIBIT C and EXHIBIT D on property located at 3125 Progress Circle.

2. CONFORMANCE TO EXHIBITS. The project shall be in conformance to the approved plans (listed below) with any changes in accordance to these conditions of approval:
   1. Exhibit C: Architectural set of plans (Dated 2/19/2019):
      a. Sheet T-1 (Title Sheet)
      b. Sheet A-1 (Site Plan)
      c. Sheet A-2 (Proposed Equipment Layout)
      d. Sheet A-3 (Proposed Antenna Layout/Antenna and RRU Schedule)
      e. Sheet A-4 (Proposed South and West Elevations)
   2. Exhibit D: Conceptual Landscape Plans (Dated 8/24/2019)
      a. Sheet L-1 (Landscape Plan)
      b. Sheet L-2 (Landscape Details)
      c. Sheet L-3 (Landscape Specifications and Notes)

3. FEES. Approval shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

4. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL. These conditions of approval shall be reproduced on page one of any plans submitted for a building permit for this project.

5. MAX HEIGHT. The top of the wireless communication facility shall not exceed a height of 70 feet.

6. EQUIPMENT AND CABINETS COLOR. The equipment cabinet shall be painted in a neutral color to match adjacent building colors.

7. ELEVATIONS AND MATERIALS. The building and structure shall be in substantial conformance with that shown on the APPROVED EXHIBIT C, dated 2/19/2019.

8. BLOCK WALL ENCLOSURE. The wireless communication facility shall be enclosed by a decorative block wall at a height of six (6) feet.

9. LANDSCAPE PLAN. All required landscape planting and irrigation shall have been installed in accordance with approved landscaping and Irrigation plans and shall be in condition acceptable to the Planning Department. Landscaping shall be healthy and free of weeds, disease or pests. The irrigation system shall be properly constructed and determined to be in good working order.

10. SITE MAINTENANCE. The project site shall be kept in good repair. Graffiti shall be removed from any structures within one week of observation and/or notification. The project site and a minimum area of 10 feet around the project site shall be kept free of weeds, obtrusive vegetation, or combustible materials, for fire prevention purposes.

11. CO-LOCATION. The applicant/operator of the facility shall agree to allow the co-location of equipment of other wireless telecommunications providers at this site when applications are received by the City and it is considered feasible, subject to an agreement between the applicant/operator, the other proposed wireless telecommunications provider, and the property owner.
12. **TREATMENT.** In accordance with Section 9.275.110 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and for the life of the permit, all finishes and surface treatment of the wireless communication facility shall be neutral in color with a matte finish.

13. **MAINTENANCE.** The proposed monopole wireless communication facility shall be kept in good repair. If at any time the structure and its equipment enclosure appear deteriorated (as determined by the Planning Department), any deterioration shall be remedied within 30 days.

14. **SIGNAGE REQUIREMENT.** Prior to final inspection of any building permit, the permit holder, developer or successor-in-interest shall install a sign no smaller than 12 inches by 12 inches upon an exterior wall or fence that surrounds the lease area that provides the following contact information: - Address of wireless communications facility and any internal site identification number or code; - Name(s) of company who operates the wireless communications facility; - Full company address, including mailing address and division name that will address problems; - Telephone number of wireless communications facility company. If a co-located facility (addition of antennas and/or equipment shelters or cabinets) is added to the existing facility, an additional sign, including the above described information, shall be installed on said shelter or cabinet stating the name of the company who operates the primary wireless communications facility and the name of the company that operates the co-located facility.

15. **ABANDONED SITES.** In accordance with Section 9.275.120 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and for the life of the permit, the following shall apply:
   a. Any wireless communication facility that is not continuously operated for a period of sixty (60) days shall be conclusively deemed abandoned.
   b. The telecommunications service provider shall have sixty (60) days after a notice of abandonment is mailed by the city to make the facility operable, replace the facility with an operable facility, or remove the facility.
   c. Within ninety (90) days of the date the notice of abandonment is mailed, the city may remove the wireless communication facility at the underlying property owner's expense and shall place a lien on the property for the cost of such removal.
   d. The owner of the property shall, within one hundred and twenty (120) days of the city's removal, return the site to its approximate natural condition. If the owner fails to do so, the city can restore and revegetate the site at the property owner's expense.
   e. If there are two (2) or more users of a single facility, the facility shall not be deemed abandoned until all users abandon it.

16. **CEASED OPERATIONS.** In the event the use hereby permitted ceases operation for a period of one (1) year or more, this approval shall become null and void.

17. **LEASE AGREEMENT.** Prior to final building permit inspection, the applicant shall submit a fully executed copy of the lease or other agreement entered into with the owner of the underlying property. The lease or other agreement shall include a provision indicating that the telecommunication service provider, or its successors and assigns, shall remove the wireless communication facility completely upon its abandonment. The lease or other agreement shall also include a provision notifying the property owner that if the telecommunication service provider does not completely remove a facility upon its abandonment, the city may remove the facility at the property owner's expense and lien the property for the cost of such removal. Propriety information in the lease may be redacted.
18. SITE INSPECTION. **Prior to final building permit inspection**, the Planning Department shall inspect and determine that the conditions of CUP18005 have been met; the basis of the inspection shall be on whether the wireless communication facility is in accordance with the approved plans.

19. IF HUMAN REMAINS FOUND. The developer/permit holder or any successor in interest shall comply with the following codes for the life of this permit: If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to Public Resource Code Section 5097.98(b) remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within a reasonable timeframe. Subsequently, the Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the "most likely descendant." The most likely descendant shall then make recommendations and engage in consultation concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

20. INADVERTENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIND. The developer/permit holder or any successor in interest shall comply with the following for the life of this permit: If during ground disturbance activities, cultural resources are discovered, the following procedures shall be followed. A cultural resources site is defined, for this condition, as being three or more artifacts in close association with each other, but may include fewer artifacts if the area of the find is determined to be of significance due to it sacred or cultural importance.

   a. All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resource shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, an archaeologist, a Native American tribal representative (or other appropriate ethnic/cultural group representative), and the Planning Director to discuss the significance of the find.

   b. At the meeting, the significance of the discoveries shall be discussed and after consultation with the Native American tribal (or other appropriate ethnic/cultural group representative) and archaeologist, a decision is made, with the concurrence of the Planning Director, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc.) for the cultural resource.

   c. Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to the appropriate preservation or mitigation measures.

21. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA). The filing of a Notice of Exemption is optional under CEQA and may be filed by the applicant after approval of the Conditional Use Permit. Please note that the filing of a Notice of Exemption is optional under CEQA, The filing of a Notice of Exemption and the posting on the list of notices by the County Clerk start a 35 day statute of limitations period on legal challenges to the agency’s decision that the project is exempt from CEQA. If a Notice of Exemption is not filed, a 180 day statute of limitations will apply. If the applicant chooses to file a Notice of Exemption, the appropriate form will be prepared by the City.

22. JURUPA VALLEY ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT. Per the Engineering Interoffice Memorandum issued on March 22, 2019, the following conditions shall apply to the project:

   a. Applicant will be responsible for any damages to items within the right-of-way due to the construction of this project. Replacement of damaged items shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the City of Jurupa Valley and Riverside County Standards.

   b. An encroachment permit from the Engineering/Public Works Department will be required for all work within the public right-of-way.
c. The City of Jurupa Valley does not grant permission to the applicant for any proposed work within any easements. Applicant must get approval through the easement holder.

23. APPROVAL PERIOD. This approval shall be used within two (2) years of approval date; otherwise, it shall become null and void and of no effect whatsoever. By use is meant the beginning of substantial construction contemplated by this approval within a two (2) year period which is thereafter diligently pursued to completion or of the actual occupancy of existing buildings or land under the terms of the authorized use. Prior to the expiration of the two year period, the permittee may request a one (1) year extension of time request in which to use this plot plan. A maximum of two (2) one-year extension of time requests shall be permitted. Should the time period established by any of the extension of time requests lapse, or should all two (2) one-year extensions be obtained and no substantial construction or use of this plot plan be initiated within four (4) years of the effective date of the issuance of this site development permit, this site development permit shall become null and void.

24. CAUSES FOR REVOCATION. In the event the use hereby permitted under this permit, a) is found to be in violation of the terms and conditions of this permit, b) is found to have been obtained by fraud or perjured testimony, or c) is found to be detrimental to the public health, safety or general welfare, or is a public nuisance, this permit shall be subject to revocation procedures.

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

26. 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.
The Applicant hereby agrees that these Conditions of Approval are valid and lawful and binding on the Applicant, and its successors and assigns, and agrees to the Conditions of Approval.

Applicant’s name (Print Form): __________________________________________

Applicant’s name (Signature): __________________________________________
ATTACHMENT NO. 3

Exhibit C: Architectural Plans
DATE: JULY 10, 2019
TO: CHAIR MOORE AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR
BY: TAMARA CAMPBELL, PRINCIPAL PLANNER
SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 6.2


RECOMMENDATION

By motion:

1) Accept the applicant’s request to withdraw the appeal (MA19146) of the Planning Director’s decision for the approval of MA18091; and

2) Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-07-10-02 granting approval of Tentative Parcel Map 37517, a 4-parcel commercial subdivision, subject to conditions of approval and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

BACKGROUND

On June 11, 2019, the Planning Director conducted a public hearing to consider a new retail commercial center and an automated drive-thru carwash on property located behind 2985 Rubidoux Blvd. The approval consisted of a Site Development Permit to allow the construction of three retail buildings totaling 20,400 square feet and a 3,600 square-foot carwash with each building on its own parcel as proposed through Tentative Parcel Map 37517. The Staff Report and site plans are attached to this report.

The Municipal Code grants the Planning Director authority to approve a Site Development Permit (SDP) subject to a public hearing when environmental review is required per the California Environmental Quality Act. The City’s CEQA consultant determined that the project could have potential negative environmental impacts but with mitigation measures, such impacts would be minimized to levels of non-significance. The project was approved with the mitigation measures of the environmental study being made part of the conditions of approval. The environmental study and mitigation measures are attached to this report.
Tentative Parcel Maps

According to the Municipal Code, the Planning Director does not have the authority to approve a Tentative Parcel Map (TPM). Instead, the Planning Commission is granted authority to approve TPM’s subject to required legal findings (set forth in the code). These legal findings are discussed later in this staff report.

Appeal of Condition of Approval for SDP

The Municipal Code also establishes that Planning Director decisions are appealable to the Planning Commission within a 10-day appeal period following the decision of the Planning Director. On June 21, 2019, (within the 10-day appeal period) the applicant submitted a formal application appealing one of the conditions of approval of the SDP.

Since June 21, 2019, the applicant has reconsidered the appeal and requests that the Planning Commission accept a request to withdraw the application. As the appeal had been advertised in the Press Enterprise and notices sent to surrounding property owners, the City is legally obligated to keep the item on the Agenda and to open the public hearing to hear from any concerned parties.

ANALYSIS

Tentative Parcel Map No. 37539 is a request to subdivide 3.04 gross acres into four commercial parcels and thereby allow the individual sale of buildings and parcels approved by the Planning Director in conjunction with Site Development Permit No. 18038. The project site is shown below.

EXHIBIT 1: SITE AND VICINITY MAP

The property is zoned “C-1/C-P” with a General Plan Land Use Designation of “Commercial Retail.” Development regulations of this zone do not specify minimum lot size requirements or lot dimensions. The TPM includes a series of “reciprocal access agreements” which will ensure that each future parcel/building owner will have continued vehicular and pedestrian access rights to cross over adjoining properties. Two of the newly created parcels (Parcels 1 and 2) will
each contain .77 acres. Parcel 3, where the car wash is located, will contain .94 acres and Parcel 4 will have .54 acres.

Engineering and Planning Department staff have evaluated the proposed map for compliance with the City’s subdivision ordinance as well as the State Subdivision Map Act and determined that the proposed map satisfies all legal requirements for approval.

**EXHIBIT 2 – PROPOSED SUBDIVISION**

Staff has evaluated the proposal in comparison with the legally required findings and believes the TPM should be approved. The following section provides the legal findings and staff’s rational for approval.

**Findings for Tentative Land Division Maps (Section 7.15.180)**

Pursuant to Title 7 (Subdivisions) – Chapter 7.15. - Tentative Maps, Section 7.15.180, a tentative tract map shall be denied if it does not meet all requirements of this title, or if any of the following findings are made:

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

The proposed map is consistent with the requirements of the General Plan Land Use
designation of Commercial Retail (CR). The map will facilitate the future construction of three (3) commercial retail buildings and a detached car wash. Furthermore, the map complies with Title 7 (Subdivisions) and Title 9 (Planning and Zoning).

B. That the design or improvement of the proposed land division is not consistent with applicable General and Specific Plans.

The proposed layout of the four parcels is consistent with the City’s General Plan.

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

The 3.04-acre site to be subdivided is physically suitable for the type of development proposed given its location behind an existing gas station and convenience store and it as well as the properties zoning designation and Additionally, adequate water and sewer connections and public services are available to the site.

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

The proposed subdivision, inclusive of its density, is physically suitable for the site in that it meets all requirements of the zoning code. The General Plan land use designation of “Commercial Retail” does not specify density standards or floor area ratios and neither does the Municipal Code for C-1/C-P zoned land.

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

The project is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially injure fish or wildlife, in that the site is highly disturbed and no known sensitive species of fish, flora or wildlife exist.

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

An Initial Study was prepared that evaluated potential effects with respect to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because mitigation measures have been required or revisions in the Project have been made or agreed to by the Applicant. The Initial Study determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. As such, the project will not cause serious public health problems.

G. That the design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements will conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed land division. A land division may be approved if it is found that
alternate easements for access or for use will be provided and that they will be substantially equivalent to ones previously acquired by the public.

There are no easements that will conflict with any easements acquired for public use. The on-site reciprocal access easements proposed within the subdivision over each lot will ensure continual permission amongst subsequent property owners to legally access their properties.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The City prepared an Initial Study in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and determined that the project could have potential environmental impacts but that through mitigation measures, the impacts could be reduced to levels of non-significance. The project will be subject to a condition that requires all mitigation measures of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) be incorporated as Conditions of Approval.

Ten days prior to the Planning Commission's public hearing, as required by the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, the Planning Department mailed bilingual notices to surrounding property owners within a 1,000-foot radius of the project site, and also had the Applicant include properties in the influence area (properties outside of the 1,000-foot radius map, but within the same block). Additionally, legal advertisements were published in the Press Enterprise. As of the date of this staff report, no comments have been received.

CONCLUSION

Tentative Parcel Map No. 37483 is consistent with all applicable provisions of Title 7 and the Subdivision Map Act for standards and procedures. Furthermore, the City's Engineering Department has reviewed the project for access, circulation, grading, and drainage and has determined it meets all requirements.

Staff recommends that: 1) the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 2019-07-10-02 approving Tentative Parcel Map 37539, subject to the attached Conditions of Approval; and 2) accept the applicants request to withdraw the appeal (MA18091).

Prepared by:

Tamara Campbell
Principal Planner

Submitted by:

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director

Reviewed by:

//s// Serita Young

Serita Young
Deputy City Attorney
ATTACHMENTS

1. Planning Director Staff Report (06/11/19)
2. Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-07-10-02 (for TPM37539)
3. Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
4. Proposed Parcel Map (TPM37539)
PLANNING DIRECTOR STAFF REPORT

DATE: JUNE 11, 2019
TO: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR
FROM: TAMARA CAMPBELL, PRINCIPAL PLANNER
SUBJECT: MASTER APPLICATION NO. 18091 (MA18091): SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 18038 (SDP18038), 2) TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 37539 (TPM37539), 3) LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT NO. 1801 (LLA1801) TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF A RETAIL CENTER CONSISTING OF THREE BUILDINGS TOTALING 20,400 SQUARE FEET AND A 3,600 SQUARE-FOOT, AUTOMATED DRIVE-THRU CARWASH AND CONSIDERATION OF A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

LOCATION: NORTHWEST CORNER OF RUBIDOUX BOULEVARD AND 30TH STREET (APNS: 178-202-020, 021, AND 024)

APPLICANT: YOUNG HE KIM

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and approve MA18091 which includes approval of Site Development Permit 18038; Tentative Parcel Map No. 375 and Lot Line Adjustment No. 1801 subject to the attached conditions of approval.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Applicant ("Applicant" or "Young He Kim") proposes to subdivide and develop approximately 3.04 acres of vacant land, consisting of 20,400 square feet of retail space in three separate buildings along with a 3,600 square-foot automated, drive-thru carwash. The carwash includes a 120-foot long tunnel and 22 vacuum bays. Landscaping, trash enclosures, right-of-way improvements, parking spaces and hardscaping are also proposed.

The specific types of retail uses are not identified as the "shell" buildings are for speculative purposes. Subsequent Site Development Permits will be required to establish the uses and to ensure compliance with permitted uses allowed within the zone.

The proposal will require the approval of the following Land Use Entitlements:

1. Site Development Permit No. 18038. Per the City's Municipal Code, Title 9 (Planning and Zoning), Section 9.150.020 (Uses Permitted), both general retail uses and car washes are permitted uses subject to the approval of a Site Development Permit.

2. Tentative Parcel Map No. 37539. The subdivision of 3.04 gross acres into four (4) parcels requires a Tentative Tract Map.
3. Lot Line Adjustment No. 1801. A Lot Line Adjustment is requested to move a property line that could otherwise create future encroachment and access issues.

**TABLE 1: GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Area</th>
<th>3.04 Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Land Use Designation</td>
<td>Commercial Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>C-1/C-P (General Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Land Use</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXHIBIT 1: SITE AND VICINITY MAP**

![Site and Vicinity Map](image-url)
The following table provides a detailed description of the proposal.

**TABLE 2 – PROJECT DETAILS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Use</th>
<th>Building sq. ft.</th>
<th>Parcel Size</th>
<th>Parking Proposed</th>
<th>Parking Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bldg. &quot;A&quot; Retail</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>.77 acres</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg. &quot;B&quot; Retail</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>.77 acres</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg. &quot;C&quot; Retail</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>.54 acres</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg. &quot;D&quot; Car Wash</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>.94 acres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,400 sq. ft. retail</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.04 acres</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT LOCATION**

Just north of the 60 Freeway, the project site is located behind an existing gas station and convenience store on the northwest corner of Rubidoux Boulevard and 30th Street. Surrounding zoning includes R-1 (Single-Family Residential) to the north, northwest and northeast and C-1/C-P (General Commercial) to the south, southwest and southeast. Surrounding land uses include mixed commercial and residential.

**TABLE 3 – EXISTING SITE AND SURROUNDING LAND USES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Vacant land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast/west</td>
<td>Single-family residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Rubidoux Market, Goodyear Tire &amp; Smog, and Riverside Business Park to the southeast across Rubidoux Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Arco-branded gasoline station and Subway to the south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Jack-in-the-Box and a storm water detention basin to the southwest across 30th Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANALYSIS OF SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

Exhibit 4 provides an illustration of the proposed site design. The three new retail buildings are situated at the rear of three newly created lots, around the perimeter of the parcel along the northwest and northeast property lines. The carwash is proposed on a fourth parcel and will run parallel with the existing convenience store on the adjacent parcel to the south of the subject site.

Although not identified on the above site plan, both 8,000 square-foot buildings (Retail "A" and Retail "B") propose 5 retail spaces. Retail Building "C" is planned to contain 3 retail spaces. The retail space sizes of "A" and "B" are 1,600 square feet each and the retail space sizes of units in "C" are 1,466 square feet each.

The drive-thru, automated carwash is adjacent to the parcel containing the existing convenience store. It features a 120-foot long tunnel where cars will be moved through cleaning scrubbers and rinsers while attached to a metal cable. The placement of the carwash and location of the vacuum equipment is located as far away as possible from the existing single-family dwellings adjacent to the northeast and northwest property line to reduce the potential from noise impacts. As described in the Noise Assessment Study prepared for the project, the orientation of the carwash further reduces noise impacts emitted from this facility onto residential uses. The closest residential structure is located more than 115-feet away from the carwash building.
The site contains adequate traffic circulation as determined by the Zoning Ordinance and the City's Traffic Engineer. The recordation of the tract map will include a series of reciprocal access easements that ensure continual emergency and vehicular accessability. Furthermore, staff routed the development plans to various internal and external agencies for comment and recommended conditions. Comments from these agencies have been considered and incorporated as modifications and/or conditions to this project as deemed appropriate by Planning staff including a condition to limit the delivery of any goods/merchandise to off-peak business hours.

Landscaping and Walls

The site is currently vacant with scattered shrubs and weeds. As depicted on an attached copy of the conceptual landscape plan, a variety of trees, shrubs, vines, and accent plants are proposed along the perimeter of the site. New landscaping includes 10 new Sycamore trees that will be planted every 40 feet on center along the frontage on Rubidoux Boulevard and 30th Street. The trees will be located in a 15’ foot wide planting area which occurs between the sidewalk and the parking lot. The existing sidewalk is 8 feet wide and is located adjacent to the curb along Rubidoux Blvd. and 30th Street.

Low water use shrub plantings will also be used in the planter area below the trees to provide some low screening of the parking lot as well as flower color, foliage color, and different textures. Accent paving will be used at the retail center entrances.

The plan was reviewed by the City's consulting Landscape Architect who approved the concept plan with minor comments. Formal landscape and irrigation plans will be subject to final review and approval by the City’s Landscape Architect. Public right-of-way improvements, including parkway landscaping, will be required prior to final map recordation as a condition of approval.

A 6-foot high decorative block wall with masonry cap and plaster is proposed along the northeast and northwest property lines and will provide an additional buffer to the residential neighborhoods that adjoin the project.

Parking

The Jurupa Valley Municipal Code requires that the project include a minimum of 115 parking spaces. Staff has confirmed that the proposed site plan satisfies this requirement but that minor revisions to the site plan are necessary pertaining to wheel stops and planter areas adjacent to residential uses. Conditions of approval have been included to ensure compliance with these zoning code provisions.

Architecture

The buildings are contemporary architectural styles with a wide range of colored plaster. Planning recommends that the color palette be limited to natural earth tones to provide additional compatibility with surrounding structures. In addition, the buildings should have greater detail and articulation to provide a higher level of quality architecture. Additional stone treatments, decorative light fixtures and window flower boxes and pedestrian benches are being required as conditions of approval. The final architectural plans, including exterior construction materials will be subject to the review and approval by the Planning Director. Elevations of the proposed architecture is provided as Exhibit 5.

The car wash is considered iconic architecture in that it provides a substantial deviation from the typical buildings surrounding it. The proposed car wash elevation is also provided as Exhibit 5.
The design of the three new trash enclosure will also be subject to further review and approval by the Planning Director.

A future site development permit will be required for a master sign plan to ensure that all tenants adhere to the design and materials established in the master sign plan. Specific parking light standards and any proposed building lighting will be subject to the submittal of a photometric plan and subject to review and approval by the Planning Director.

Development Standards

In addition to Section 9.115.020, Title 9 of the Municipal Code also identifies specific development regulations for any projects that occur within this specific zoning category. Staff has reviewed the project in comparison with the development standards and determined that it complies with most of the regulations. Deviations from the code requirements will be discussed later in this report. Table 4 compares the proposal with the standards of the C-1/C-P Zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Project Compliance with Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Setbacks. There are no yard requirements for buildings which do not exceed thirty-five (35) feet in height except as required for specific plans. Any portion of a building which exceeds thirty-five (35) feet in height shall be set back from the front, rear and side lot lines not less than two (2) feet for each foot by which the height exceeds thirty-five (35) feet. The front setback shall be measured from the existing street line unless a specific plan has been adopted in which case it will be measured from the specific plan street line. The rear setback shall be measured from the existing rear lot line or from any recorded alley or easement; if the rear line adjoins a street, the rear setback requirement shall be the same as required for a front setback. Each side setback shall be measured from the side lot line or from an existing adjacent street line, unless a specific plan has been adopted, in which case it will be measured from the specific plan street line.</td>
<td>Yes. The project complies with this provision. Additionally, proposed setbacks are used for landscaping, sidewalks, parking and driveways and are also in compliance with the regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Height requirements. No building or structure shall exceed fifty (50) feet in height, unless a greater height is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.370. In no event, however, shall a building or structure exceed seventy-five (75) feet in height, unless a variance is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.270.</td>
<td>Yes. Heights of buildings comply with this provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Landscaping. Automobile storage space shall be provided as required by Section 9.240.120.</td>
<td>Yes. The development complies with this provision. Yes. The parking area will be revised as required by a condition of approval to ensure compliance with this section. Further tabulation of parking is provided in a subsequent table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Mechanical Equipment. All roof mounted mechanical equipment shall be screened from the ground elevation view to a minimum sight distance of 1,320 ft.</td>
<td>Yes. The development complies with this requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Requirements for Site Development Permit

Per Section 9.240.330 - Site Development Permit, (3) Requirements for Approval, no Site Development Plan shall be approved unless it complies with the following standards:

1. The proposed use must conform to all the requirements of the City’s General Plan and with all applicable requirements of State law and the ordinances of the City of Jurupa Valley.

   The site is zoned C-1/C-P (General Commercial) with a General Plan Land Use Designation of Commercial Retail (CR). The use is consistent with the intent and purpose of both the zoning and the General Plan and has been evaluated for its compliance with all applicable state laws.

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

   The proposed development has been designed to protect the health, safety, and general welfare of existing and future sensitive land uses by incorporating setbacks, sidewalks, street and traffic improvements and landscaping along the project’s perimeter. The building layout, landscaping and public improvements conform to the logical development of the land and are compatible with the present and future development of the surrounding area which consists primarily of commercial land uses within commercial uses.

   The project will require public right-of-way improvements along Rubidoux Boulevard. Additionally, the Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan was reviewed and approved by Engineering Department for the grading and drainage requirements outlined under the Engineering section of the Conditions of Approval.

3. All Site Development Permits which permit the construction of more than one structure on a single legally divided parcel shall, in addition to all other requirements, be subject to a condition which prohibits the sale of any existing or subsequently constructed structures on the parcel until the parcel is divided and a final map recorded in accordance with Ordinance No. 460 (Subdivision Regulations) in such a manner that each building is located on a separate legally divided parcel.

   A condition of approval shall be included to prohibit the sale of any existing or subsequently constructed structures on the parcel until the parcel is divided per Ordinance No. 460 (Subdivision Regulations).

ANALYSIS OF TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP

Subdivisions are regulated by the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, Title 7 (Subdivisions) - Chapter 7.15. - Tentative Maps and the State of California Subdivision Map Act. The site currently consists of 3 parcels while the proposed Tentative Parcel Map is intended to create 4 separate parcels. The applicant wishes to subdivide the parcels so each building and the car wash could be sold separately. The subdivision is not subject to minimum dimensions or size requirements so therefore, it complies with the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.
Proposed Parcel Configuration

Findings for Tentative Land Division Maps (Section 7.15.180)

Pursuant to Title 7 (Subdivisions) – Chapter 7.15. - Tentative Maps, Section 7.15.180, a tentative tract map shall be denied if it does not meet all requirements of this title, or if any of the following findings are made:

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

The proposed map is consistent with the requirements of the General Plan Land Use designation of Commercial Retail (CR). The map will facilitate the future construction of three (3) commercial retail buildings and a detached car wash. Furthermore, the map complies with Title 7 (Subdivisions) and Title 9 (Planning and Zoning).

B. That the design or improvement of the proposed land division is not consistent with applicable General and Specific Plans.

The proposed layout of the four (4) parcels is consistent with the City’s General Plan.
C. That the site of the proposed land division is not physically suitable for the type of development.

The 3.04-acre site is physically suitable as it is a flat, vacant lot adjacent to other commercial land uses. Additionally, there are adequate water and sewer connections and public services are available to the site.

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

Density is not a factor with this project as it is not a residential development. However, the proposed project is physically suitable for the site in that it is supported by the commercial retail land use designation under the General Plan.

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

The project is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially injure fish or wildlife of their habitat, in that the site is highly disturbed and occupied by ruderal flora and bare ground. Because of the existing degraded site condition, the absence of special-status plant communities, and overall low potential for most special status species to utilize or reside on-site, the proposed project would not be expected to directly impact federal or state-listed threatened or endangered species.

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

An Initial Study was prepared that evaluated potential effects with respect to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because mitigation measures have been required or revisions in the Project have been made or agreed to by the Applicant. The Initial Study determined that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. As such, the project will not cause serious public health problems.

G. That the design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements will conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed land division. A land division may be approved if it is found that alternate easements for access or for use will be provided and that they will be substantially equivalent to ones previously acquired by the public.

There are no easements that will conflict with any easements acquired for public use. The on-site reciprocal access proposed within the subdivision over each lot will ensure continual permission amongst subsequent property owners to legally access their properties.

Findings for Lot Line Adjustment

Prior to approving a request for a Lot Line Adjustment, the City is required to make the following findings:

1. While new parcels are being created as part of the proposed Tentative Parcel Map, no existing parcels will be deleted.
2. No parcel will be reduced below the minimum lot area required by the C-1/C-P zone, set forth in Title 9 of the City's Municipal Code.

The C-1/C-P Zone does not establish minimum lot areas.

3. The proposed adjustment does not have a condition of approval for a tentative parcel map.

Because the proposed project includes the creation of a new parcel, a tentative parcel map application was also concurrently submitted.

4. Public rights-of-way will be altered, and have been separately approved by the Public Works Director (City Engineer).

N/A

ANALYSIS – GENERAL PLAN

The proposal promotes the goals and policies of several General Plan Elements that were adopted as part of the City’s 2017 General Plan Update. In particular, the project furthers provisions found in the Economic Sustainability Element.

Economic Sustainability Element

ES 1.7 Long-Term Benefits. Consider long-term Community benefits, not just short-term returns, in our decision-making processes.

This project will offer financial gains to Jurupa Valley on both a short-term and long-term basis.

ES 3.2 - New Business Attraction. Attract new commercial enterprises that balance and diversify the commercial base and provide needed goods and services. These could include the introduction of new commercial and institutional sectors such as medical, educational, and visitor-serving uses.

While the project is not clear on specific retail uses, the new construction of retail space will promote the diversification to the area’s commercial base. This could result in needed goods and services that otherwise would only be available by driving to outer lying cities.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The City prepared an Initial Study in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and determined that the project could have potential environmental impacts but that through mitigation measures, the impacts could be reduced to levels of non-significance. The project will be subject to a condition that requires all mitigation measures of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) be incorporated as Conditions of Approval.

Ten days prior to the Planning Director’s public hearing, as required by the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, the Planning Department mailed bilingual notices to surrounding property owners within a 1,000-foot radius of the project site, and also had the Applicant include properties in the influence area (properties outside of the 1,000-foot radius map, but within the same block). Additionally, legal advertisements were published in the Press Enterprise. As of the date of this staff report, no comments have been received.
CONCLUSION

The proposed project is consistent with applicable goals and policies of the General Plan and complies with most of the requirements of the City's zoning code. Potential impacts have been analyzed and mitigation measures incorporated to reduce impacts to a "less than significant level". Importantly, the proposal will provide a source of revenue and create local job opportunities. Based upon the findings set forth above, staff recommends approval of Site Development Permit No. 18038, Tentative Parcel Map 37539 and Lot Line Adjustment 1801 subject to the Conditions of Approval.

Prepared by:

/\s/ Tamara Campbell
Tamara Campbell
Principal Planner

ATTACHMENTS

1. Exhibit A – Recommended Conditions of Approval
2. Exhibit B – Project Plans and Elevations
3. CEQA Documents
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-07-10-02


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

Section 1. Project. Young He Kim (the “Applicant”) has applied for Tentative Parcel Map No. 37517 (Master Application No. 18091 or MA No. 18091) for a Schedule “G” subdivision of approximately 3.04 acres into four (4) lots on real property located at 2985 Rubidoux Boulevard (APNs: 178-202-020, -021, AND -024) in the C-1/C-P Zone and designated Commercial Retail (“CR”) (the “Project”).

Section 2. Tentative Parcel Map.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Tentative Parcel Map No. 37517, a Schedule “G” subdivision of approximately 3.04 acres into four (4) lots on real property located at 2985 Rubidoux Boulevard (APNs: 178-202-020, -021, AND -024) in the C-1/C-P Zone.

(b) Section 7.05.020.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley is designated as the “Advisory Agency” charged with the duty of making investigations and reports on the design and improvement of all proposed tentative Schedule “G” Parcel Maps in the City of Jurupa Valley. However, if any such tentative map land division includes a policy implication or the proposed use is the subject of concern for the public interest, as expressed by the City Council, the Planning Director may refer review of the tentative map land division subject to the Planning Director’s review to the Planning Commission and the division shall be heard by the Planning Commission, as the Advisory Agency, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 7.05.

(c) Sections 7.05.020.A. and 7.15.150 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provide that the Planning Commission is authorized to approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove all such tentative map land divisions and report the action directly to the City Council and the land divider.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(g) Sections 7.05.030.B. and 7.15.150 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provide that if a land divider or any interested party believes that they may be adversely affected by the decision of the Planning Commission, the land divider or any interested party may appeal the decision to the City Council. Any such appeal shall be filed and processed pursuant to the
provisions of Section 9.05.100 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and subject to the provisions of Section 9.05.110 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

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. 18091 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 July 10, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 18091, at which time all persons interested in the Master Application No. 18091 had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing.

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

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

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

(b) Thereafter, City staff provided public notice of the public comment period and of the intent to adopt the MND as required by law. The public comment period commenced on June 27, 2019, and expired on July 5, 2019. Copies of the documents have been available for public review and inspection at City Hall, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509. The City did not receive any comments during the public review period.

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

1) The MND was prepared in compliance with CEQA;

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

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

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

Section 5. Findings for Approval of Tentative Parcel Map. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the proposed Tentative Parcel Map No. 37517 should be granted because:

(a) The proposed Tentative Parcel Map No. 37517 meets all requirements of Title 7 (Subdivisions) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code in that the parcels will be divided to meet all criteria.

(b) The proposed land division will be consistent with the Jurupa Valley 2017 General Plan and the General Plan land use designation Commercial Retail (CR) in that the land is suitable for the proposed commercial subdivision, including Floor-to-Area ratio.

(c) The design or improvement of the proposed land division is consistent with the City’s General Plan 2017 in that the land division is consistent with the commercial development policies within the General Plan.

(d) The site of the proposed land division is physically suitable for the type of development, will accommodate the proposed commercial development, and will be graded according to applicable code standards.

(e) The proposed subdivision, inclusive of its density, is physically suitable for the site in that it meets all requirements of the zoning code. Since the General Plan land use designation of “Commercial Retail” does not specify density standards of floor area ratios for this commercial land use designation under the General Plan and the zoning standards of the Municipal Code.

(f) The design of the proposed land division or proposed improvements, as conditioned and with the imposition of mitigation measures, 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 in that there are no easements that will conflict with any easements acquired for public use. The on-site reciprocal access easements proposed within the subdivision over each lot will ensure continual permission amongst subsequent property owners to legally access their properties.
(h) Tentative Parcel Map No. 37483 is consistent with all applicable provisions of Title 7 and the Subdivision Map Act for standards and process. Furthermore, the City's Engineering Department has reviewed the project for access, circulation, grading, and drainage and has conditioned the project to comply with mandated regulations.

(i) The design of the proposed land division or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through, or use of, property within the proposed land division in that the proposed tentative parcel map and development plans have been prepared to prevent any such conflicts.

Section 5. Approval of Master Application No. 18091 with Conditions. Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby approves Tentative Parcel Map No. 37517, a Schedule “G” subdivision of approximately 3.04 acres into four (4) lots on real property located at 2985 Rubidoux Boulevard (APNs: 178-202-020, -021, AND -024) in the C-1/C-P Zone and designated Commercial Retail (“CR”), subject to the recommended conditions of approval attached hereto as Exhibit “A”.

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

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

Corey Moore
Chair of Jurupa Valley Planning Commission

ATTEST:

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

I, Thomas Merrell, Planning Director of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-07-10-02 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 10th day of July, 2019, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

NOES: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSION MEMBERS:

______________________________
THOMAS G. MERRELL
PLANNING DIRECTOR
EXHIBIT "A"

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR MA19146
(Tentative Parcel Map No. 37539)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. **PROJECT PERMITTED.** Master Application No. 19146 (MA19146): Tentative Parcel Map No. 37539, to allow the subdivision of 3.04 gross acres into four (4) commercial parcels for property located at the northwest corner of Rubidoux Boulevard and 30th Street (Assessor Parcel Numbers 178-202-020, 021, and 024).

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

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

4. **MITIGATION MEASURES.** This project shall be subject to the mitigation measures adopted within the Mitigation Measure and Monitoring Program prepared for the project and included with these conditions of approval.

Conditions of Approval for MA19146 (TPM37539)
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5. **FEES.** The approval of Master Application No. 19146 (MA19146): Tentative Parcel Map No. 37539 (TPM37539) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

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

7. **CONFORMANCE TO APPROVED EXHIBITS.** The project shall be in conformance to the approved plans (listed below) with **any changes** in accordance to these conditions of approval:
   - Tentative Parcel Map No. 37539 (date-stamped 06/06/2019)

8. **PROOF OF RECORDATION.** Prior to the issuance of any Building Permit, the Parcel Map shall be recorded by the County of Riverside.

9. **SALE OF INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS.** No structure constructed on the Project site may be sold until the subject Project on which the structure is located is divided and a final map recorded in accordance with the City’s subdivision regulations such that the structure is located on a separate legally divided parcel.

10. **PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY.** Public right-of-way improvements, including parkway landscaping, will be required prior to final map recordation as a condition of approval.

11. **PLACEMENT OF BUILDINGS.** Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall submit and obtain Planning Director approval of a revised site plan that places the three commercial buildings on the property lines or plan for the control maintenance and use of the area between the buildings and the property line.

**ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT**

1. **GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (ENGINEERING)**

1.1. The use hereby conditioned is for a Site Development Permit (SDP18038), and Tentative Parcel Map (Tentative Parcel Map No. 37539); being a subdivision of parcels 2, 3, and 4 of Parcel Map No. 28705, Book 195, pages 64 and 65 of parcel maps, in the office of the Riverside County Recorder; consisting of 3.01 acres, into 4 lots for commercial purposes. Exhibit titled Tentative Parcel Map No 37539, prepared by ITF & Associates, Inc. is hereby referenced.

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

1.3. Rubidoux Boulevard is a paved, City maintained street identified as an Urban Arterial Primary Corridor by the City's General Plan with an ultimate right-of-way
width of .52 ft. Dedication and improvements shall be per modified section of 118 ft.

1.4. 30th Street is a paved, City maintained street identified as Local Road by the City’s General Plan. Right-of-way dedication on 30th St. frontage is not required. The applicant is required to prepare street improvement plans and construct improvements on 30th Street along the project’s frontage; as described on these conditions of approval.

1.5. A reciprocal access easement among the proposed parcels is required.

1.6. A cross-lot drainage easement among the proposed parcels is required. Applicant shall include maintenance responsibilities in CC&Rs.

1.7. All utility extensions within the subdivision and within individual lots shall be placed underground.

1.8. The maintenance of onsite improvements such as but not limited to, BMPs, asphalt and landscape maintenance and repairs, shall be addressed in the project’s CC&Rs.

2. PRIOR TO GRADING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

2.1. No grading permit shall be issued until the Site Development Permit (SDP), the Tentative Parcel Map (TPM), and all other Planning related cases are approved and are in effect, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

2.2. This project will require a grading permit, encroachment permit, and a hauling permit from the Engineering and Public Works departments.

2.3. Applicant shall provide reciprocal access easement(s) among all the proposec parcels.

3. PRIOR TO PARCEL MAP RECORDATION (ENGINEERING)

3.1. No Parcel Map shall be recorded until the Site Development Permit (SDP) and all other related cases are approved and are in effect unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

3.2. No Parcel Map shall be recorded until the annexation process to Jurupa Valley Landscape & Lighting Maintenance District 89-1-C associated with this project is finalized.

3.2.1. Applicant shall prepare Landscape and Irrigation plans for annexation. Plans shall be prepared per Riverside County Ordinance 859 and per the City’s submittal guidelines and package.

3.2.2. Improvements to be included in the annexed zone include, but are not limited to, the maintenance of the following:

3.2.2.1. Parkway landscape maintenance;

3.2.2.2. Parkway tree trimming;
3.2.2.3 Streetlight maintenance.

3.3. The Applicant shall provide improvement plans for approval of the City Engineer for all public improvements including, but not limited to, street improvements, parkway improvements, landscape and irrigation.

3.4. Agreements and securities for all street improvements shall be submitted for acceptance prior to Parcel Map approval.

3.5. Rights-of-way for streets and public utilities purposes shall be dedicated and shown on the final Map in accordance with these conditions of approval.

3.6. Rubidoux Boulevard is classified as a Major Primary Corridor in the General Plan with an ultimate right-of-way width of 118-feet. The Applicant shall dedicate property to an ultimate half width right-of-way of 59-feet from centerline to property line. This portion of dedication is referenced as LOT ‘A’ on the Tentative Parcel Map No 37539. Applicant shall clearly show the dedication of right-of-way on the Final Map for approval of the City Engineer.

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

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

3.9. This project will not be required to underground all utilities at the project frontage. The Applicant will be required to prepare a cost estimate for the City to review and approve. The Applicant will be required to provide in lieu fees for utility undergrounding at the project frontage.

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

3.11. No Parcel Map shall be recorded until all requests are satisfied by the Applicant and approved by the City Engineer.

The Applicant hereby agrees that these Conditions of Approval are valid and lawful and binding on the approval for MA18091

Applicant agrees to these Conditions of Approval

Applicant’s name (Print Form): ____________________________________________

Applicant’s name (Signature): ____________________________________________

Date: __________________
Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

City of Jurupa Valley Master Application 18091

Site Development Permit No. 18038
Tentative Parcel Map No. 37517
Lot Line Adjustment 1801

City of Jurupa Valley
8930 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
Contact: Tamara Campbell, Principal Planner
(951) 332-6464
tcampbell@jurupavalley.org

Applicant:
Young He Kim
2985 Rubidoux Boulevard
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509

May 9, 2019
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MASTER APPLICATION 18091 SUMMARY

A. Site Development Permit (SDP) 18038: To construct a retail center consisting of three buildings totaling 20,600 square feet and a 3,600 square foot carwash.

B. Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) No. 37517: Subdivide 3.04 gross acres into four (4) lots.

C. Lot Line Adjustment (LLA) No. 1801: A Lot Line Adjustment is required to ensure that the new buildings do not cross property lines.
1.0. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of an Initial Study

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

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

1.2 Purpose of a Mitigated Negative Declaration

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

1.3 Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Document

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

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

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

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

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

3) The Riverside County Clerk.

The Notice of Intent also was noticed to the general public in the Riverside Press-Enterprise, which is a primary newspaper of circulation in the areas affected by the Project.

The Notice of Intent identifies the location(s) where the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and its associated Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program and technical reports are
available for public review. During the 20-day public review period, comments on the adequacy of the Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration document may be submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department.

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

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

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

1.5 Initial Study /Mitigated Negative Declaration Findings and Conclusions

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

The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed Project would result in no impacts or less than significant impacts with implementation of Plans, Policies, Programs, or Project Design Features to the environment under the following issue areas:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Wildfire
The Initial Study determined that the proposed Project would result in potentially significant impacts to the following issue areas, but the Project will incorporate mitigation measures that would avoid or mitigate effects to a point where clearly no significant environmental impacts on the environment would occur:

- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Noise
- Tribal Cultural Resources

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

2.1 Project Location

The City of Jurupa Valley covers approximately 43.5 square miles within the County of Riverside. The City is bordered by the City of Fontana and County of San Bernardino to the north, City of Norco and the City of Riverside to the south, City of Eastvale to the west, and City of Riverside and County of San Bernardino to the east. Specifically, the Project is located behind 2985 Rubidoux Boulevard. The Project site is identified by the following Assessor Parcel Numbers:

APNs: 178-202-020, 021, and 024.

2.2 Project Description

The Project Applicant, Young He Kim, submitted the following application to the City of Jurupa Valley, which comprise the proposed Project: Site Development Permit (SDP) 18038, Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) 37517; and Lot Line Adjustment (LLA) 1801. The City of Jurupa Valley also refers to these applications as Master Application (MA) No. 18091. The Project’s application materials are on file with the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509 and are hereby incorporated by reference.

A. Site Development Permit (SDP) 18038: To construct a retail center consisting of three buildings totaling 20,600 square feet and a 3,600 square foot carwash.

Lot A: 8,000 square foot general retail building.

Lot B: 8,000 square foot general retail building.

Lot C: 3,600 square foot car wash.

Lot D: 4,400 square foot general retail building.

B. Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) No. 37517: Subdivide 3.04 gross acres into four (4) lots (Lots A, B, C, and D)

C. Lot Line Adjustment (LLA) No. 1801: A Lot Line Adjustment is required to ensure that the new buildings do not cross property lines.

D. Proposed Site Improvements

Street Improvements and Access

There are two (2) new proposed access points to the site; one along Rubidoux Boulevard and one along 30th Street. Rubidoux Boulevard, adjacent to the Project site, is an existing paved four-lane roadway with curb, gutter, and sidewalk. No additional roadway improvements are proposed except for additional dedication of right-of-way and the construction of the new driveway approach per City standards.
30th street, adjacent to the Project site, is an existing paved two-lane roadway with curb, gutter, and sidewalk. No additional roadway improvements are proposed except for the construction of the new driveway approach per City standards.

**Water and Sewer Improvements**

Water: The Project will connect to the existing 8-inch diameter water lines in Rubidoux Boulevard and 30th Street.

Sewer: The Project will connect to the existing 8-inch diameter sewer lines in Rubidoux Boulevard and 30th Street.

**Drainage Improvements**

The site drains naturally to the west through the existing parkway drain at 30th Street. Proposed Buildings A and B will be constructed in the northern portion of the site and proposed Building C will be constructed in eastern portion of the site. The proposed carwash building will be constructed between Building C and the existing gas station.

Roofs drains from Building A and B downspouts and parking lots will be collected in a v-gutter located south of Building A and B and flow into an infiltration trench on the western portion of the site. Roofs drains from the carwash building downspouts and parking lot will be collected in a v-gutter located to the west of the carwash building and flow into an infiltration trench on the western portion of the site. Only the overflow drain from the infiltration trench will flow to the 30th Street curb outlet.

**E. Operational Characteristics**

The Project would be operated as a retail center and carwash. As such, typical operational characteristics include employees and customers traveling to and from the site, delivery of supplies to the site, and maintenance activities.

**2.3 Existing Site Conditions/Environmental Setting**

CEQA Guidelines §15125 establishes requirements for defining the environmental setting to which the environmental effects of a proposed project must be compared. The environmental setting is defined as “...the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the Notice of Preparation is published, or if no Notice of Preparation is published, at the time the environmental analysis is commenced...” (CEQA Guidelines §15125[a]). A Notice of Preparation was not required at the time the Initial Study was commenced. Thus the environmental setting for the Project is the approximate date that the Project’s Initial Study Checklist commenced in May, 2018.

The site is located on the northwestern side of Rubidoux Boulevard and the northeastern side of 30th Street within a mixed commercial and residential area of the City. The site is a highly disturbed vacant lot subject to periodic disking and/or mowing and is primarily occupied by non-native grasses and weedy annuals. A few non-native ornamental trees are present, mostly along the site edges. The largest trees observed onsite are Peruvian pepper tree (Schinus molle) and blue Jacaranda (Jacaranda mimosifolia). Several mulefat (Baccharis salicifolia) and at least one
unidentified small willow (*Salix* species), about 8 to 12 feet tall, were observed onsite along the fence line surrounding the adjacent gas station parking lot. Additional unidentified deciduous small trees (leafless during the survey due to season) are also present along this fence line, but they are likely non-native ornamental species. The mulefat and willow appear to be supported by landscape irrigation runoff associated with the gas station.

The topography of the site is relatively flat with an elevation of 840 feet above average mean sea level (AMSL).

Existing and surrounding land uses are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Single-family residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>Single-family residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Rubidoux Market, Goodyear Tire &amp; Smog, and Riverside Business Part to the southeast across Rubidoux Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Arco-branded gasoline station and Subway to the south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Jack in the Box and a stormwater detention basin to the southwest across 30th Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Inspection, May, 2018*

2.4 **Existing General Plan Land Use and Zoning Designations**

The Project site’s General Plan land use designation is CR (Commercial Retail) which allows local- and regional-serving retail and service uses. The Project’s zoning classification is C-1/C-P (General Commercial). A summary of the existing General Plan land use and zoning designations for the Project site and surrounding properties is provided in Table 2.
Table 2. Existing and Surrounding General Plan and Zoning Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>CR (Commercial Retail)</td>
<td>C-1/C-P (General Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>MDR (Medium Density Residential)</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>MDR (Medium Density Residential)</td>
<td>R-1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>CR (Commercial Retail)</td>
<td>C-1/C-P (General Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>CR (Commercial Retail)</td>
<td>C-1/C-P (General Commercial)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Jurupa Valley-General Plan Land Use Map May, 2018*
3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Evaluation Format

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

1. Aesthetics
2. Agriculture & Forestry Resources
3. Air Quality
4. Biological Resources
5. Cultural Resources
6. Energy
7. Geology & Soils
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions
9. Hazards & Hazardous Materials
10. Hydrology & Water Quality
11. Land Use & Planning
12. Mineral Resources
13. Noise
14. Population & Housing
15. Public Services
16. Recreation
17. Transportation
18. Tribal Cultural Resources
19. Utilities and Service Systems
20. Wildfire
21. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Each factor is analyzed by responding to a series of questions pertaining to the impact of the Project on the particular factor in the form of a checklist. This Initial Study provides a manner to analyze the impacts of the Project on each factor in order to determine the severity of the impact and determine if mitigation measures can be implemented to reduce the impact to less than significant without having to prepare an Environmental Impact Report.

CEQA also requires Lead Agencies to evaluate potential environmental effects based to the fullest extent possible on scientific and factual data (CEQA Guidelines §15064[b]). A determination of whether or not a particular environmental impact will be significant must be based on substantial evidence, which includes facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, and expert opinion supported by facts (CEQA Guidelines §15064[f][5]).

The effects of the Project are then placed in the following four categories, which are each followed by a summary to substantiate why the Project does not impact the particular factor with or without mitigation. If "Potentially Significant Impacts" that cannot be mitigated are determined, then the Project does not qualify for a Mitigated Negative Declaration and an Environmental Impact Report must be prepared:
### Potentially Significant Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially significant impact(s) have been identified or anticipated that cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance. An Environmental Impact Report must therefore be prepared.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially significant impact(s) have been identified or anticipated, but mitigation is possible to reduce impact(s) to a less than significant category. Mitigation measures must then be identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No &quot;significant&quot; impact(s) identified or anticipated. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact(s) identified or anticipated. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) and the Project Design Features (PDF) were assumed and accounted for in the assessment of impacts for each issue area if applicable.

Mitigation Measures (MM) were formulated only for those issue areas where the results of the impact analysis identified significant impacts that could be reduced to less than significant levels.

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

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

| ☐ Aesthetics | ☒ Biological Resources | ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources | ☐ Air Quality |
| ☐ Geology and Soils | ☒ Hydrology and Water Quality | ☒ Cultural Resources | ☐ Energy |
| ☐ Recreation | ☐ Utilities and Service | ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions | ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials |
| ☒ Noise | ☐ Systems | ☐ Land Use and Planning | ☐ Mineral Resources |
| ☐ Transportation | ☐ Population and Housing | ☒ Tribal Cultural Resources | ☐ Public Services |
| ☐ Wildfire | ☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance |
Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed use COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be recommended for adoption.

I find that although the proposal could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made by or agreed to by the Project Applicant. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be recommended for adoption.

I find that the proposal MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposal MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

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

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director

City of Jurupa Valley

Printed Name/Title

Agency

May 9, 2019

Date

Initial Study/Environmental Checklist
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3.1 AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other regulations governing scenic quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1 (a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: General Plan, Google Earth, Project Application Materials*

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

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

**PPP 3.1-1**

As required by Municipal Code Section 9.115.040 (3), no building or structure shall exceed fifty (50) feet in height, unless a greater height is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.370. In no event, however, shall a building or structure exceed seventy-five (75) feet in height, unless a variance is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.270.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**
The Project site is located on the northwestern side of Rubidoux Boulevard and the northeastern side of 30th Street within a mixed commercial and residential area of the City. According to the General Plan, scenic vistas are points or corridors that are accessible to the public and that provide a view of scenic areas and/or landscapes. A scenic vista visible from the Project site are the Rattlesnake Mountains located approximately 2,000 feet to the northwest of the Project site.

As required by PPP 3.1-1 above, any buildings proposed on the Project site are restricted to 50 feet in height and in no case higher than 75 feet unless a zoning variance is approved. As proposed, the proposed buildings are 22-feet in height. As such, the Project will not exceed the maximum height allowed and would not block or completely obstruct views from surrounding public vantage points (Rubidoux Boulevard or 30th Street) to the Rattlesnake Mountains visible in the horizon under existing conditions.

Based on the analysis above, impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant.

### 3.1 (b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Sources: California Department of Transportation “Scenic Highway Program Eligible and Officially Designated Routes,” General Plan, General Plan Figure 4.23, Google Earth.*

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

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

### Project Design Features (PDF)

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

### Impact Analysis

California's Scenic Highway Program was created by the Legislature in 1963. Its purpose is to protect and enhance the natural scenic beauty of California highways and adjacent corridors, through special conservation treatment. The state laws governing the Scenic Highway Program are found in the Streets and Highways Code, Sections 260 through 263.

According to the California Department of Transportation, the Project site is not located within a State Scenic Highway. As such, there is no impact.

### 3.1 (c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Sources: Project Application Materials, Google Earth.*

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

According to the Census 2010 Urbanized Area Outline Maps, the project site is located in the Riverside-San Bernardino, CA Urbanized Area. The Project is subject to General Plan Policy COS-9.3 which requires that urban development implement the aesthetic principles for design context, utilities and signs, streetscapes and major roadways and General Plan Policy COS 9.4 which requires the consideration of the effects of new development, streets and road construction, grading and earthwork and utilities on views and visual quality.

In addition, the Project is subject to the development standards required by Municipal Code Section 9.111.040 for the C-1/C-P zone. Compliance with these mandatory General Plan and Municipal Code requirements will ensure that the Project will not degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings.

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

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: Project Application Materials.*

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

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

**PPP 3.1-2** All outdoor lighting shall be designed and installed to comply with California Green Building Standard Code Section 5.106 or with a local ordinance lawfully enacted pursuant to California Green Building Standard Code Section 101.7, whichever is more stringent.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

**PDF 3.1-1** As required by the building elevations submitted as part of the application materials for MA 18091, the primary exterior of the proposed buildings will consist of stucco and brick veneer and tempered glass with glazing.

**Impact Analysis**
The Project would increase the amount of light in the area above what is being generated by the vacant site by directly adding new sources of illumination including security and decorative lighting for the proposed buildings. With implementation of PPP 3.1-1, impacts relating to light would be less than significant.
3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timber and zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 (a) **Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

**Determination: No Impact**

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

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

---

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

**Determination: No Impact.**

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

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

**Agricultural Zoning**

The Project site is zoned C-1/C-P (General Commercial) which allows a variety of commercial uses. The C-1/C-P Zone is not considered a primary agricultural zone. As such, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use.

**Williamson Act**

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

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

Determination: No Impact.
Sources: General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map.

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

The Project site is zoned C-1/C-P (General Commercial). The Project site does not contain any forest lands, timberland, or timberland zoned as Timberland Production, nor are any forest lands or timberlands located or nearby the Project site. Because no lands on the Project site are zoned for forestland or timberland, the Project has no potential to impact such zoning. Therefore, no impact would occur.

3.2 (d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Field Survey.

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

The Project site and surrounding properties do not contain forest lands, are not zoned for forest lands, nor are they identified as containing forest resources by the General Plan. Because forest land is not present on the Project site or in the immediate vicinity of the Project site, the Project has no potential to result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur.

3.2 (e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

Determination: No Impact.
Sources: California Department of Conservation.

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program classifies the Project site as “Urban Built-Up Lands.” There is no land being used primarily for agricultural purposes in the vicinity of the site. As such, the Project would not result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use and no impacts would occur.
### 3.3 AIR QUALITY

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

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

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Source: CalEEMod Printouts (Appendix A).*

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

*Federal Air Quality Standards*

Under the Federal Clean Air Act, the Federal Environmental Protection Agency establishes health-based air quality standards that California must achieve. These are called “national (or federal) ambient air quality standards” and they apply to what are called “criteria pollutants.” Ambient (i.e. surrounding) air quality standard establish a concentration above which a criteria pollutant is known to cause adverse health effects to people. The national ambient air quality standards apply to the following criteria pollutants:
Ozone (8-hour standard)
- Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10)
- Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5)
- Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NOx)
- Sulphur Dioxide (SO2), and
- Lead.

State Air Quality Standards

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

- Ozone (1-hour standard)
- Ozone (8-hour standard)
- Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10)
- Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5)
- Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NOx)
- Sulphur Dioxide (SO2), and
- Lead

Regional Air Quality Standards

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

Attainment Designation

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Pollutant</th>
<th>State Designation</th>
<th>Federal Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone – 1 hour standard</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>No Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone – 8 hour standard</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10)</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5)</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criteria Pollutant | State Designation | Federal Designation
--- | --- | ---
Carbon Monoxide (CO) | Attainment | Attainment
Nitrogen Dioxide (NOx) | Attainment | Attainment
Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) | Attainment | Attainment
Lead | Attainment | Attainment

Source: California Air Resources Board, 2015

Air Quality Management Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: CalEEMod Printouts (Appendix A).

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

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

PPP 3.3-2 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113, "Architectural Coatings" Rule 1113 limits the release of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) into the atmosphere during painting and application of other surface coatings.

PPP 3.3-3 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1186 "PM10 Emissions from Paved and Unpaved Roads and Livestock Operations" Adherence to Rule 1186 reduces the release of criteria pollutant emissions into the atmosphere during construction.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

As shown in Table 3 above, the South Coast Air Basin, in which the Project site is located, is considered to be in “non-attainment” status for several criteria pollutants.
The South Coast Air Quality Management District has developed regional and localized significance thresholds for regulated pollutants. Any project in the South Coast Air Basin with daily emissions that exceed any of the indicated regional or localized significance thresholds would be considered to contribute to a projected air quality violation. The Project's regional and localized air quality impacts are discussed below.

**Regional Impact Analysis**

The following provides an analysis based on the applicable regional significance thresholds established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District in order to meet national and state air quality standards which are shown in Table 4 below.

**Table 4. South Coast Air Quality Management District Air Quality Regional Significance Thresholds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Emissions (Construction) (pounds/day)</th>
<th>Emissions (Operational) (pounds/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOx</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District CEQA Air Quality Significance Thresholds (2019)*

Both construction and operational emissions for the Project were estimated by using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) which is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies to quantify potential criteria pollutant emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. The model can be used for a variety of situations where an air quality analysis is necessary or desirable such as California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents and is authorized for use by the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

**Construction Related Impacts**

It was assumed that the construction activities for the Project will be completed within 7.5 months and that heavy construction equipment would be operating at the Project site for eight hours per day, five days per week during construction. It is mandatory for all construction activities to comply with several South Coast Air Quality Management District Rules, including Rule 403 for controlling fugitive dust, PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$ emissions from construction activities. Rule 403 requirements include, but are not limited to, applying water in sufficient quantities to prevent the generation of visible dust plumes, applying soil binders to uncovered areas, reestablishing ground cover as quickly as possible, utilizing a wheel washing system to remove bulk material from tires and vehicle
undercarriages before vehicles exit the commercial facility portion of the Project site, covering all trucks hauling soil with a fabric cover and maintaining a freeboard height of 12 inches, and maintaining effective cover over exposed areas. Compliance with Rule 403 was accounted for in the construction emissions modeling.

Implementation of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113 governing the content in architectural coating paint, thinners, and solvents, was accounted for in the construction emissions modeling. Implementation of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1186 to reduce the amount of particulate matter entrained in the ambient air as a result of vehicular travel on paved and unpaved public roads was also accounted for in the construction emissions modeling. These South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule Rules are included as PPP 3.3-1 through PPP 3.3-3.

Short-term criteria pollutant emissions will occur during site grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating activities. Emissions will occur from use of equipment, worker, vendor, and hauling trips, and disturbance of onsite soils (fugitive dust). The estimated maximum daily construction emissions are summarized in Table 5 below. Emissions resulting from the Project construction would not exceed numerical thresholds established by the SCAQMD and therefore no mitigation is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Daily Emissions</th>
<th>Emissions (pounds per day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Threshold</td>
<td>20.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Regional Threshold?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalEEMod Printouts (Appendix A)

Long-Term Regional Operation Related Impacts

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

The results of the CalEEMod model for operation of the Project are summarized in Table 6 below. Based on the results of the model, operational emissions associated with operation the Project will not exceed the thresholds established by SCAQMD.
Table 6. Maximum Operational Daily Emissions (lbs/day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Daily Emissions</th>
<th>Emissions (pounds per day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Threshold</td>
<td>8.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Regional Threshold?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SCAQMD and CelEEMod

Based on the analysis above, regional air quality impacts for construction and operation of the Project would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Localized Impact Analysis

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

Localized Significance Thresholds are only applicable to the following criteria pollutants: oxides of nitrogen (NO$_x$), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter less than 10 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM$_{10}$) and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM$_{2.5}$). Localized Significance Threshold’s represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable national or state ambient air quality standard, and are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each source receptor area and distance to the nearest sensitive receptor.

Construction localized impacts were evaluated pursuant to the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Final Localized Significance Thresholds Methodology for Project. This methodology provides screening tables for one through five acre project construction scenarios, depending on the amount of site disturbance during a day. Maximum daily oxides of nitrogen (NO$_x$), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$) emissions will occur during building construction, grading, and paving of parking lots and drive aisles.

On-site operational activities can result in localized increases in criteria pollutant levels that can cause air quality standards to be exceed even if standards are not exceeded on a regional level. On-site area and energy sources were evaluated.

As shown in Table 7 below, emissions resulting from the Project will not exceed LST numerical thresholds established by the SCAQMD and no mitigation is required.
Table 7.
Localized Significance Threshold Emissions (lbs/day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>LST Significance Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lbs/Day*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NOx) for Construction and Operation</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CO) for Construction and Operation</td>
<td>1007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 10 for Operation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10 for Construction</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.5 for Operation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5 for Construction</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Emissions (mitigated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(NOx) for Construction and Operation</td>
<td>20.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CO) for Construction and Operation</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 10 for Operation</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10 for Construction</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.5 for Operation</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5 for Construction</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceeds Threshold?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(NOx) for Construction and Operation</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CO) for Construction and Operation</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 10 for Operation</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10 for Construction</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.5 for Operation</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5 for Construction</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on LST SRA #22 2-acre @ 25 meters

CO Hot Spots

CO Hot Spots are typically associated with idling vehicles at extremely busy intersections (i.e., intersections with an excess of 100,000 vehicle trips per day). There are no intersections in the vicinity of the Project site which exceed the 100,000 vehicle per day threshold typically associated with CO Hot Spots. In addition, the South Coast Air Basin has been designated as an attainment area for CO since 2007. Therefore, Project-related vehicular emissions would not create a Hot Spot and would not substantially contribute to an existing or projected CO Hot Spot.

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

3.3(c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: CalEEMod Printouts (Appendix A).

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts related to a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

(Refer to PPP 3.3.1 through PPP 3.3-3 under issue 3.3(b) above).

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

Impact Analysis

According to the SCAQMD, individual projects that do not generate operational or construction emissions that exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily thresholds for project specific impacts would also not cause a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the South Coast Air Basin is in nonattainment, and, therefore, would not be considered to have a significant, adverse air quality impact. Alternatively, individual project-related construction and operational emissions that exceed SCAQMD thresholds for project-specific impacts would be considered cumulatively considerable.

As discussed in Issue 3.3(b) above, the Project would not exceed the regional or localized significance thresholds for construction activities. As such, the Project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

Based on the analysis above, impacts would be less than significant.

**3.3(d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: CalEEMod Printouts (Appendix A).*

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

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts related to a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

(Refer to PPP 3.3.1 through PPP 3.3-3 under Issue 3.3(b) above).

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

Sensitive receptors (i.e., children, senior citizens, and acutely or chronically ill people) are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the general population. Land uses that are considered sensitive receptors typically include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, hospitals, convalescent homes, and retirement homes. The nearest sensitive are the residences located adjacent to the northeast and northwest property lines.

As shown on Table 8 above under the discussion of issue 3.3 (b), the Project will not exceed any of the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Localized Significance Thresholds during near-term construction or long-term operation. In addition, the Project would not create a CO Hot Spot. Accordingly, Project-related localized emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction or long-term operation and impacts would be less than significant.
3.3 (e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts related to objectionable odors. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program:

PPP 3.3-4 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 402 “Nuisance.” Adherence to Rule 402 reduces the release of odorous emissions into the atmosphere.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

According to the South Coast Air Quality Management District *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The Project proposes a retail center and a drive-thru carwash.

The Project does not contain land uses typically associated with emitting objectionable odors. Potential odor sources associated with the proposed Project may result from construction equipment exhaust and the application of asphalt and architectural coatings during construction activities and the temporary storage of typical solid waste (refuse) associated with the proposed Project’s (long-term operational) uses. The construction odor emissions would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature and would cease upon completion of the respective phase of construction and is thus considered less than significant. It is expected that Project-generated refuse would be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with the City’s solid waste regulations. The proposed Project would also be required to comply with PPP 3.3-4 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances. Therefore, odors associated with the proposed Project construction and operations would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.
### 3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Habitat Assessment (Appendix B).*
Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts related to impacts to candidate sensitive, or special status species. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

The Habitat Assessment (Appendix B), found that the site is a highly disturbed vacant lot subject to periodic disking and/or mowing. Vegetation is ruderal (weedy) with few native species. A few ornamental trees are present and may provide habitat for nesting songbirds. Several mulefat plants and one small willow are growing next to the adjacent parking lot and appear to be supported by irrigation runoff. No sensitive plant communities are present. No special status plants or wildlife were detected onsite.

With implementation of PPP 3.4-1, impacts related to candidate, sensitive, or special status species are less than significant.

3.4(b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Habitat Assessment (Appendix B).

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

There are no jurisdictional drainage features or riparian/riverine habitat onsite. The scattered mulefat and willow along the fence line do not represent functional riparian habitat and were not analyzed under the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Section 6.1.2 as riparian habitat because the plants appear to be artificially supported by irrigation. Soil types are not consistent with an alkali playa or vernal pool complex and pools or depressions characteristic of vernal pool habitat were not noted as present on the subject property. No MSHCP
species listed for protection associated with riparian/riverine areas or vernal pools were observed. As such, there are no impacts.

### 3.4(c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Source: Habitat Assessment (Appendix B).*

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

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

### Project Design Features (PDF)

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

### Impact Analysis

No Jurisdictional Waters are located within the Project site. No signs of hydrology, aquatic vegetation, or hydric soils were present within or adjacent to the Project site. As such, there are no impacts.

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

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

*Source: Habitat Assessment (Appendix B).*

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

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

### Project Design Features (PDF)

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

### Impact Analysis

No wildlife corridors are identified on the Project site. Biological connectivity across the site is restricted by existing chain link fencing and adjacent roads and development.

However, grading and vegetation clearing during the breeding season could potentially impact nesting birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and mitigation is required. Impacts to nesting birds would be minimized by grading and clearing outside of the breeding season (February 15 through September 1). If any vegetation removal is to occur during the breeding season, it is
recommended that a qualified biologist survey the site for nesting birds and establish appropriate avoidance buffers around any active nests.

Mitigation Measure (MM)

MM-BIO-1 - Nesting Bird Survey. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department shall ensure vegetation clearing and ground disturbance shall be prohibited during the migratory bird nesting season (February 1 through September 15), unless a migratory bird nesting survey is completed in accordance with the following requirements:

a. A migratory nesting bird survey of the Project's impact footprint shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three business (3) days prior to initiating vegetation clearing or ground disturbance.

b. A copy of the migratory nesting bird survey results report shall be provided to the City of Jurupa Planning Department. If the survey identifies the presence of active nests, then the qualified biologist shall provide the Planning Department with a copy of maps showing the location of all active nests and an appropriate buffer zone around each nest sufficient to protect the nest from direct and indirect impact. The size and location of all buffer zones as determined by a qualified biologist, shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Department. The nests and buffer zones shall be field checked weekly by a qualified biological monitor. The approved buffer zone shall be marked in the field with construction fencing, within which no vegetation clearing or ground disturbance shall commence until the qualified biologist and Planning Department verify that the nests are no longer occupied and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, impacts are less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.4(e)</th>
<th>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Source: Tree Report (Appendix C).*

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

The subject properties has many "tree of heavens" *Ailanthus altissima*, which is a weed species. No protected species of trees as defined by the General Plan are located on the Project site. As such, there are no impacts and no mitigation measures are required.
3.4(f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Habitat Assessment (Appendix B).

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to conflicting with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. This measure would be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

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

Based on the Habitat Assessment (Appendix B) prepared for the Project and the MSHCP:

- The Project site does not contain MSHCP riparian/riverine areas or vernal pools.
- Development of the Project will not impact any MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species.
- The Project site does not contain suitable habitat to support the Delhi Sand Flower-Loving Fly.
- The Project site is not required to comply with the Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines.
- The project site falls within the area covered by the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The site is not within an MSHCP Criteria Cell and is not within an area where surveys for burrowing owl.

With implementation of PPP 3.4-1, impacts related to conflicts with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan are less than significant.
### 3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.5(a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

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

*Source: Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix D).*

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

1. A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.

2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements [off section 5024.1(g)] of the Public Resources Code.
3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California.

A cultural resources records search, additional research, and a field survey were conducted for the Project area. No cultural resources have been previously documented within or adjacent to the Project area. However, the former presence of historic period buildings and features within the Project area and numerous prehistoric resources in the vicinity indicate some sensitivity for potential subsurface cultural resources. As such, the following mitigation measures are required:

**Mitigation Measures (MMs)**

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

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

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

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix D).*

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

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

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

Impact Analysis

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

A cultural resources records search, additional research, and a field survey were conducted for the Project area. No cultural resources have been previously documented within or adjacent to the Project area. However, the former presence of historic period buildings and features within the Project area and numerous prehistoric resources in the vicinity indicate some sensitivity for potential subsurface cultural resources. As such, Mitigation Measures CR-1 and CR-2 above are required.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.5(c)</th>
<th>Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6(a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact Analysis

Short-Term Construction Impacts

Construction of the Project would create temporary increased demands for electricity and vehicle fuels compared to existing conditions. Construction of the Project would require electricity use to power some of the construction-related equipment. The electricity use during construction would vary during different phases of construction, where the majority of construction equipment during grading would be gas-powered or diesel-powered, and the later construction phases would require electricity-powered, such as interior construction and architectural coatings.
Table 8 below shows the estimated energy consumption for Project construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Number of Construction Days</th>
<th>Average Worker and Vendor Trips Per Day</th>
<th>Horse Power Hours per Construction Phase</th>
<th>Construction Equipment Energy Use (1)</th>
<th>Gas &amp; Fuel Use (2)</th>
<th>Worker and Vendor Trips Gas &amp; Fuel Use (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Const., Paving, Architectural Coating</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40,920</td>
<td>2,211.8</td>
<td>6,040.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>55.1 kWh</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,335.4 Gal.</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,070.9 Gal.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: Calculation is based on an average construction energy cost of $2.28 per month of energy use per 1,000 square feet of building space (15,220 s.f.) over the total duration of construction (8 months), at the rate of 8 cents per kilowatt hour (kWh).

2: Calculation is based on expected horsepower (HP) hours and an average factor of 1 gallon of fuel per 18.5 horsepower-hour.

3: Calculation is based on number of expected worker and vendor trips per day, multiplied by an average trip length of 14.7 miles and based on the average fuel economy of a light duty automobile of 26.77 miles per gallon.

Since the Project site is already served by onsite electrical infrastructure, adequate electrical infrastructure capacity is available to accommodate the electricity demand during construction would not require additional or expanded electrical infrastructure.

The construction contractors are anticipated to minimize idling of construction equipment during construction and reduce construction and demolition waste by recycling. Such required practices would limit wasteful and unnecessary fuel and electrical energy consumption. Thus, impacts from energy use during short-term construction activities would be less than significant.

**Long-Term Operational Impacts**

Operation of the Project would create additional demands for electricity as compared to existing conditions, and would result in increased transportation energy use. Operational use of energy would include heating, cooling, and ventilation of buildings; operation of electrical systems, security and control center functions, use of on-site equipment and appliances; and indoor, outdoor, perimeter, and parking lot lighting.

The Project would create a net increase in electricity demand of approximately 313,932 kWh per year. This net increase is well within SCE’s systemwide net increase in electricity supplies of approximately 15,273 GWh annually over the 2012-2024 period (CEC, Electricity Consumption by County, 2017). Therefore, there are sufficient planned electricity supplies in the region for the estimated net increase in electricity demands, and buildout under the proposed Project would not require expanded electricity supplies.
Additionally, plans submitted for building permits of development projects in the Project area would be required to include verification demonstrating compliance with the 2016 Building and Energy Efficiency Standards and are also required to be reviewed. The Project would also be required adhere to the provisions of CALGreen, which established planning and design standards for sustainable site development, energy efficiency (in excess of the California Energy Code requirements), water conservation, material conservation, and internal air contaminants.

Based on the above analysis, the proposed Project would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.

### 3.6(b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**  
*Source: California Energy Commission*

**Impact Analysis**

The California Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards are designed to ensure new and existing buildings achieve energy efficiency and preserve outdoor and indoor environmental quality. These measures (Title 24, Part 6) are listed in the California Code of Regulations. The California Energy Commission is responsible for adopting, implementing and updating building energy efficiency. Local city and county enforcement agencies have the authority to verify compliance with applicable building codes, including energy efficiency.

The Project is required to comply with the California Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. As such, the Project will not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.
3.7 GEOLGY AND SOILS

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

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Geotechnical Investigation Report (Appendix E).

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

The Project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and no known faults underlie the site. Because there are no faults located on the Project site, there is no potential for the Project to expose people or structures to adverse effects related to ground rupture.

---

**3.7 (a) (2) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Strong seismic ground shaking?**

---

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Geotechnical Investigation Report (Appendix E).*

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

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

PPP 3.7-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, the Project is required to comply with the most recent edition of the *California Building Code* to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic hazards.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

The Project site is located in a seismically active area of Southern California and is expected to experience moderate to severe ground shaking during the lifetime of the Project. This risk is not considered substantially different than that of other similar properties in the Southern California area. As a mandatory condition of Project approval, the Project would be required to construct the proposed structures in accordance with the *California Building Code* (CBC). The City’s Building and Safety Department would review the building plans through building plan checks, issuance of a building permit, and inspection of the building during construction, which would ensure that all required CBC seismic safety measures are incorporated into the building. Compliance with the CBC as verified by the City’s review process, would reduce impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.7-1, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
**3.7 (a) (3) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**
*Source: Geotechnical Investigation Report (Appendix E)*

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

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

**PPP 3.7-1** As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, the Project is required to comply with the most recent edition of the *California Building Code* to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic hazards.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

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

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

The Project site is identified by the General Plan (Figure 8-5 Liquefaction Susceptibility) as being in an area with a moderate susceptibility of liquefaction. According to the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation (Appendix D) prepared for the Project, the subject site is located in the area as delineated to have low potential of soil liquefaction. Due to dense deposits, the soil liquefaction potential at subject site is considered negligible.

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

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

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Field Investigation

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

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

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

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Geotechnical Investigation Report (Appendix K).

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis
Construction

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

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

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

Operation

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

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.9-2, impacts are less than significant.

\[
3.7(c) \quad \text{Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on-or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?}
\]

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**
*Source: Geotechnical Investigation Report (Appendix E).*

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

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to an unstable geologic unit. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:
PPP 3.7-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, the Project is required to comply with the most recent edition of the California Building Code to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic hazards.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

Landslide

As noted in the response to Issue 3.7 (a) (4) above, the Project site is relatively flat and contains no slopes that may be subject to landslides. Therefore the site is not considered susceptible to landslides.

Lateral Spreading

Lateral spreading is a term referring to landslides that commonly form on gentle slopes and that have rapid fluid-like flow horizontal movement. Most lateral spreading is caused by earthquakes but it is also caused by landslides. As noted in the response to Issue 3.7 (a) (4) above, the Project site is relatively flat and contains no slopes that may be subject to landslides. Therefore the Project site is not considered susceptible to lateral spreading.

Subsidence

Subsidence is the downward movement of the ground caused by the underlying soil conditions. Certain soils, such as clay soils are particularly vulnerable since they shrink and swell depending on their moisture content. Subsidence is an issue if buildings or structures sink which causes damage to the building or structure. Subsidence is usually remedied by excavating the soil the depth of the underlying bedrock and then recompacting the soil so that it is able to support buildings and structures.

According to the Riverside County Map My County website, the Project site is considered “susceptible” to subsidence. Due to the dense consistency of the underlying soils, excessive dynamic settlement is not expected with implementation of PPP 3.7-1 and impacts are less than significant.

Liquefaction

As noted in the response to Issue 3.7 (a) (3) above, the potential for exposure to liquefaction is considered moderate to low. Due to the dense consistency of the underlying soils, excessive dynamic settlement is not expected with implementation of PPP 3.7-1 and impacts are less than significant.

Collapse

Collapse occurs in saturated soils in which the space between individual particles is completely filled with water. This water exerts a pressure on the soil particles that influences how tightly the
particles themselves are pressed together. The soils lose their strength beneath buildings and other structures.

As noted in the response to Issue 3.7 (a) (3) above, due to the dense consistency of the underlying soils, collapse is not expected to occur with implementation of PPP 3.7-1 and impacts are less than significant.

3.7 (d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?

**Determination: Less than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Geotechnical Investigation Report (Appendix E).*

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

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

PPP 3.7-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, the Project is required to comply with the most recent edition of the *California Building Code* to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic hazards.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

Expansive soils are those that undergo volume changes as moisture content fluctuates; swelling substantially when wet or shrinking when dry. Soil expansion can damage structures by cracking foundations, causing settlement and distorting structural elements.

Test data in the Geotechnical Investigation Report (Appendix E) conducted for the Project indicate that silty sand (expansion index = 12 for phase 1, 8 for phase 2, 14 for phase 3 and 19 for phase 4) at floor level shows very low expansion potential.

Design-level geotechnical plans pursuant to the *California Building Code* are required prior to approval of construction, as required by PPP 3.7-1. Compliance with the *California Building Code* is a standard practice and would be required by the City Building and Safety Department. Therefore, compliance with the requirements of the *California Building Standards Code* as identified in a site specific geotechnical design would be reviewed by the City, as part of the building plan check and development review process, would ensure that potential soil stability impacts would be less than significant.
3.6(e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Project Application Materials.

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

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

3.7(f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
Sources: Map My County Website, County of Riverside, Geotechnical Investigation Report (Appendix D).

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

Paleontological Resources

Paleontological resources are the preserved fossilized remains of plants and animals. Fossils and traces of fossils are preserved in sedimentary rock units, particularly fine to medium grained marine, lake, and stream deposits, such as limestone, siltstone, sandstone, or shale, and in ancient soils. They are also found in coarse-grained sediments, such as conglomerates or coarse alluvium sediments. Fossils are rarely preserved in igneous or metamorphic rock units. Fossils may occur throughout a sedimentary unit and, in fact, are more likely to be preserved subsurface, where they have not been damaged or destroyed by previous ground disturbance, amateur collecting, or natural causes such as erosion.
Based on the Map My County website maintained by the County of Riverside accessed on May 5, 2019, the Project site is classified as having a High A sensitivity for paleontological resources. High A is described as: "HIGH SENSITIVITY (HIGH A): BASED ON GEOLOGIC FORMATIONS OR MAPPABLE ROCK UNITS THAT ARE ROCKS THAT CONTAIN FOSSILIZED BODY ELEMENTS, AND TRACE FOSSILS SUCH AS TRACKS, NESTS AND EGGS. THESE FOSSILS OCCUR ON OR BELOW THE SURFACE."

As such, development of the Project has the potential to impact paleontological resources. The following mitigation measure is required.

**Mitigation Measure (MM)**

**MM-GEO-1: Paleontological Monitoring.** A qualified paleontologist (the "Project Paleontologist") shall be retained by the developer prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Project Paleontologist will be on-call to monitor ground-disturbing activities and excavations on the Project site following identification of potential paleontological resources by project personnel. If paleontological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project, ground-disturbing activities will be temporarily redirected from the vicinity of the find. The Project Paleontologist will be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading or excavation activities in the vicinity in order to make an evaluation of the find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure CR-4 shall apply.

**MM-GEO-2: Paleontological Treatment Plan.** If a significant paleontological resource(s) is discovered on the property, in consultation with the Project proponent and the City, the qualified paleontologist shall develop a plan of mitigation which shall include salvage excavation and removal of the find, removal of sediment from around the specimen (in the laboratory), research to identify and categorize the find, curation in the find a local qualified repository, and preparation of a report summarizing the find.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 and GEO-2, impacts are less than significant.

**Unique Geologic Feature**

Unique geologic features are those that are unique to the field of Geology. Unique geologic features are not common in Jurupa Valley. The geologic processes that formed the landforms in Jurupa Valley are generally the same as those in other parts of the state. What makes a geologic unit or feature unique can vary considerably. A geologic feature is unique if it:

- Is the best example of its kind locally or regionally;
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a geologic principle that is exclusive locally or regionally;
- Provides a key piece of geologic information important in geology or geologic history;
- Is a "type locality" (the locality where a particular rock type, stratigraphic unit or mineral species is first identified) of a geologic feature;
- Is a geologic formation that is exclusive locally or regionally;
Contains a mineral that is not known to occur elsewhere in the City; or

- Is used repeatedly as a teaching tool.

Based on the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared for the Project (Appendix D), the Project site is relatively flat and the subsurface material encountered at the test boring locations consisted of undocumented fill overlying native soils. The undocumented fill consisted of brown, loose to compacted, silty sand. The depth of this unit ranged to 1 foot. Native soils underlying the existing fill consist of red brown to light brown to gray white, firm to dense, silty to slightly silty to trace silty, clayey sand to the bored. These features are not considered "unique."

Based on the analysis above, the Project will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature. There is no impact and no mitigation measures are required.
3.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: CalEEMod Printouts (Appendix A).

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

PPP 3.8-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, California Energy Code, prior to issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant shall submit plans showing that the Project will be constructed in compliance with the most recently adopted edition of the applicable California Building Code Title 24 requirements.

PPP 3.8-2 As required by Municipal Code Section 9.283.010, Water Efficient Landscape Design Requirements, prior to the approval of landscaping plans, the Project proponent shall prepare and submit landscape plans that demonstrate compliance with this section.

PPP 3.8-3 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010 (8), prior to issuance of a building permit, the Project proponent shall submit plans in compliance with the California Green Building Standards.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

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

- Commercial projects that emit less stationary source greenhouse gas emissions less than 3,000 MTCO2e per year are not considered a substantial greenhouse gas emitter and the impact is less than significant. Projects that emit in excess of 3,000 MTCO2e per year require additional analysis and mitigation.

A summary of the projected annual operational greenhouse gas emissions, including amortized construction-related emissions associated with the development of the Project is provided in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>GHG Emissions MT/yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N2O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Wastewater</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Threshold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed Threshold?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on guidance from the SCAQMD, if a commercial project would emit GHG emissions less than 3,000 MTCO2e per year, the project is not considered a substantial GHG emitter and the GHG impact is less than significant, requiring no additional analysis and no mitigation.

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan, May 22, 2014, Western Riverside County Council of Governments Subregional Climate Action Plan, September 2014.*

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

There are no Plans, Policies, or Programs specific to the project relating to this issue.

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

The Climate Change Scoping Plan was first approved by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) in 2008 and must be updated every five years. The First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan was approved by the Board on May 22, 2014. The Climate Change Scoping Plan provides a framework for actions to reduce California’s GHG emissions, and requires CARB and other state agencies to adopt regulations and other initiatives to reduce GHGs. As such, the Climate Change Scoping Plan is not directly applicable to the Projects in many cases. The Project is not in conflict with the Climate Change Scoping Plan because its individual greenhouse gas emissions are below screening thresholds as noted in the response to Issue 3.8 (a) above and the Project will implement such greenhouse reduction measures Water Efficient Landscaping, Title 24 Energy Efficiency Requirements, and recycling and waste reduction requirements.

In addition, the City of Jurupa Valley is a participant in the Western Riverside County Council of Governments Subregional Climate Action Plan (WRCOG Subregional CAP). The specific goals and actions included in the WRCOG Subregional CAP that are applicable to the proposed Project include those pertaining to energy and water use reduction, promotion of green building measures, waste reduction, and reduction in vehicle miles traveled. The proposed Project would also be required to include all mandatory green building measures for new developments under the CALGreen Code, as required by the City Municipal Code Section 8.05.010 (B), which would require that the new buildings reduce water consumption, employ building commissioning to increase building system efficiencies, divert construction waste from landfills, and install low pollutant emitting finish materials. In addition, the City’s requires that all landscaping comply with water efficient landscaping requirements.

The implementation of these stricter building and appliance standards would result in water, energy, and construction waste reductions for the development of the proposed Project. In addition, as described above, the development of proposed Project would not exceed the GHG thresholds. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases with implementation of PPP 3.8-1 through 3.8-3.
### 3.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.9(a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

3.9(b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**
*Source: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Appendix F), Project Application Materials.*

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

There are numerous regulations pertaining to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to this issue. These measures will be included in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:

PPP 3.9-1 As required by Health and Safety Code Section 25507, if a future business handles a hazardous material or a mixture containing a hazardous material that has a quantity at any one time above the thresholds described in Section 25507(a) (1) through (6), a business shall establish and implement a business plan for emergency response to a release or threatened release of a hazardous material in accordance with the standards prescribed in the regulations adopted pursuant to Section 25503, and business shall obtain approval from the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health prior to occupancy.

**Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

**Existing Hazardous Materials**

The *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Appendix F)* prepared for the Project indicated there that there are no known Recognized Environmental Conditions existing on the Project site. A Recognized Environmental Concern is one of the terms used to identify environmental liability within the context of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. The American Society for Testing and Materials defines the Recognized Environmental Condition in the E1527-13 standard in part as “the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment.”

**Construction Activities**

Heavy equipment that would be used during construction of the Project would be fueled and maintained by substances such as oil, diesel fuel, gasoline, hydraulic fluid, and other liquid materials that would be considered hazardous if improperly stored or handled. In addition,
materials such as paints, roofing materials, solvents, and other substances typically used in building construction would be located on the Project site during construction. Improper use, storage, or transportation of hazardous materials could result in accidental releases or spills, potentially posing health risks to workers, the public, and the environment. The potential for accidental releases and spills of hazardous materials during construction is a standard risk on all construction sites, and there would be no greater risk for improper handling, transportation, or spills associated with future development that would be a reasonably consequence of the development of the Project than would occur on any other similar construction site.

Construction contractors are required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations regarding hazardous materials, including but not limited to requirements imposed by the Environmental Protection Agency, California Department of Toxic Substances Control, South Coast Air Quality Management District, and the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. As such, impacts due to construction activities would not cause a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Based on the analysis above, a less than significant impact would occur.

Operational Activities

Federal and State Community-Right-to-Know laws allow the public access to information about the amounts and types of chemicals that may be used by the businesses that would operate at the Project site. Laws also are in place that require businesses to plan and prepare for possible chemical emergencies. Any business that operates any of the facilities at the Project site and that handles and/or stores substantial quantities of hazardous materials (§ 25500 of California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95) would be required to prepare and submit a Hazardous Materials Business Emergency Plan (HMBEP) to the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health (RCDEH) in order to register the business as a hazardous materials handler. Such business is also required to comply with California’s Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Law, which require immediate reporting to Riverside County Fire Department and State Office of Emergency Services regarding any release or threatened release of a hazardous material, regardless of the amount handled by the business.

With mandatory regulatory compliance as required by PPP 3.9-1 above, potential hazardous materials impacts associated with long-term operation of the Project is not expected to pose a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor would the Project increase the potential for accident operations which could result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Sources: Project Application Materials, Google Earth.

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

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

**Impact Analysis**

The Project site is not located within one-quarter (0.25) mile of a mile from an existing or proposed school. The nearest school is Nueva Vista Continuation High School located approximately 1.75 miles northwest of the Project site. In addition, as discussed in the responses to issues 3.9 (b) and 3.9 (c) above, the all hazardous or potentially hazardous materials would comply with all applicable federal, State, and local agencies and regulations with respect to hazardous materials.

---

3.9(d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

**Determination: No Impact.**

*Sources: DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese List) Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Appendix F).*

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

The Project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As such, no impact would occur.

---

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

**Determination: No Impact.**

*Source: Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission.*

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

Hazards and Hazardous Materials
The nearest airport is Flabob Airport located approximately 1.25 miles southwest of the Project site. According to Map FL-1, Flabob Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Project site is not located within an airport compatibility zone. As such, the Project will not result in a safety hazard or create excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area.

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

**Determination: No Impact.**
*Sources: General Plan, Project Application Materials.*

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

Access to the Project site is proposed from Rubidoux Boulevard which is an improved 4-lane roadway and 30th Street which is an improved 2-lane roadway. The Project site does not contain any emergency facilities nor does it serve as an emergency evacuation route. During construction and long-term operation, the Project would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles via Rubidoux Boulevard and 30th Street and connecting roadways as required by the City. Furthermore, the Project would not result in a substantial alteration to the design or capacity of any public road that would impair or interfere with the implementation of evacuation procedures. Because the Project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan, impacts are less than significant.

3.9(h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

**Determination: No Impact.**
*Source: General Plan.*

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**
According to General Plan Figure 8-11: Wildfire Severity Zones in Jurupa Valley, the Project site is shown as having a "moderate" fire hazard and is not located within a high wildfire hazard area. Therefore the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires and no impact would occur.
3.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9(a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**
*Source: Preliminary Hydrology Study (Appendix G).*

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

The following apply to the Project and would reduce impacts relating water quality and waste discharge requirements. These measures will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:
PPP 3.10-1  As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section B (1), any person performing construction work in the city shall comply with the provisions of this chapter, and shall control storm water runoff so as to prevent any likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. The City Engineer shall identify the BMPs that may be implemented to prevent such deterioration and shall identify the manner of implementation. Documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 shall be required when requested by the City Engineer.

PPP 3.10-2  As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section B (2), any person performing construction work in the city shall be regulated by the State Water Resources Control Board in a manner pursuant to and consistent with applicable requirements contained in the General Permit No. CAS000002, State Water Resources Control Board Order Number 2009-0009-DWQ. The city may notify the State Board of any person performing construction work that has a non-compliant construction site per the General Permit.

PPP 3.10-3  As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section C, new development or redevelopment projects shall control storm water runoff so as to prevent any deterioration of water quality that would impair subsequent or competing uses of the water. The City Engineer shall identify the BMPs that may be implemented to prevent such deterioration and shall identify the manner of implementation. Documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 shall be required when requested by the City Engineer. The BMPs may include, but are not limited to, the following and may, among other things, require new developments or redevelopments to do any of the following:

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

   a. Incorporating landscaping, green roofs and open space into the project design;

   b. Using porous materials for or near driveways, drive aisles, parking stalls and low volume roads and walkways; and

   c. Incorporating detention ponds and infiltration pits into the project design.

2. Direct runoff to permeable areas by orienting it away from impermeable areas to swales, berms, green strip filters, gravel beds, rain gardens, pervious pavement or other approved green infrastructure and French drains by:

   a. Installing rain-gutters oriented towards permeable areas;

   b. Modifying the grade of the property to divert flow to permeable areas and minimize the amount of storm water runoff leaving the property; and
c) Designing curbs, berms or other structures such that they do not isolate permeable or landscaped areas.

(3) Maximize storm water storage for reuse by using retention structures, subsurface areas, cisterns, or other structures to store storm water runoff for reuse or slow release.

(4) Rain gardens may be proposed in-lieu of a water quality basin when applicable and approved by the City Engineer.

PPP 3.10-4

As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section E, any person or entity that owns or operates a commercial and/or industrial facility(s) shall comply with the provisions of this chapter. All such facilities shall be subject to a regular program of inspection as required by this chapter, any NPDES permit issued by the State Water Resource Control Board, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, Porter-Cologne Waste Quality Control Act (Wat. Code Section 13000 et seq.), Title 33 U.S.C. Section 1251 et seq. (Clean Water Act), any applicable state or federal regulations promulgated thereto, and any related administrative orders or permits issued in connection therewith.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

Construction Impacts

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

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

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

Operational Impacts

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

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

Proposed Buildings A and B will be constructed in the northern portion of the site and proposed Building C will be constructed in eastern portion of the site. The proposed carwash building will be constructed between Building C and the existing gas station. Roofs drains from Building A and B downspouts and parking lots will be collected in a v-gutter located south of Building A and B and flow into an infiltration trench on the western portion of the site. Roofs drains from the carwash building downspouts and parking lot will be collected in a v-gutter located to the west of the carwash building and flow into an infiltration trench on the western portion of the site. Only the overflow drain from the infiltration trench will flow to the 30th Street curb outlet.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.10-1 through PPP 3.10-4, impacts would be less than significant.

3.10(b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Appendix E), Preliminary Hydrology Study (Appendix G).

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

Water service would be provided to the Project site by the Rubidoux Community Services District ("District"). According to the District’s 2015 Draft Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the sole source of potable water supply for the District is groundwater extracted from the southern portion
of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin (also referred to herein as the “Basin”) of the Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin.

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.10(c)</th>
<th>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)</td>
<td>Impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.
Source: Preliminary Hydrology Study (Appendix G).

Impact Analysis

Existing Condition
The site drains naturally to the west through the existing parkway drain at 30th Street.

**Post-Development Condition**

Proposed Buildings A and B will be constructed in the northern portion of the site and proposed Building C will be constructed in eastern portion of the site. The proposed carwash building will be constructed between Building C and the existing gas station.

Roofs drains from Building A and B downspouts and parking lots will be collected in a v-gutter located south of Building A and B and flow into an infiltration trench on the western portion of the site. Roofs drains from the carwash building downspouts and parking lot will be collected in a v-gutter located to the west of the carwash building and flow into an infiltration trench on the western portion of the site. Only the overflow drain from the infiltration trench will flow to the 30th Street curb outlet.

Based on the design of the Project’s storm water management system as described above and with implementation of PPP 3.10-1 through 3.10-4, impacts are less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.10(d)</th>
<th>In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Determination: No Impact.**

*Source: General Plan Figure 8-9: Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM).*

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

According to General Plan Figure 8-9: Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the Project site is not located within a flood hazard zone. According to the California Department of Conservation, California Official Tsunami Inundation Maps the site is not located within a tsunami inundation zone. The Project would not be at risk from seiche because there is no water body in the area of the Project site capable of producing as sesiche. As such, there is no impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.10(e)</th>
<th>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Determination: No Impact.**

*Source: Project Application Materials.*

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

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

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

Impact Analysis

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

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

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of PPP 3.10-1 through PPP 3.10-4, impacts would be less than significant.
3.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.11(a) Physically divide an established community?

Determination: No Impact.

Sources: Project Application Materials, Google Earth.

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

An example of a Project that has the potential to divide an established community includes the construction of a new freeway or highway through an established neighborhood. The subject property is located on the northwestern side of Rubidoux Boulevard and the northeastern side of 30th Street within a mixed commercial and residential area. The immediately surrounding properties consist of single-family residences to the northeast; single-family residences to the northwest; Rubidoux Market, Goodyear Tire & Smog, and Riverside Business Park to the southeast across Rubidoux Boulevard; an Arco-branded gasoline station and Subway to the south; and Jack in the Box and a stormwater detention basin to the southwest across 30th Street. As such, no impacts would occur with respect to dividing an established community.

3.11(b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Sources: General Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan, Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program Project Application Materials.
Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

The General Plan land use designation currently assigned to the Project site is Commercial-Retail (CR) and has a zoning classification of C-1/C-P (General Commercial). As demonstrated throughout this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Project would otherwise not conflict with any applicable goals, objectives, and policies of the City of Jurupa General Plan or the City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. Additionally, the Project would not conflict with any applicable policy document, including the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program. And the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Air Quality Management Plan. The purpose of these plans are to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect.

In conclusion, the Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating adverse environmental effects and impacts are less than significant with implementation of the following:
3.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.12(a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

Determination: No Impact.

Source: General Plan.

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

According to General Plan Figure 4-16: Jurupa Valley Mineral Resources, the Project site is mapped within MRZ-3, which is defined as "Areas containing known or inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resources significance." No mineral resource extraction activity is known to have ever occurred on the Project site. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State of California. Therefore, no impact would occur.

3.12(b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Source: General Plan.

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

According to General Plan Figure 4-16: Jurupa Valley Mineral Resources, the Project site is mapped within MRZ-3, which is defined as "Areas containing known or inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resources significance." However, no mineral resource extraction activity is known to have ever occurred on the Project site. As such, impacts are less than significant.
3.13 NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.13(a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
Source: Noise Impact Study (Appendix I), Traffic Impact Study (Appendix J).

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

PPP 3.12-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 11.05.020 (9), private construction projects located within one-quarter (¼) of a mile from an inhabited dwelling shall not perform construction between the hours of six (6:00) p.m. and six (6:00) a.m. during the months of June through September and between the hours of six (6:00) p.m. and seven (7:00) a.m. during the months of October through May.

PPP 3.12-2 As required by Jurupa Valley Municipal Code Section 11.05.040, no person shall create any sound, or allow the creation of any sound, on any property that causes the exterior sound level on any other occupied property to exceed the sound level standards set forth in Table 1 of this section or that violates the special sound source standards set forth in Section 11.05. 060.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Existing Ambient Noise Environment

Noise data indicates that traffic along Rubidoux Boulevard, 30th Street and the S.R. 60 Freeway are the primary sources of noise impacting the site and the surrounding area. Noise data indicates the ambient noise level ranges between 53.2 dBA Leq to 61.3 dBA Leq over the entire 24-hour monitoring period. The measured CNEL is 64.1 dB.

Off-Site Receptors

Off-site receptors that may be affected by Project operational noise include existing residences to the northeast and northwest. The worst-case stationary noise was modeled using SoundPLAN acoustical modeling software. Worst-case assumes the blowers are always operational when in reality the noise will be intermittent and cycle on/off depending on customer usage. Project operational are assumed to occur within 8AM to 10PM, which falls within the allowable time per the City's noise ordinance (Section 11.05.060). A total of nineteen (19) receptors were modeled to evaluate the proposed Project's operational impact. (See Exhibit 3).
Construction Noise

Project construction would include site preparation, grading, building construction, architectural coating, and paving of the commercial development and associated parking lot. As shown on Table 10 below, noise levels generated by heavy construction equipment can range from approximately 75 dBA to 99 dBA when measured at 50 feet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Equipment</th>
<th>Range of Sound Levels Measured (dBA at 50 feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pile Drivers</td>
<td>81 to 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Drills</td>
<td>83 to 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Hammers</td>
<td>75 to 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
<td>78 to 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumps</td>
<td>68 to 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozers</td>
<td>85 to 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractors</td>
<td>77 to 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-End Loaders</td>
<td>86 to 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graders</td>
<td>79 to 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Compressors</td>
<td>76 to 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks</td>
<td>81 to 87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Per Section 11.05.020 (9) of the Municipal Code, construction activities occurring between the hours of 6:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of June through September and between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of October through May are exempt from noise standards.

Regardless of the Project’s consistency with the Municipal Code as described above, construction activities, especially those involving heavy equipment, will result in unmitigated noise levels at 50 feet that have the potential to reach 87 dBA Leq and 89 dBA Lmax at the nearest sensitive receptors during grading. Noise levels for the other construction phases would be lower and range between 83 - 84 dBA.
The following mitigation measure is required to reduce construction noise impacts to the maximum extent feasible:

Mitigation Measure (MM)

Mitigation Measure NOI-1-Construction Noise Mitigation Plan. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the developer is required to submit a construction-related noise mitigation plan to the City Planning Department for review and approval. The plan must depict the location of construction equipment and how the noise from this equipment will be mitigated during construction of this project. In addition, the plan shall require that the following notes are included on grading plans and building plans. Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the notes and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by City of Jurupa Valley staff or its designee to confirm compliance. These notes also shall be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors.

"a) Haul truck deliveries shall be limited to between the hours of 6:00am to 6:00pm during the months of June through September and 7:00am to 6:00pm during the months of October through May.

b) Construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers' standards.

c) All stationary construction equipment shall be placed in such a manner so that emitted noise is directed away from any sensitive receptors adjacent to the Project site.

d) Construction equipment staging areas shall be located the greatest distance between the staging area and the nearest sensitive receptors."

Operational Noise (Stationary)

As shown in Exhibit 3, the Project plus the ambient (quietest measured hourly average level) noise levels. Project plus ambient noise level projections are anticipated to be 68.0 dBA Leq at industrial receptors (R2), range between 56.5 to 58.6 dBA Leq at residential receptors (R3 – R17) and be 60.0 dBA Leq at commercial receptors (R18 – R19). The "project plus ambient" noise projections to the adjacent uses are below the City’s 65 commercial limit and 75 dBA industrial limit as outlined within the General Plan.

However, in order to reduce noise impacts to the maximum extent feasible, the following mitigation measure is required:

Mitigation Measure (MM)

Mitigation Measure NOI-2-Turbine Pump Noise Enclosure.

Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the building plans shall show that an 8-foot tall CMU enclosure around the vacuum turbine pumps will be constructed.

Offsite Roadway Noise impacts.
The Project would generate traffic on area roadways, thereby increasing vehicle trips as a result of the Project. Utilizing the ITE’s Trip Generation Manual 10th Edition trip rates and empirical trip generation estimates, the Proposed Project trip generation was calculated at 1,810 daily trips.

Typically, a doubling of traffic volumes is required to result in an increase of 3 dBA, which is considered to be a barely audible change. Based on the Traffic Impact Study (Appendix J) prepared for the Project (Appendix I), Project generated traffic will not result in a doubling of traffic volumes along any affected roadway segment. As such, the proposed Project traffic would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient roadway noise levels.

3.13(b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
Source: Noise Impact Study (Appendix I).

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

Construction Vibration

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

The City has relied upon vibration standards promulgated by Caltrans in past CEQA documents. According to Caltrans, the threshold at which there may be a risk of architectural damage to normal houses with plastered walls and ceilings is 0.20 PPV inch/second. Primary sources of vibration during construction would be bulldozers. At a distance of 20 feet, a large bulldozer would yield a worst-case 0.114 PPV (in/sec) which may be perceptible for short periods of time during grading along the property lines adjacent to the residential uses along the Project site, but is below any threshold of damage.

Operational Vibration

Typically, groundborne vibration sources that could potentially affect nearby properties are from rail roads and trucks traveling at higher speeds on freeways and highways. The Project does not have rail access nor is it a major transportation facility or roadway. Therefore, the operational impacts associated with ground-borne vibration would be less than significant at nearby sensitive uses.

Based on the above analysis, impacts are less than significant.
3.13 (c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission.

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

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

Impact Analysis
The nearest airport is Flabob Airport located approximately 1.25 miles southwest of the Project site. According to Map FL-1, Flabob Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Project site is not located within an airport compatibility zone. As such, the Project will not result in excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area.
### 3.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

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

**Determination:** Less than Significant Impact.

*Source: Project Application Materials.*

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

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

#### Project Design Features (PDF)

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

#### Impact Analysis

The Project would not directly result in population growth because it does not propose any residential dwelling units. According to the General Plan Economic Sustainability Element: “The City is a net exporter of jobs, with more residents working outside the City than non-residents working inside the City.” (General Plan p. 11-3.). Thus, it is anticipated that new employees generated by the Project would be within commuting distance and would not generate needs for any housing.

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

Water and sewer service to the Project site will be provided by the Rubidoux Community Services District. The Project will connect to the existing 8-inch diameter water lines in Rubidoux Boulevard and 30th Street. The Project will connect to the existing 8-inch diameter sewer lines in Rubidoux Boulevard and 30th Street.
No additional infrastructure will be needed to serve the Project site other than connection to the existing infrastructure in the vicinity of the Project site.

In addition, the analysis in Section 3.15, Public Services, of this Initial Study Checklist demonstrates that the impacts on public services are less than significant so the public service provider’s ability to provide services will not be reduced. Based on the above analysis, impacts are less than significant.

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

Determination: No Impact.
Sources: Project Application Materials.

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

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

Impact Analysis
The Project site contains does not contain any residential units. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not displace a substantial number of existing housing, nor would it necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. As such, there is no impact.
### 3.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

---

### FIRE PROTECTION

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Riverside County Fire Department.*

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

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

**PPP 3.15-1** The Project applicant shall comply with all applicable Riverside County Fire Department codes, ordinances, and standard conditions regarding fire prevention and suppression measures relating to water improvement plans, fire hydrants, automatic fire extinguishing systems, fire access, access gates, combustible construction, water availability, and fire sprinkler systems.
PPP 3.15-2  As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75, the Project is required to pay a Development Impact Fee that the City can use to improve public facilities and/or, to offset the incremental increase in the demand for public services that would be created by the Project.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

The Riverside County Fire Department provides fire protection services to the Project site. The Project site would be primarily served by the West Riverside Fire Station No. 18, an existing station located at an existing station located approximately 3.0 roadway miles southwest of the Project site at 7545 Mission Boulevard.

Development of the Project would impact fire protection services by placing an additional demand on existing fire protection resources should its resources not be augmented. To offset the increased demand for fire protection services, the Project would be conditioned by the City to provide a minimum of fire safety and support fire suppression activities, including compliance with State and local fire codes, fire sprinklers, a fire hydrant system, paved access, and secondary access routes.

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

In addition, as required by the City's Inter-Agency Project Review Request process, the Project plans were routed to the Fire Department for review and comment on the impacts to providing fire protection services. The Fire Department did not indicate that the Project would result in the need for new or physically altered fire facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.15-1 and PPP 3.15-2, impacts related to fire protection are less than significant.

POLICE PROTECTION

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

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

The following applies to the Project and would reduce impacts relating to police protection. This measure will be included in the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance:
PPP 3.15-2  As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75, the Project is required to pay a Development Impact Fee that the City can use to improve public facilities and/or, to offset the incremental increase in the demand for public services that would be created by the Project.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

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

In addition, consistent with General Plan Policy CSSF 2.1-2, the Project plans were routed to the Sheriff’s Department for review and comment to increase public safety and maintain close coordination with the Sheriff’s Department and law enforcement programs. The Sheriff’s Department did not indicate that new or physically altered Sheriff to serve the Project.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.15-2, impacts related to police protection are less than significant.

SCHOOLS

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

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

PPP 3.14-3 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Project Applicant shall pay required development impact fees to the Jurupa Unified School District following protocol for impact fee collection.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis
MA 18091
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The Project does not propose any housing and would not directly create additional students to be served by the Jurupa Unified School District. However, the Project would be required to contribute fees to the Jurupa Unified School District in accordance with the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (Senate Bill 50). Pursuant to Senate Bill 50, payment of school impact fees constitutes complete mitigation under CEQA for Project-related impacts to school services.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.15-3, impacts related to schools are less than significant.

PARKS

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

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

As noted in the response to Issue 3.15(a) above, the Project will not create an additional need for housing thus directly increasing the overall population of the City and generating additional need for parkland. The payment of development impact fees will reduce any indirect Project impacts related to parks.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.15-4, impacts related to parks are less than significant.

OTHER PUBLIC FACILITIES

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

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

PPP 3.15-2 above is applicable to the Project.
Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

As noted in the response to Issue 3.15(a) above, development of the Project would not result in a direct increase in the population of the Project area and would not increase the demand for public services, including public health services and library services which would require the construction of new or expanded public facilities.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.16(a) Would the proposed Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact.

Source: Project Application Materials.

Impact Analysis

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

PPP 3.15-4 Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant shall pay required park development impact fees to the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District pursuant to District Ordinance No. 01-2007 and 02-2008.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

The Project would not cause a substantial physical deterioration of any park facilities or would accelerate the physical deterioration of any park facilities because the Project does not proposes residential dwelling units which would increase the population that would use parks. The payment of Development Impact Fees will reduce any indirect Project impacts related to recreational facilities.

Based on the above analysis, with implementation of PPP 3.15-4, impacts related to recreational facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
3.16(b) Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment?

**Determination: Less than Significant Impact.**
*Source: Project Application Materials*

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

As noted in the response to Issue 3.16(a) above, the Project does not propose any recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment. In addition, no offsite parks or recreational improvements are proposed or required as part of the Project.

Based on the above analysis, impacts related to parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
### 3.17 TRANSPORTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Source: Traffic Impact Study (Appendix J).*

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

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

**PPP 3.17-1** The Project Proponent shall make required per-unit fee payments associated with the Western Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF) pursuant to Chapter 3.70 of the Municipal Code.

**PPP 3.17-2** As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75, the Project is required to pay a Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing revenue that the City can use to fund transportation improvements such as roads, bridges, major improvements and traffic signals.

### Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Motor Vehicle Analysis

For purposes of determining the significance of traffic impacts generated by the Project, the City relies upon the County of Riverside Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines which contains the following significance criteria:

1) When existing traffic conditions exceed the General Plan target Level of Service (LOS).

2) When project traffic, when added to existing traffic will deteriorate the LOS to below the target LOS, and impacts cannot be mitigated through project conditions of approval.

3) When cumulative traffic exceeds the target LOS, and impacts cannot be mitigated through the TUMF network (or other funding mechanism), project conditions of approval, or other implementation mechanisms.

Table 11 below shows the Level of Service (LOS) Thresholds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service (LOS)</th>
<th>Signaled Intersection</th>
<th>Unsignalized Intersection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 1≤10 seconds</td>
<td>≤10 seconds</td>
<td>≤10 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 10–20 seconds</td>
<td>10–15 seconds</td>
<td>15–25 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 20–35 seconds</td>
<td>25–35 seconds</td>
<td>35–50 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 35–55 seconds</td>
<td>≥50 seconds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 55–80 seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ≥80 seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: County of Riverside Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines*

Study Area Intersections

The following study intersections were included in the analysis as shown on Table 12 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection ID #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28th Street and Rubidoux Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30th Street and Rubidoux Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WB Route 60 On-Ramp from Rubidoux Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EB Route 60 Off-Ramp &amp; On-Ramp at Rubidoux Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34th Street &amp; Rubidoux Boulevard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Traffic Impact Study (Appendix J)*

Traffic Scenarios Analyzed

The Traffic Impact Study prepared for the Project examined the following scenarios:

1. Existing (2018) plus Project Traffic Volumes;
2. Projected (2020) plus Project Conditions; and
Trip Generation

The Project is projected to generate approximately 1,810 trip-ends per day with 166 total vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 193 total vehicles per hour during the PM peak hour.

Although the Traffic Impact Analysis (Appendix J) prepared for the Project identifies that the Intersection #3 would operate at LOS F, the City’s Transportation Manager has determined that the actual LOS would be LOS D. As such, there is no significant impact.

In summary, all intersections are forecast to operate at LOS D and no mitigation measures are required. However, the Engineering Department may require certain roadway improvements be constructed or installed that are not required by CEQA.

Transit Service Analysis

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

Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Analysis

The Project is not proposing to construct any improvements that will interfere with bicycle and pedestrian use. Pedestrian and bicycle access will be available to the Project site from Rubidoux Boulevard and 30th Street. In addition, bicycle parking will be provided on the Project site. Therefore, the Project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy applying to non-motorized travel. Impacts are less than significant.

3.17(b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Determination: No Impact.
Source: CEQA Guidelines

Impact Analysis

LOS has been used as the basis for determining the significance of traffic impacts as standard practice in CEQA documents for decades. In 2013, California Senate Bill (SB) 743 was passed, which is intended to balance the need for LOS for traffic planning with the need to build infill housing and mixed-use commercial developments within walking distance of mass transit facilities, downtowns, and town centers and to provide greater flexibility to local governments to balance these often competing needs. At full implementation of SB 743, the California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) is expected to replace LOS as the metric against which traffic impacts are evaluated, with a metric based on vehicle miles traveled (VMT). On December 28, 2018, the OPR adopted several new changes to the CEQA Guidelines, including the requirement that lead agencies implement a VMT-based analysis, rather than a LOS metric, in reviewing traffic impacts. These changes to the Guidelines, however, also provide a “grace period,” and do not require lead agencies to apply a VMT metric until July 1, 2020. Because this Mitigated Negative Declaration is circulated for public review before July 1, 2020, the City, as the lead agency, was not required to use a VMT metric in its analysis of traffic impacts. For this reason, this Mitigated Negative Declaration uses a
LOS metric in its traffic analysis as described in Section 3.17 (a) above, and is thus in compliance with the standards in effect at the time of its circulation. As such, there is no impact.

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

**Determination:** No impact.

*Source: Project Application Materials.*

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

Access to the site is from Rubidoux Boulevard and 30th Street which are existing improved roadways abutting the site. The Project will construct a new driveway improvement along Rubidoux Boulevard and 30th Street which will be constructed to meet City standards.

In addition, the Project is located in a proposed commercial area with residential uses adjacent to the Project site. The Project would not be incompatible with existing development in the surrounding area to the extent that it would create a transportation hazard as a result of an incompatible use. Accordingly, the Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use. Impacts would be less than significant and mitigation is not required.

3.16(d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

**Determination:** Less Than Significant Impact.

*Source: Project Application Materials.*

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

The Project would result in a new commercial use which would increase the need for emergency access to-and-from the site. Adequate emergency access would be provided to the Project site from Rubidoux Boulevard and 30th Street. During the course of the preliminary review of the Project, the Project's transportation design was reviewed by the City's Engineering Department, County Fire
Department, and County Sheriff's Department to ensure that adequate access to and from the site would be provided for emergency vehicles.

With the adherence to mandatory requirements for emergency vehicle access, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
3.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Source: Cultural Resource Assessment (Appendix D).

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

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

1. A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.

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

3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California.
A cultural resources records search, additional research, and a field survey were conducted for the Project area. No cultural resources have been previously documented within or adjacent to the Project. However, the former presence of historic period buildings and features within the Project area and numerous prehistoric resources in the vicinity indicate some sensitivity for potential subsurface cultural resources. As such, the following mitigation measures are required:

**Mitigation Measures (MMS)**

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

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

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

---

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

---

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

*Source: AB 52 Consultation.*
Impact Analysis

On July 1, 2015 AB 52 (Gatto, 2014) went into effect. AB 52 established “Tribal Cultural resources” as a resource subject to CEQA review. Tribal Cultural Resources are either of the following:

(1) Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:

(A) Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.

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

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

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

The Planning Department notified the following California Native American Tribes per the requirements of AB52:

- Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation
- Soboba Band Luiseño Indians
- Torres Martinez Band of Cahuilla Indians.

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

Mitigation Measure (MM)

**TCR-1- NATIVE AMERICAN MONITORING, TREATMENT OF DISCOVERIES, AND DISPOSITION OF DISCOVERIES.**

1.

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

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

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

b) **TREATMENT OF DISCOVERIES:** If a significant tribal cultural resource is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). A representative of the consulting Native American Tribe(s), the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared, and implemented to protect the identified tribal cultural resources from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design, possible avoidance, and if necessary a 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 procedures (limited to non-destructive analysis), appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the tribal cultural resources in accordance with current professional archaeology standards. The treatment plan shall require monitoring by the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during data recovery and shall require that all recovered artifacts undergo basic field analysis and documentation, whichever is appropriate. At the completion of the basic field analysis and documentation, any recovered tribal cultural resources shall be temporarily curated according to current professional repository standards until the course for final disposition is determined. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department, the Eastern Information Center, and the appropriate Native American Tribes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

With implementation of Mitigation Measure TCR-1, impacts are less than significant.
### 3.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water, drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple years?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.19(a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water, drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

**Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Sources: Rubidoux Community Services District, Project Application Materials.*

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**
Water

The Project will connect to the existing 8-inch diameter water lines in Rubidoux Boulevard and 30th Street.

Sewer

The Project will connect to the existing 8-inch diameter sewer lines in Rubidoux Boulevard and 30th Street.

Storm Drainage

Proposed Buildings A and B will be constructed in the northern portion of the site and proposed Building C will be constructed in eastern portion of the site. The proposed carwash building will be constructed between Building C and the existing gas station. Roofs drains from Building A and B downspouts and parking lots will be collected in a v-gutter located south of Building A and B and flow into an infiltration trench on the western portion of the site. Roofs drains from the carwash building downspouts and parking lot will be collected in a v-gutter located to the west of the carwash building and flow into an infiltration trench on the western portion of the site. Only the overflow drain from the infiltration trench will flow to the 30th Street curb outlet.

Electric Power

The Project will connect to the existing Southern California Edison electrical distribution facilities available at the Project site.

Natural Gas

The Project will connect to the existing Southern California Gas natural gas distribution facilities available at the Project site.

The installation of the utilities at the locations as described above are evaluated throughout this Initial Study. In instances where impacts have been identified, Plans, Policies, Programs (PPP), Project Design Features (PDF), or Mitigation Measures (MM) are required to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, additional measures beyond those identified throughout this Initial Study would not be required.

3.19(b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple years?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Source: Rubidoux Community Services District 2015 UWMP.

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

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

**Impact Analysis**

Water service would be provided to the Project site by the Rubidoux Community Services District ("District"). According to the District's 2015 Draft Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the sole source of potable water supply for the District is groundwater extracted from the southern portion of the Riverside-Arlington Subbasin (also referred to herein as the "Basin") of the Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin.

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

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

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

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

The 2015 UWMP estimated that, in 2020 during normal-year, single-dry-year, and multiple-dry-year conditions, the District anticipates a total water supply of approximately 17,000 AFY and a demand of 10,397 AFY, resulting in an excess capacity of 6,603 AFY (RCSD 2015). The District issued a "Will Serve" letter dated April 5, 2018. The Will Serve letter does not guarantee that the District will provide water service for the Project, but rather is an indicator that the District has the potential to provide water service provided that fees are paid and water improvements are constructed per the District's standards.

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

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.  
Source: Rubidoux Community Services District. 2015 UWMP

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis

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

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

Wastewater use for the Project was estimated by using The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEEMod). The model can be used to estimate wastewater usage for analysis in CEQA documents. The Project is estimated to have an indoor water demand of 1.84 million gallons per year which includes wastewater. Assuming (a maximum) that all the water is discharged to the sewer system, the increase in wastewater from the proposed Project would be 4.6 AF (acre feet per year), which is within the operational capacity of the RWQCP. The capacity of existing wastewater treatment plant would be able to accommodate this increase within the existing capacity. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in impacts related to wastewater treatment provider capacity, and impacts would be less than significant.

3.19(d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

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

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

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

**Project Design Features (PDF)**

*Construction Related Impacts*

Waste generated during the construction of the Project would primarily consist of discarded materials from the construction of driveways, common areas, infrastructure installation, and other project-related construction activities. Solid waste generated in Jurupa Valley is transported to the Agua Mansa Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility at 1830 Agua Mansa Road. From there, recyclable materials are transferred to third-party providers, and waste materials are transported to various landfills in Riverside County, including the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and the El Sobrante Landfill.

According to the Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details website accessed on April 28, 2019, these landfills receive well below their maximum permitted daily disposal volume and demolition and construction waste generated by the Project is not anticipated to cause these landfills to exceed their maximum permitted daily disposal volume. Furthermore, none of these regional landfill facilities are expected to reach their total maximum permitted disposal capacities during the Project’s construction period. As such, these regional landfill facilities would have sufficient daily capacity to accept construction solid waste generated by the commercial facility.

*Operational Related Impacts*

The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies to quantify potential air quality criteria pollutant emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. The model can also be used to estimate solid waste generation rates for various types of land uses for analysis in CEQA documents. Waste disposal rates by land use and overall composition of municipal solid waste in California is primarily based on CalRecycle data.

Based on solid waste generation usage obtained from CalEEMod, the Project would generate approximately 35.17 tons of solid waste per year or 192 pounds per day.

According to the Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details website accessed on April 28, 2019, the Badlands Sanitary Landfill has a permitted disposal capacity of 4,000 tons per day with a remaining capacity of 15,748,799 cubic yards. The Badlands Sanitary Landfill is estimated to reach capacity, at
the earliest time, in the year 2022. The El Sobrante Landfill is has a permitted disposal capacity of 16,034 tons per day with a remaining capacity of 145,530,000 tons. The El Sobrante Landfill is estimated to reach capacity, at the earliest time, in the year 2045.

Solid waste generated during long-term operation of the Project would be disposed at the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and/or the El Sobrante Landfill. During long-term operation, the Project’s solid waste generation of 192 pounds per day would represent a minimal amount of the daily permitted disposal capacity at the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and the El Sobrante Landfill.

The Project is not anticipated to cause these landfills to exceed their maximum permitted daily disposal volume. Because the Project would generate a relatively small amount of solid waste per day, as compared to the permitted daily capacities for Badlands Sanitary Landfill and the El Sobrante Landfill, these regional landfill facilities would have sufficient daily capacity to accept solid waste generated by the Project.

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

3.19(e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

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

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

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

PPP 3.19-1 The Project shall comply with Section 4.408 of the 2013 California Green Building Code Standards, which requires new development projects to submit and implement a construction waste management plan in order to reduce the amount of construction waste transported to landfills. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the City of Jurupa Valley shall confirm that a sufficient plan has been submitted, and prior to final building inspections, the City of Jurupa shall review and verify the Contractor’s documentation that confirms the volumes and types of wastes that were diverted from landfill disposal, in accordance with the approved construction waste management plan.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Impact Analysis.

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

According to the Cal Recycle Facility/Site Summary Details website accessed on April 28, 2019, these landfills receive below their maximum permitted daily disposal volume and demolition and construction waste generated by the Project is not anticipated to cause these landfills to exceed their maximum permitted daily disposal volume. Furthermore, none of these regional landfill facilities are expected to reach their total maximum permitted disposal capacities during the construction period for the commercial facility. As such, these regional landfill facilities would have sufficient daily capacity to accept construction solid waste generated by the Project.

Operational Related Impacts

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

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

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

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

**WILDFIRE -- If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Due to slopes, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Sources: General Plan, Cal Fire.*

### Impact Analysis

As stated in the State of California’s General Plan Guidelines: “California’s increasing population and expansion of development into previously undeveloped areas is creating more ‘wildland-urban interface’ issues with a corresponding increased risk of loss to human life, natural resources, and economic assets associated with wildland fires.” To address this issue, the state passed Senate Bill 1241 to require that General Plan Safety Elements address the fire severity risks in State Responsibility Areas (SRAs) and Local Responsibility Areas (LRAs). As shown in General Plan Figure 8-11, Jurupa Valley contains several areas within Very High and High fire severity zones that are located in an SRA. SRAs are those areas of the state in which the responsibility of preventing and suppressing fires is primarily that of the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, also known as CAL FIRE.

However, according to General Plan Figure 8-11, The Project site is located in the “Urban-Unzoned” fire hazard area and is thus not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. As such, there are no impacts.
3.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the Project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the Project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

3.20(a) Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
Source: This Initial Study Checklist.

Impact Analysis

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

All Plans, Policies, or Programs pertaining to Biological Resources and Cultural Resources shall apply.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Mitigation Measures (MM)

BIO-1, CR-1 through CR-2, and TCR-1 shall apply.

In instances where impacts have been identified, the Plans, Policies, or Programs were applied to the Project based on the basis of federal, state, or local law currently in place which effectively reduces environmental impacts, or Mitigation Measures are required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, Project does not have impacts which would have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

| 3.19(b) | Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? |

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
Source: This Initial Study Checklist.

Impact Analysis

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

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

All Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) identified in this Initial Study Checklist document shall apply.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Mitigation Measures (MM)

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

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
Source: This Initial Study Checklist.

Impact Analysis

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

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)


Project Design Features (PDF)

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

Mitigation Measures (MM)

NOI-1 shall apply.

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

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. [http://opr.ca.gov/m_ceqa.php](http://opr.ca.gov/m_ceqa.php)


City of Jurupa Valley General Plan, 2017 [www.jurupavalley.org](http://www.jurupavalley.org)

City of Jurupa Valley General Plan EIR, 2017 [www.jurupavalley.org](http://www.jurupavalley.org)

California Department of Toxic Substances Control, [www.dtsc.ca.gov](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov)

Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan [www.rivcowm.org](http://www.rivcowm.org)


South Coast Air Quality Management District, [www.aqmd.gov](http://www.aqmd.gov)

South Coast Air Quality Management District, Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan [www.aqmd.gov](http://www.aqmd.gov)

Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan. [http://www.rctima.org/mshcp/](http://www.rctima.org/mshcp/)

5.0 REPORT PREPARATION PERSONNEL

LEAD AGENCY:

City of Jurupa Valley
Planning Department
8930 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, Ca 92509

Ernest Perea, CEQA Administrator
Tamara Campbell, Principal Planner
6.0 MITIGATION MONITORING REPORTING PROGRAM

PROJECT NAME: MA 18091

DATE: May 9, 2019

PROJECT MANAGER: Tamara Campbell, Principal Planner

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The Project involves the following components:

A. Site Development Permit (SDP) 18038: To construct a retail center consisting of three buildings totaling 20,600 square feet and a 3,600 square foot carwash.

B. Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) No. 37517: Subdivide 3.04 gross acres into four (4) lots.

C. Lot Line Adjustment (LLA) No. 1801: A Lot Line Ad

PROJECT LOCATION: The Project is located behind 2985 Rubidoux Boulevard. The Project site is identified by the following Assessor Parcel Numbers: APNs: 178-202-020, 021, and 024.

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

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

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

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) were assumed and accounted for in the assessment of impacts for each issue area. Mitigation Measures were formulated only for those issue areas where the results of the impact analysis identified significant impacts. All three types of measures described above will be required to be implemented as part of the Project.
| AESTHETICS |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| PPP 3.1-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 9.115.040 (3), no building or structure shall exceed fifty (50) feet in height, unless a greater height is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.370. In no event, however, shall a building or structure exceed seventy-five (75) feet in height, unless a variance is approved pursuant to Section 9.240.270. | Planning Department | Prior to the issuance of building permits |
| PPP 3.1-2 All outdoor lighting shall be designed and installed to comply with California Green Building Standard Code Section 5.106 or with a local ordinance lawfully enacted pursuant to California Green Building Standard Code Section 101.7, whichever is more stringent. | Planning Department | Prior to the issuance of building permits |
| PDF 3.1-1 As required by the building elevations submitted as part of the application materials for MA 18091, the primary exterior of the proposed buildings will consist of stucco and brick veneer and tempered glass with glazing. | Planning Department | Prior to the issuance of building permits |

<p>| AIR QUALITY |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| PPP 3.3-1 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, “Fugitive Dust.” Rule 403 requires implementation of best available dust control measures during construction activities that generate fugitive dust, such as earth moving and stockpiling activities, grading, and equipment travel on unpaved roads. | Engineering Department | During grading |
| PPP 3.3-2 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1186 “PM10 Emissions from Paved and Unpaved Roads and Livestock Operations” and Rule 1186.1, “Less-Polluting Street Sweepers.” Adherence to Rules 1186 and 1186.1 reduces the release of criteria pollutant emissions into the atmosphere during construction. | Building &amp; Safety Department | During construction |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.3-3 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 402 “Nuisance.” Adherence to Rule 402 reduces the release of odorous emissions into the atmosphere.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department Engineering Department Planning Department</td>
<td>During construction and on-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.3-4 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 402 “Nuisance.” Adherence to Rule 402 reduces the release of odorous emissions into the atmosphere.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.3-5 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 402 “Nuisance.” Adherence to Rule 402 reduces the release of odorous emissions into the atmosphere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPP 3.4-1 The Project is required to pay mitigation fees pursuant to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MHSCP) as required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.80.</th>
<th>Planning Department</th>
<th>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM-BIO-1- Nesting Bird Survey.</strong> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department shall ensure vegetation clearing and ground disturbance shall be prohibited during the migratory bird nesting season (February 1 through September 15), unless a migratory bird nesting survey is completed in accordance with the following requirements:</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. A migratory nesting bird survey of the Project’s impact footprint shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three business [3] days prior to initiating vegetation clearing or ground disturbance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A copy of the migratory nesting bird survey results report shall be provided to the City of Jurupa Planning Department. If the survey identifies the presence of active nests, then the qualified biologist shall provide the Planning Department with a copy of maps showing the location of all active nests and an appropriate buffer zone around each nest sufficient to protect the nest from direct and indirect impact. The size and location of all buffer zones as determined by a qualified biologist, shall be subject to review and approval by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</td>
<td>VERIFIED BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Planning Department. The nests and buffer zones shall be field checked weekly by a qualified biological monitor. The approved buffer zone shall be marked in the field with construction fencing, within which no vegetation clearing or ground disturbance shall commence until the qualified biologist and Planning Department verify that the nests</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM- CR-1: Archaeological Monitoring.</strong> A qualified archaeologist (the &quot;Project Archaeologist&quot;) shall be retained by the developer prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Project Archaeologist will be on-call to monitor ground-disturbing activities and excavations on the Project site following identification of potential cultural resources by project personnel. If archaeological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project, ground-disturbing activities will be temporarily redirected from the vicinity of the find. The Project Archaeologist will be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading or excavation activities in the vicinity in order to make an evaluation of the find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure CR-2 shall apply.</td>
<td>Engineering Department Planning Department</td>
<td>During grading and in the event of discovery of resources during grading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM- CR-2: Archaeological Treatment Plan.</strong> If a significant archaeological resource(s) is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). The archaeological monitor, the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented by the archaeologist to protect the identified archaeological resource(s) from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the archaeological resource(s) in accordance with current professional archaeology standards (typically this sampling level is two (2) to five (5) percent of the volume of the cultural deposit). At the completion of the laboratory analysis, any recovered archaeological resources shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility. A final report containing the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</td>
<td>VERIFIED BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department and the Eastern Information Center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.7-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, the Project is required to comply with the most recent edition of the California Building Code to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic hazards.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP’s 3.10-1 through PPP 3.10-4 in Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality shall apply.</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and during operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM-GEO-1: Paleontological Monitoring. A qualified paleontologist (the “Project Paleontologist”) shall be retained by the developer prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Project Paleontologist will be on-call to monitor ground-disturbing activities and excavations on the Project site following identification of potential paleontological resources by project personnel. If paleontological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project, ground-disturbing activities will be temporarily redirected from the vicinity of the find. The Project Paleontologist will be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading or excavation activities in the vicinity in order to make an evaluation of the find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure GEO-2 shall apply.</td>
<td>Panning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM-GEO-2: Paleontological Treatment Plan. If a significant paleontological resource(s) is discovered on the property, in consultation with the Project proponent and the City, the qualified paleontologist shall develop a plan of mitigation which shall include salvage excavation and removal of the find, removal of sediment from around the specimen (in the laboratory), research to identify and categorize the find, curation in the find a local qualified repository, and preparation of a report summarizing the find.</td>
<td>Engineering Department Planning Department</td>
<td>During grading and in the event of discovery of resources during grading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</td>
<td>VERIFIED BY:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.8-1</strong> As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, <em>California Energy Code</em>, prior to issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant shall submit showing that the Project will be constructed in compliance with the most recently adopted edition of the applicable California Building Code Title 24 requirements.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.8-2</strong> As required by Municipal Code Section 9.283.010, <em>Water Efficient Landscape Design Requirements</em>, prior to the approval of landscaping plans, the Project proponent shall prepare and submit landscape plans that demonstrate compliance with this section.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.8-3</strong> As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010 (6), the Project proponent shall comply with the <em>California Green Building Standards</em>.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

| PPP 3.9-1 As required by Health and Safety Code Section 25507, if a future business handles a hazardous material or a mixture containing a hazardous material that has a quantity at any one time above the thresholds described in Section 25507(a) (1) through (6), a business shall establish and implement a business plan for emergency response to a release or threatened release of a hazardous material in accordance with the standards prescribed in the regulations adopted pursuant to Section 25503, aid business shall obtain approval from the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health prior to occupancy. | Planning Department | Planning Department to confirm if Riverside County Department of Environmental Health requires a Business Plan prior to occupancy | |

### HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<p>| <strong>PPP 3.10-1</strong> As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, <em>Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section B (1)</em>. any person performing construction work in the city shall comply with the provisions of this chapter, and shall control storm water runoff so as to prevent any likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. The City Engineer shall identify the BMPs that may be implemented to prevent such deterioration and shall identify the manner of implementation. Documentation | Engineering Department | Prior to the issuance of grading permits | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP)</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 shall be required when requested by the City Engineer.</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.10-2</strong> As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section B (2), any person performing construction work in the city shall be regulated by the State Water Resources Control Board in a manner pursuant to and consistent with applicable requirements contained in the General Permit No. CAS000002, State Water Resources Control Board Order Number 2009-0009-DWQ. The city may notify the State Board of any person performing construction work that has a non-compliant construction site per the General Permit.</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.10-3</strong> As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section C, new development or redevelopment projects shall control storm water runoff so as to prevent any deterioration of water quality that would impair subsequent or competing uses of the water. The City Engineer shall identify the BMPs that may be implemented to prevent such deterioration and shall identify the manner of implementation. Documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the MS4 shall be required when requested by the City Engineer. The BMPs may include, but are not limited to, the following and may, among other things, require new developments or redevelopments to do any of the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(a) Incorporating landscaping, green roofs and open space into the project design;

(b) Using porous materials for or near driveways, drive aisles, parking stalls and low volume roads and walkways; and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c) Incorporating detention ponds and infiltration pits into the project design. (2) Direct runoff to permeable areas by orienting it away from impermeable areas to swales, berms, green strip filters, gravel beds, rain gardens, pervious pavement or other approved green infrastructure and French drains by: (a) Installing rain-gutters oriented towards permeable areas; (b) Modifying the grade of the property to divert flow to permeable areas and minimize the amount of storm water runoff leaving the property; and (c) Designing curbs, berms or other structures such that they do not isolate permeable or landscaped areas. (3) Maximize storm water storage for reuse by using retention structures, subsurface areas, cisterns, or other structures to store storm water runoff for reuse or slow release. (4) Rain gardens may be proposed in-lieu of a water quality basin when applicable and approved by the City Engineer.</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>During operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PPP 3.10-4** As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, *Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section E,* any person or entity that owns or operates a commercial and/or industrial facility(s) shall comply with the provisions of this chapter. All such facilities shall be subject to a regular program of inspection as required by this chapter, any NPDES permit issued by the State Water Resource Control Board, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Wat), Code Section 13000 et seq., Title 33 U.S.C. Section 1251 et seq., (Clean Water Act), any applicable state or federal regulations promulgated thereto, and any related administrative orders or permits issued in connection therewith.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM)</strong></th>
<th><strong>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</strong></th>
<th><strong>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</strong></th>
<th><strong>VERIFIED BY:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP)</td>
<td><strong>NOISE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</strong></td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a building permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.13-1</strong></td>
<td>As required by Municipal Code Section 11.05.020 (9), private construction projects located within one-quarter (¼) of a mile from an inhabited dwelling shall not perform construction between the hours of six (6:00) p.m. and six (6:00) a.m. during the months of June through September and between the hours of six (6:00) p.m. and seven (7:00) a.m. during the months of October through May.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.13-2</strong></td>
<td>As required by Jurupa Valley Municipal Code Section 11.05.040, no person shall create any sound, or allow the creation of any sound, on any property that causes the exterior sound level on any other occupied property to exceed the sound level standards set forth in Table 1 of this section or that violates the special sound source standards set forth in Section 11.05.060.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>During operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure NOI-1-Construction Noise Mitigation Plan</strong></td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for Conditional Use Permit No. 17004, the developer is required to submit a construction-related noise mitigation plan to the City Planning Department for review and approval. The plan must depict the location of construction equipment and how the noise from this equipment will be mitigated during construction of this project. In addition, the plan shall require that the following notes are included on grading plans and building plans. Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the notes and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by City of Jurupa Valley staff or its designee to confirm compliance. These notes also shall be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“a) Haul truck deliveries shall be limited to between the hours of 6:00am to 6:00pm during the months of June through September and 7:00am to 6:00pm during the months of October through May.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers' standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</td>
<td>VERIFIED BY:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) All stationary construction equipment shall be placed in such a manner so that emitted noise is directed away from any sensitive receptors adjacent to the Project site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Construction equipment staging areas shall be located the greatest distance between the staging area and the nearest sensitive receptors.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.15-1</strong> The Project applicant shall comply with all applicable Riverside County Fire Department codes, ordinances, and standard conditions regarding fire prevention and suppression measures relating to water improvement plans, fire hydrants, automatic fire extinguishing systems, fire access, access gates, combustible construction, water availability, and fire sprinkler systems.</td>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a building permit or occupancy permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.15-2</strong> As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75, the Project is required to pay a Development Impact Fee that the City can use to improve public facilities and/or, to offset the incremental increase in the demand for public services that would be created by the Project.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Per Municipal Code Chapter 3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.15-3</strong> Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Project Applicant shall pay required development impact fees to the Jurupa Unified School District following protocol for impact fee collection.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.15-4</strong> Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Project Applicant shall pay required park development impact fees to the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District pursuant to District Ordinance No. 01-2007 and 02-2008.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.17-1</strong> Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Project Proponent shall make required per-unit fee payments associated with the Western Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF), and the City</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Jurupa Valley Development Impact Fee (DIF).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.17-2 As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75, the Project is required to pay a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing revenue that the City can use to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fund transportation improvements such as roads, bridges, major improvements and traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

**TCR-1- NATIVE AMERICAN MONITORING, TREATMENT OF DISCOVERIES, AND DISPOSITION OF DISCOVERIES.**

I.

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

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

II.

d) **MONITORING**: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall contact the consulting Native American Tribe(s) that have requested monitoring through consultation with the City during the AB 52 process (Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kiiz Nation and the Soboba Band Luiseño Indians). The applicant shall coordinate with the Tribe(s) to develop a Tribal Monitoring Agreement(s). A copy of the agreement shall be provided to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>e) TREATMENT OF DISCOVERIES:</strong> If a significant tribal cultural resource is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). A representative of the consulting Native American Tribe(s), the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented to protect the identified tribal cultural resources from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design, possible avoidance, and if necessary a 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 procedures (limited to non-destructive analysis), appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the tribal cultural resources in accordance with current professional archaeology standards. The treatment plan shall require monitoring by the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during data recovery and shall require that all recovered artifacts undergo basic field analysis and documentation, whichever is appropriate. At the completion of the basic field analysis and documentation, any recovered tribal cultural resources shall be temporarily curated according to current professional repository standards until the course for final disposition is determined. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department, the Eastern Information Center, and the appropriate Native American Tribes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f) DISPOSITION OF DISCOVERIES:</strong> In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this project. The following procedures will be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to tribal cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the Jurupa Valley Planning Department with the details. | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Planning Department with evidence of same:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A fully executed reburial agreement with the appropriate culturally affiliated Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If more than one Native American Group is involved with the project and cannot come to a consensus as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center by default.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Should reburial of collected cultural items be preferred, it shall not occur until after the Phase IV monitoring report has been submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department. Should curation be preferred, the developer/permit applicant is responsible for all costs and the repository and curation method shall be described in the Phase IV monitoring report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERIFIED BY:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

**PPP 3.19-1** The Project shall comply with Section 4.408 of the 2013 California Green Building Code Standards, which requires new development projects to submit and implement a construction waste management plan in order to reduce the amount of construction waste transported to landfills. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the City of Jurupa Valley shall confirm that a sufficient plan has been submitted, and prior to final building inspections, the City of Jurupa shall review and verify the Contractor’s documentation that confirms the

| Building & Safety Department |
| Prior to the issuance of building permits |

**M-13**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM) PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP) PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>volumes and types of wastes that were diverted from landfill disposal, in accordance with the approved construction waste management plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT NO. 3

Proposed Tentative Parcel Map (dated 4-19-2018)