MEETING AGENDA
OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, October 23, 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 September 11, 2019 Regular Meeting- Revised

5.2 September 25, 2019 Regular Meeting

5.3 October 9, 2019 Regular Meeting

6. Public Hearings

6.1 MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 18190 TO ALLOW A PUBLIC USE PERMIT (PUP18001) FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A 38,000 SQUARE-FOOT COMMUNITY CENTER AND OTHER MINOR IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDING LANDSCAPING AND PARKING AT THE VERNOLA FAMILY PARK LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF BELLEGRAVE AND WINEVILLE AVENUE APPLICANT: JURUPA AREA RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT (JARPD)

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, a Mitigated Negative Declaration with a recommended Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared. The City’s decision to prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration should not be construed as a recommendation of either approval or denial of this Project.

RECOMMENDATION

By motion, adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-10-23-02 (1) adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration with Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP); and (2) approving Public Use Permit No. 18001.

6.2 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NO. 19005: CONSIDERATION OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE 2017 GENERAL PLAN COMMUNITY SAFETY, SERVICES, AND FACILITIES ELEMENT TO INCORPORATE THE CITY’S LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN (LHMP)

The proposed General Plan Amendment is exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3), the “Common Sense Exemption,” which states that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. Because the proposed amendment is limited to text changes in reference to the City’s LHMP, there is no possibility that it may have a significant effect on the environment and is therefore not subject to CEQA.

RECOMMENDATION

By motion, adopt Planning Commission Resolution 2019-10-23-01, recommending that the City Council approve General Plan Amendment No. 19005 to amend the 2017 General Plan Community Safety, Services, and Facilities Element to incorporate the City’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP).

7. Commission Business

8. Public Appearance/Comments
9. Planning Commissioner’s Reports and Comments

10. Planning Department Report

11. Adjournment

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

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

The Regular Session of the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. on September 11, 2019 at the City Council Chambers, 8930 Limonite Ave., Jurupa Valley.

Members present:

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

Members absent:

- Corey Moore, Chair

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

3. Public Appearance/Comments - None

4. Approval of Agenda

Commissioner Newman moved, and Commissioner Silva seconded, a motion to approve the September 11, 2019 agenda. The motion was approved 4:0.

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

5. Approval of Minutes

Commissioner Silva moved and Commissioner Lopez seconded, a motion to approve the August 21, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes. The motion was approved 4:0.

Ayes: Lopez, Newman, Pruitt, Silva
Noes: None
Abstained: None
Absent: Moore
Commissioner Lopez moved and Commissioner Silva seconded, a motion to approve the August 28, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes. The motion was approved 4:0.

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

6. PUBLIC HEARING

6.1 MASTER APPLICATION NO. 19135 (TPM37062EOT) TO CONSIDER A ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP (TPM37062) FOR LIMONITE PLAZA – A 38,800 SQUARE-FOOT SHOPPING CENTER ON 5.5 GROSS ACRES LOCATED AT 9241 LIMONITE AVE. (APN: 165-240-019)

Ms. Annette Tam, Senior Planner, provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the project’s background (including the past approvals and expiration of entitlements for the shopping center) and application. Ms. Tam noted the applicant has proposed minor modifications to the site plan under the Site Development Permit application that is not under consideration at this time. The Extension of Time for the Tentative Parcel Map is under consideration. The original expiration date for the Tentative Parcel Map is 7/21/19. The applicant is requesting a one-year extension to allow additional time to record the final map. The extension would then expire on 7/21/20. The applicant has a pending final map application with the Engineering Department to record the final map. Currently, the applicant also has submitted building permit applications with Building and Safety for the remainder of the shopping center.

Deputy City Manager, Mr. George Wentz, noted the city has been working with the applicant on completing the shopping center and is looking to complete the shopping center quickly to stimulate economic interest.

COMMISSIONERS QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

• Parcel map process and past delays
• Concerns for future delays in project schedule
• Representative not present at a previous hearing for similar project

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Chair Pro Tem Pruitt opened the public hearing.

Ms. Terri Merrihew, applicant’s representative, apologized for not having a representative at the previous hearing for the Mission and Pyrite shopping center project (MA19161 and MA19134). Ms. Merrihew assured the Commissioners that the project will be completed and the extension of time for the map is critical in obtaining financing to construct and complete the remainder of the project.

Ms. Kim Jarrell Johnson, resident, has concerns with the project including the phasing process. She is not in favor of the Extension of Time.

Ms. Jacqueline Lee has concerns with map processing delays and Limonite property not being maintained causing graffiti. She encouraged the Commissioners to inquire what type of vendors are interested in locating at the site.
PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED
There being no other person wishing to speak, the Chair Pro Tem closed the public hearing.

COMMISSIONER DELIBERATION

• Finances for the remaining project to be completed
• Would like to see the completion of the shopping center for economic development

PUBLIC HEARING RE-OPENED
Ms. Terri Merrihew, applicant’s representative, noted their intention is to complete the project in its entirety.

There being no other persons wishing to speak. Chair Pro Tem Pruitt closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Lopez moved, and Commissioner Silva seconded, a motion to approve Resolution No. 2019-09-11-01A adopting a previous environmental document review determination and approving a one-year Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 37062 for Limonite Plaza shopping center. The motion was approved 4:0.

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

7. Commission Business

7.1 MASTER APPLICATION NO. 19134 (TPM36977EOT) RESOLUTION TO DENY THE 1-YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TPM36977 OF VALLEY PLAZA – SHOPPING CENTER OF 4.44 ACRES)

Ms. Annette Tam, Senior Planner, presented a summary of the Planning Commission hearing held on August 21, 2019 for MA19134. MA19134 is for a one-year Extension of Time for TPM36977 for the Valley Square shopping center project located at 8250 Mission Blvd. Ms. Tam provided a resolution denying the one-year Extension of Time for Planning Commission’s consideration per Planning Commission’s direction on August 21, 2019. At the August 21, 2019 meeting, the Planning Commission expressed concerned that the approval of the Extension of Time would allow the owner to subdivide and sell vacant parcels which would leave the construction of the remainder of the shopping center uncertain.

COMMISSIONERS QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

• Clarification of the language was provided by the Assistant City Attorney’s

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED
Chair Pro Tem Pruitt opened the public hearing.

Ms. Terri Merrihew, applicant’s representative, stated they would appeal the decision.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED
There being no other persons wishing to speak. Chair Pro Tem Pruitt closed the public hearing.

Chair Pro Tem Pruitt moved and Commissioner Lopez seconded, a motion denying a one-year Extension of Time for TPM36977 for Valley Square shopping center on 4.44 acres. The Motion was approved 3:1.
Ayes: Lopez, Pruitt, Silva
Noes: Newman
Abstained: None
Absent: Moore

8. Public Appearance/Comments - None

9. Planning Commissioner’s Reports and Comments

Commissioner Newman requested that the meeting be closed in remembrance of 9-11
Chair Pro Tem Pruitt announced she was pleased to see motor officers on Limonite.

10. Planning Department Report – Planning Director Merrell discussed upcoming agenda
items. There being no further business before the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission,
Chair Pro Tem Pruitt adjourned the meeting at 7:55 p.m. to the September 25, 2019
Planning Commission meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director
Secretary of the Planning Commission
1. Call to Order and Roll Call

   The Regular Session of the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. on September 25, 2019 at the City Council Chambers, 8930 Limonite Ave., Jurupa Valley.

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

   Members absent: All Present

2. Pledge of Allegiance – Chair Moore led the Pledge of Allegiance

3. Public Appearance/Comments - None

4. Approval of Agenda

   Chair Pruitt moved, and Commissioner Newman seconded, a motion to approve the September 25, 2019 agenda. The motion was approved 5:0.

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

5. Approval of Minutes

   Commissioner Lopez moved and Commissioner Silva seconded, a motion to continue the September 11, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes. The motion was approved 5:0.

   Ayes: Lopez, Moore, Newman, Pruitt, Silva
   Noes: None
6. PUBLIC HEARING

6.1 MASTER APPLICATION NO. 19162 (MA19162) FOR SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 19078 (SDP19078); TO ALLOW A SHOPPING CENTER ON 5.5 ACRES (LIMONITE PLAZA) AT 9241 LIMONITE AVE. (APN:165-240-019)

Mr. Tom Merrell, Planning Director, provided a PowerPoint presentation and briefed the commissioners of the project background and status of past approvals, revised permit approvals, minor modifications and the Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 37062. Mr. Merrell noted the Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 37062 was approved at the September 11, 2019 Planning Commission and the expiration date is July 21, 2020. Mr. Merrell discussed and reviewed the pending applications with the Commissioners.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Ms. Toni Merrihew, Applicant representative, stated they are committed to completing the project and look forward to the completion and noted a high profile restaurant is looking to locate at the site.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Chair Moore moved, and Commissioner Newman seconded, a motion to adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-09-25-01 with modified revisions and corrections. The motion was approved 5:0.

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

7. Commission Business

7.1 A PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 8 OF THE JURUPA VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE CONCERNING GRADING REGULATIONS

Mr. Steve Loriso, City Engineer and Public Works Director provided background and details for the proposed Ordinance. Mr. Loriso noted the existing Ordinance is intended to regulate grading in the unincorporated areas of the county and therefore does not adequately address the City’s specific needs related to grading. In addition the existing Ordinance calls for the Building Official to oversee all grading operations as part of the building permit process and the proposed ordinance remedies by having the Public Works Director responsible for regulating all grading work. Mr. Loriso stated the proposed ordinance clarifies the authority and responsibility for all grading operations consistent with standards adopted in most cities and noted that by incorporating this into the municipal code rather than relying on Riverside County to improve and update its ordinance, the City can best tailor it to meet its needs in the future.

COMMISSIONER DELIBRATION

- Number of Public Works employees requested
- Add Air Monitoring and dust control language
• Would like language to include for full acreage site criteria
• Add language to Ordinance identifying fill origin and for it to be tested
• Identify contaminated sites located in Jurupa Valley
• Correct typographical errors on document

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED – NO SPEAKERS

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED
Chair Moore moved, and Commissioner Newman seconded, a motion to adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-09-25-01 with modified revisions and corrections. The motion was approved 5:0.

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

8. Public Appearance/Comments - None

9. Planning Commissioner's Reports and Comments –

Commissioners Silva and Newman discussed the State of the City event and both were pleased with the program. Commissioner Lopez requested a workshop to review compliance with Conditions of Approval as some developers do not follow conditions. Commissioner Silva announced the upcoming Food Fest to be held at the Spectrum Center.

10. Planning Department Report – Planning Director Mr. Merrell discussed upcoming agenda items and gave details of each project coming before the Planning Commission. There being no further business before the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission, Chair Moore adjourned the meeting at 8:05 p.m. to the October 9, 2019 Planning Commission meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP, Planning Director
Secretary of the Planning Commission
1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Due to the prior cancelation of the Regular Session, the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission meeting was called to order by the Secretary of the Planning Commission at 7:00 p.m. on October 9, 2019 at the City Council Chambers, 8930 Limonite Ave., Jurupa Valley and due to a lack of a quorum, was adjourned.

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
STAFF REPORT

DATE: OCTOBER 23, 2019
TO: CHAIR MOORE AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: THOMAS G. MERRELL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR
BY: KIRT A. COURY, SENIOR PLANNER
SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 6.1

MASTER APPLICATION (MA) NO. 18190 (PUP18001) TO CONSTRUCT A 18,028 SQUARE-FOOT COMMUNITY FACILITY WITH ADDED LANDSCAPING AND PARKING AT THE VERNOLA FAMILY PARK AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF BELLEGRAVE AND WINEVILLE AVENUE (APN: 160-470-003) APPLICANT: JURUPA AREA RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT (JARPD)

RECOMMENDATION

By motion, adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-10-23-01 (1) adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration with Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP); and (2) approving Public Use Permit No. 18001.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

The applicant, Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District (JARPD), has submitted a Public Use Permit application for the addition of 8.8 acres to an existing 22-acre outdoor recreation facility known as the "Vernola Family Park." As shown on Exhibits A and B (following page), the Project is located on the southwest corner of Bellegrave Avenue and Wineville Avenue. The project includes the following:

- 18,028 square-foot community building
- Addition of 300 parking spaces (approximately)
- Turf open play areas
- Splash pad play area
- Covered picnic table shelters
- Exercise pump track
- Restrooms

Access to the site is provided by Wineville Avenue which abuts the eastern boundary of the site; Pat's Ranch Road which abuts the western boundary of the site; and Shearwater Drive which abuts the southern boundary of the site.

Wineville Avenue, adjacent to the site is a 4-lane roadway with a meandering concrete sidewalk. Pat's Ranch Road adjacent to the site is a paved 2-lane roadway with curb, gutter, and sidewalk. The roadway terminates in a cul-de-sac just south of the Project site. Shearwater Drive, adjacent to the site, is a paved 2-lane roadway with a median and has a v-ditch for drainage purposes.
Other minor site improvements include on and offsite landscaping and security through parking lot light fixtures. Exhibit B (next page) is a colorized version of the proposed park expansion.

It should also be noted that the Applicant is proposing the Project in two phases:

**Phase 1** - 18,028 sq. ft. community center with multipurpose room, kitchen, restrooms, staff area, landscaping and parking (under this application).

**Phase 2** - Future gymnasium (roughly 15,000 sq. feet) with an indoor activity center (TBD) Development of Phase 2 will require the submittal of a Revised Permit application, which will again be considered by the Commission at a later date.

---

**EXHIBIT A. PROJECT SITE**

---

**TABLE 1: GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION</th>
<th>Open Space, Recreation (OS-R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZONING</td>
<td>Single Family Residential (R-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFIC PLAN</td>
<td>I-15 Corridor Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANALYSIS

General Plan

The City of Jurupa Valley General Plan land use designation for the site is OS-R (Open Space, Recreation) and since the proposal is for enhanced recreational facilities, the project is considered consistent with the General Plan. In addition, the project has been designed to ensure consistency with the following policies found in the Land Use Element of the General Plan.
• Policy LUE 1.1 Compatible Structures: “Require that structures be designed and operated in a manner that preserves and is compatible with the environmental character where they are located, including lighting, telecommunications equipment and other facilities and equipment.

• Policy LUE 1.7 Accessibility: “Require that open space recreation facilities be accessible to the community, regardless of age, physical limitation, or income level.”

Zoning Ordinance

The zoning classification for the site is R-1 (Single Family Dwellings). Parks are permitted with a Public Use Permit pursuant to Section 9.55.010(9),(F) in the R-1 Zone. The following table provides an analysis of the project’s compliance with the development standards set forth in the R-1 Zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2 - DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS OF THE R-1 ZONE (CODE SECTION 9.55.020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R-1 Zone Development Standard</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Setbacks | Front: 20 feet  
| | Side: 5 feet  
| | Rear: 10 feet | Yes – as shown on plans |
| Maximum Height | 40 feet | Yes – as shown on plans. Tallest structure is 39’ – 8” |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3 - OFF-STREET PARKING (CODE SECTION 9.240.120)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Standard &amp; Min. Requirements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Recreation Area: Total area of the new playground &amp; bike course (9,368 sq. feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Space: Total area of office/reception area (950 sq. feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Area: Total area of the activity room and multi-purpose room (7,700 sq. feet)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I-15 Corridor Specific Plan (No. 266)

The Specific Plan, approved by Riverside County in 1993, was implemented primarily to promote high quality development and infrastructure along the I-15 Freeway. The project, located within this Planning Area, proposes a high architectural standard in a high visibility area, while providing a multi-purpose gathering space for the community. The project compliments surrounding land uses by adding the following features:

• Building scale, by providing accent illumination at entrances and exits, an aesthetic color and materials palette, and an overall height of 40 feet.
• Site lighting, which provides ample coverage of both the parking and building area, and freestanding fixtures that comply with the Plan’s lighting height limit of 20 feet.
• Lush and appealing landscaping, both on-site and near the road rights-of-way along Wineville Avenue and Shearwater Drive (future).

Findings for Approval of a Public Use Permit

Jurupa Valley Municipal Code Section 9.240.310 (D) establishes that the City must make legal findings for issuance of a Public Use Permit. The following findings apply:

a) A public 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.

    Staff believes this finding can be made in that the project has been designed (and includes mitigation measures and conditions of approval) that ensure it will not be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of the community.

b) 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, in that, the conditions of approval and mitigation measures will mitigate potential impacts.

    Staff believes that this finding can be made in that all of the conditions of approval and Mitigation Measures of the CEQA mandated Mitigated Negative Declaration are required for project approval to ensure the continual health, safety and welfare of the community.

California Environmental Quality Act

The City of Jurupa Valley has prepared and intends to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Project. The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration is supported by an Initial Study 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 determines that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because mitigation measures have been required or revisions in the Project have been made or agreed to by the Applicant.

During the 20-day public review of the Mitigated Negative Declaration, the City has provided an information handout about the project in Spanish and English and invited residents within 1,000 feet to provide comments to the staff. Additionally, the residents were informed that City staff would be available to answer any question and address concern in both Spanish and English. Furthermore, the public notice for the public hearing was also in both Spanish and English languages.

Public Review Period

The public review period for the environmental document began on September 9, 2019 and ended on September 30, 2019. The City did not receive any comments during the public review period.
CONCLUSION

Expansion of the Vernola Family Park allows for additional active and passive recreational uses and is beneficial to the community. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and complies with development standards of the zoning code. The proposed Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, along with the conditions of approval, provide that any potential negative consequences of the projects have been eliminated, minimized or reduced to levels of non-significance. The expansion of the Vernola Family Park will further enhance recreational opportunities and activities within the surrounding area and community. Based on the analysis and ability to conclude findings in the affirmative, staff recommends the approval of the Public Use Permit.

Prepared by:

//s// Kirt Coury

Kirt Coury
Senior Consultant

Reviewed by:

//s// Serita Young

Serita Young
Deputy City Attorney

Submitted by:

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director

ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution No. 2019-10-23-01
   a. Exhibit A. Recommended Conditions of Approval
   b. Exhibit B. Mitigated Negative Declaration with Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program

2. Project Plans Date Stamped 10/14/19
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-10-23-01

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE VERNOLA FAMILY PARK EXPANSION PROJECT, AND APPROVING PUBLIC USE PERMIT NO. 18001 TO ALLOW AN 8.8 ACRE EXPANSION OF THE VERNOLA FAMILY PARK LOCATED ON THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF BELLGRAVE AVENUE AND WINEVILLE AVENUE (APN: 160-470-003)

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

Section 1. Project. Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District (the “Applicant”) has applied for Public Use Permit No. 18001 to allow an 8.8 acre expansion of the Vernola Family Park on real property located on the corner of Bellgrave Avenue and Wineville Avenue in the Open Area Combining Zone - Residential Developments (R-5) Zone and designated Open Space, Recreation (OS-R) (APN: 160-470-003) (Master Application No. 18190 or MA No. 18190) (the “Project”).

Section 2. Public Use Permit.

(a) The Applicant is seeking approval of Public Use Permit No. 18001 to allow an 8.8 acre expansion of the Vernola Family Park on real property located on the corner of Bellgrave Avenue and Wineville Avenue in the Open Area Combining Zone - Residential Developments (R-5) Zone and designated Open Space, Recreation (OS-R), including the expansion of the parking area, the construction of a community building and restrooms, and the installation of turf open play areas, a splash pad play area, covered picnic table shelters, and an exercise pump track.

(b) Section 9.240.310.A.(3) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the following use, among others, is permitted in any zone classification provided a public use permit has been granted pursuant to the provisions of Section 9.240.310: government uses.

(c) Section 9.240.310.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that a public hearing shall be held on the application for a public use permit in accordance with the provisions of Section 9.240.250 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, and all of the procedural requirements and rights of appeal as set forth therein shall govern the hearing.

(d) Section 9.240.310.D. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that a public 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. 18190 was processed including, but not limited to, a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

(b) On October 23, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 18190, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing.

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

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

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

(b) Thereafter, City staff provided public notice of the public comment period and of the intent to adopt the MND as required by law. The public comment period commenced on September 9, 2019, and expired on September 30, 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

3) The MND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Planning Commission.

(d) Based on the findings set forth in this Resolution, the Planning Commission hereby adopts the MND and MMRP for the Project.
(e) The Planning Director is authorized and directed to file a Notice of Determination in accordance with CEQA.

Section 5. **Findings for Approval of Public Use Permit.** The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine, and declare that the proposed Public Use Permit No. 18001 should be granted because:

(a) The proposed Public Use Permit No. 18001 will not be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of the community because conditions of approval and mitigation measures that protect the health, safety and general welfare of the community have been included that reduce any potential negative impacts to levels of non-significance.

Section 6. **Approval of Master Application No. 18190 with Conditions.** Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby approves Public Use Permit No. 18001 (MA No. 18190) to allow an 8.8 acre expansion of the Vernola Family Park on real property located on the corner of Bellgrave Avenue and Wineville Avenue in the Open Area Combining Zone - Residential Developments (R-5) Zone and designated Open Space, Recreation (CS-R) (APN: 160-470-003), 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 23rd day of October, 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. 2019-10-23-01 was duly adopted and passed at a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 23rd day of October, 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

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. **PROJECT PERMITTED.** MA18190 (PUP18001) is for the approval of a new 38,200 square-foot community center (activity room, multi-purpose rooms and kitchen) and playground, with other minor site improvements such as parking and landscaping. The property is located south of Vernola Family Park, near the southwest corner of Bellegarde Avenue & Wineville Avenue (APN: 160-470-003).

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 property 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 of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) under MA18190 (PUP18001).

5. **FEES.** The approval of MA18190 (PUP18001) shall not become effective until all planning fees have been paid in full.

6. **APPROVAL PERIOD.** This approval shall be used within three (3) years of the 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 three (3) year period which is thereafter diligently pursued to completion or to the
actual occupancy of existing buildings or land under the terms of the authorized use. Should no substantial construction or use of this permit be initiated within three (3) years of the approval date this permit, it shall become null and void.

7. CONFORMANCE TO APPROVED EXHIBITS. The project shall be in conformance to the approved plans listed below with changes in accordance to these conditions of approval:

   a) Architectural, Landscape, and Grading Plans (date-stamped 10/14/2019)

In addition, prior to the expiration of the project’s 10-day appeal period, the applicant shall re-submit plans ensuring the consistency of both the parking lot design and parking lot tabulations on all sheets.

In addition, prior to the expiration of the project’s 10-day appeal period, the applicant shall re-submit master plans to the Engineering Department that show the driveway on Shearwater Drive and accurately show the proposed improvements.

8. INCORPORATE CONDITIONS. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the owner or designee shall include within the first four pages of the working drawings a list of all conditions of approval imposed by the project’s final approval.

9. ON-SITE LANDSCAPING. Prior to the issuance of any Building permit, the applicant shall submit a "Professional Services (PROS)" application (with current fees) and the following items for Planning Director review and approval:

   a) The total cost estimate of landscaping, irrigation, and one-year of maintenance.

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

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

   d) Final landscape, maintenance, planting, and irrigation plans and digital copies (CD format). The plans shall be modified to include the following:

      i. Tree legend

      ii. Consistency with the site plan

Prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy for MA18190 (PUP18001), the following events shall be satisfied in the order it is listed:

1. Substantial Conformance Letter. The Landscape Architect of Record shall conduct an inspection and submit a letter to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department once the landscape architect has deemed the installation is in conformance to the approved plans.

2. City Inspection. The City landscape architect shall conduct an inspection of the installation to confirm the landscape and irrigation plan was constructed in accordance to the approved plans.

10. FUTURE GYMNASIUM. A Revised Permit shall be submitted for the entitlement of the future gymnasium, south of the community center.
11. EVENT HOURS OF OPERATION. In consideration of the residential neighborhood to the east, hours of operation for events held at the multi-purpose center shall be limited between the hours of 8am and 9pm.

12. OVERFLOW PARKING. Prior to the issuance of any Building permit, the applicant shall submit a signage plan identifying the restriction of parking from the project site to Vernola Family Park, that satisfies this condition for the review and approval of the Planning Director.

13. TRASH COLLECTION. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit plans to include the trash collection with details and specification to the Planning Department for review and approval. Walls of the enclosure and any solid gates shall have graffiti protection coating. In addition, the applicant shall submit an approval or clearance letter from the waste collection agency to the Planning Department.

14. PERIMETER WALL & FENCE. Prior to the issuance of any Building permit, the applicant shall submit a “Wall & Fence” plan that satisfies this condition for the review and approval of the Planning Director.

15. GRAFFITI PROTECTION FOR WALLS. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit plan that includes anti-graffiti coating or protection for the exterior side of all perimeter walls and exterior of building walls to half the height of the structure or 12 feet, whichever is greater, for City review and approval. The applicant shall remove any graffiti on the property as soon as possible. In addition, if the applicant was notified by the City, the applicant shall remove the graffiti within seven (7) days of the City’s notice.

16. OUTDOOR LIGHTING. The applicant shall provide sufficient outdoor lighting after dusk. All outdoor lighting fixtures shall be maintained in good condition. All lighting fixtures shall be designed and constructed in conformance with the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and the I-15 Freeway Specific Plan. In addition, all lighting and fixtures shall be designed and constructed to be consistent with the existing lighting for the Vernola Family Park. Light fixtures shall be shielded to prevent any light to flood onto adjacent properties.

   a) Photometric Plan. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit a photometric plan which provides ample site coverage and prevents spillage and glare onto adjacent properties.

17. MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTY. Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District (JARPD) shall be responsible for the maintenance of all on-site improvements including, but not limited to, structures, equipment, basins, on-site landscaping and irrigation, etc.

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

1.1 The use hereby conditioned is for a Public Use Permit (PUP18001).

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

1.3 Shearwater Drive is a residential road. Applicant is required to provide improvements along the frontage, including, but not limited to:
   a. Improvements include, but are not limited to, trail, landscape, sidewalk, curb & gutter, and streetlights.
   b. If connections to facilities on Shearwater require cuts on asphalt, the City will require additional pavement work through the encroachment permit – no small patches on new asphalt will be permitted.
   c. Vehicular access at proposed driveway will be restricted to right-in and right-out.
   d. No parking along Shearwater Drive will be permitted.

1.4 Wineville Avenue is a City maintained Major Road. Applicant is required to provide improvements along the frontage, including, but not limited to:
   a. Improvements include, but are not limited to, trail, landscape, sidewalk, curb & gutter, and streetlights.

1.5 Pats Ranch Road is a City maintained Major road. Applicant is required to provide improvements along the frontage:
   a. Improvements include, but are not limited to, trail, landscape, sidewalk, curb & gutter, and streetlights.
   b. Pats Ranch Road will not be open to through traffic, applicant shall provide cash-in-lieu for construction of paved road connecting existing cul-de-sac terminus to pavement at Shearwater Drive intersection.
   c. Existing cul-de-sac shall be modified to create westerly offset cul-de-sac. Design shall be approved by City Engineer.
   d. Installation of barricade and appropriate signage at end of existing cul-de-sac will be required.

1.6 In compliance with Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Ordore the project is required to comply with the Water Quality Management Plan for Urban Runoff (WQMP). The WQMP addresses post-development water quality impacts from new development and redevelopment projects. Guidelines and templates to assist the developer in completing the necessary studies are available on-line at www.floodcontrol.co.riverside.ca.us under Programs and Services, Stormwater Quality.
2. PRIOR TO GRADING PERMIT (ENGINEERING)

2.1 The project proponent shall cause for a "rough" grading plan or a combined "rough and precise" grading plan for the entire site for review and approval by the City Engineer.

2.1.1 Grading agreement and securities shall be in place prior to permit issuance.

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

2.1.3 Grading plan shall provide for protection of downstream properties from damages caused by alteration of the drainage patterns.

2.1.4 Temporary erosion control measures shall be implemented immediately following rough grading to prevent transport and deposition of earthen materials onto downstream/downwind properties, public right-of-way, or other drainage facilities. Erosion Control Plans shall be submitted along with the grading plans for review and approval.

2.1.5 Driveway approaches and access points shall be located and shown on the plans as approved on the approved entitlement exhibits. All driveways shall be constructed per Riverside County Standards.

2.2 Prior to approval of the grading plan, the project proponent shall submit for review and approval a geotechnical/soils report for the proposed grading, infrastructure improvements and post-construction water quality management features and facilities (BMPs). All recommendations of that report shall be incorporated in the grading plan. The tile and date of the report and the name and contact information of the project's Geotechnical/Soils Engineer shall be included on the face of the grading plan. The Geotechnical/Soils Engineer must sign the grading plan.

2.3 Prior to approval of the grading plans, the project proponent shall submit a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) for review and approval of the City Engineer. WQMP shall be prepared in conformance with the requirements of the City of Jurupa Valley and the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFC&WCD) for the Santa Ana watershed.

2.4 Prior to approval of the grading plan for disturbance of one (1) or more acres the landowner shall provide evidence that it has prepared and submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) a Storm Water Pollution Prevention plan (SWPPP). The SWRCB issued WDID number shall be included on the face of the grading plan.

2.5 Any (if any) proposed retaining walls will require a separate permit(s). Permits shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any grading permit unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer and Building Official.

2.6 A haul permit may be required for grading operations.

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

2.6.2 Where grading involves import or export using City streets, the Project
Proponent shall obtain approval of the haul route and a haul route permit
from the Public Works Department.

2.7 Prior to approval of the grading plan, the project proponent shall prepare a final
drainage study corresponding with the proposed improvements, for review and
approval of the City Engineer. A California licensed Civil Engineer shall sign the
drainage study and the grading plan.

2.8 Street improvement plans shall be submitted for review of the engineering
department. Plans required include, but are not limited to:
2.8.1 Streetlight plans,
2.8.2 Signing and striping,
2.8.3 Street improvements (road and parkway),
2.8.4 Storm drain plans,
2.8.5 Landscape and irrigation.

2.9 Street improvements plans shall provide ADA compliant path of travel, including at
driveways.

2.10 The project proponent shall prepared landscaping and irrigation plans for areas
within the street right-of-way for review and approval of the City Engineer and per the
City of Jurupa Valley guidelines.

2.11 Proposed basin overflow connects to the City's storm drain facility. Applicant will
have to revise approved storm drain plans previously submitted and approved for the
development to the South

3. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMIT

3.1 The project Geotechnical/Soils engineer shall certify to the completion of grading in
conformance with the approved grading plans and the recommendations of the
Geotechnical/Soils report approved for this project.

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

3.3 The site's BMP facilities and features shall be constructed as shown on the projects
site grading plans or separate post-construction BMP improvement plans approved
of the City Engineer. Post-construction water quality surface features and facilities
such as basins and bio-swales are not required to be landscaped prior to issuance of
building permits, but must be otherwise constructed and additional temporary erosion
control measures in place as approved by the City Engineer.

3.4 The project proponent shall take the steps necessary to enter into an agreement with
the City for the maintenance of landscape, irrigation system, trail, and other parkway
pertaining parkway infrastructure at the frontage of the property.

3.5 Prior to issuance of building permit, street improvement plans shall be approved by
the City Engineer.

3.6 Project proponent shall provide clearance letter form water and sewer utility
purveyor, that all and any conditions by the water and sewer utility purveyor have
been satisfied or appropriately initiated to is satisfaction.
4. PRIOR TO OCCUPANCY (ENGINEERING)

4.1 The Project Proponent is responsible for the completing off all grading and construction of all infrastructure improvements within the public right-of-way in accordance with approved plans, with Riverside County Ordinance 461, as adopted by the City, and with all other applicable requirements, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

4.2 The Project geotechnical/soils engineer shall provide a Final Grading Certification, certifying to the completion of the precise grading in conformance with the approved grading plans and the recommendation of the Geotechnical/Soils report.

4.3 A licensed surveyor or civil engineer shall certify to the completion of precise grading in conformance with the lines and grades shown on the approved grading plans.

4.4 The Project Civil Engineer shall provide Record ("As-built") Drawings of grading and all infrastructure improvements.

4.5 The Project Proponent is responsible for completing all landscaping and irrigation improvements within the public right-of-way as applicable.

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

4.7 Prior to completion and acceptance of improvement or prior to the final building inspection, whichever occurs first, the Project Proponent shall ensure that streetlights are energized and provide assurance of continued maintenance and operation by completing annexation to Jurupa Valley's L&LMD for street lighting along the frontage of the project.

4.8 Cash-in-lieu of construction fee for the connection of Pats Ranch Road at Shearwater Drive shall be paid to the City.

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

Applicant's name (Print Form):

Applicant's name (Signature):

Date: ________________
Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

City of Jurupa Valley Master Application (MA) 18190
Public Use Permit No. 18001
Vernola Family Park Expansion Project

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

Applicant:

Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District
4810 Pedley Road, Jurupa Valley CA 92509
Contact: Colby Diuguid
(951) 361-2090
Colby@jarpd.org

September 3, 2019
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A. Public Use Permit (PUP) 18001: Proposed expansion of an existing 22 acre park on approximately 8 acres of vacant land which includes the following:

- Expansion of the parking area

- New 38,200 sf community building (multi-purpose room, kitchen, gymnasiums)

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

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

1.5 Initial Study /Mitigated Negative Declaration Findings and Conclusions

Section 3.0 of this document contains the 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 on the southwest corner of Bellegrave Avenue and Wineville Avenue. The Project site is identified by the following Assessor Parcel Number:

- 160-470-003.

2.2 Project Description

The Project Applicant, Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District (JARPD), submitted the following application to the City of Jurupa Valley, which comprise the proposed Project: Public Use Permit (PUP) 18001. The City of Jurupa Valley also refers to these applications as Master Application (MA) No. 18190. 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. Public Use Permit (PUP) 18001:

The Project includes the addition of 8.8 acres to an existing 22-acre outdoor recreation facility known as Vernola Family Park. The proposed expansion to the existing park will add an additional 8.8 acres of land (currently disturbed) located directly south of the existing park. Construction would include the following:

- Expansion of the parking area with approximately 300 parking spaces.
- 38,000 sf community building including a gymnasium and a multi-suite clubhouse.
- Turf open play areas.
- Splash pad play area
- Covered picnic table shelters.
- Exercise pump track.
- Restrooms.

Street Improvements and Access

Wineville Avenue:

Continue parkway improvements (trail, landscape, sidewalk, curb & gutter) per existing improvements along the park’s frontage. Applicant will be required to enter into an agreement for the maintenance of the parkway improvements.

Pat’s Ranch Road:

Construct parkway improvements along Pat’s Ranch Road and throughout the site frontage, including (but not limited to) curb & gutter, sidewalk, trail, and landscaping. Existing cul-de-sac
MA 18190
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shall be left on place (as is). Installation of barricade and appropriate signage at end of existing cul-de-sac.

**Shearwater Drive**

Construct pedestrian crossing with crosswalk warning lights.

**Water and Sewer Improvements**

**Water:**

Water service is available from an existing 16-inch diameter water line in Pat’s Ranch Road and an existing 8-inch diameter water line in Wineville Avenue. The Project will connect to the existing waterline(s).

**Sewer:**

The Project will connect to an existing 10-inch diameter sewer line in Pat’s Ranch Road.

**Drainage Improvements**

The Project will construct three (3) bio-retention basins on the southern portion of the site adjacent to Shearwater Drive. These basins will capture and treat stormwater runoff prior to entering the storm drain system.

**E. Operational Characteristics**

The Project would be operated as a recreational park. As such, typical operational characteristics include park visitors traveling to and from 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 October, 2018.

The Project site is flat with elevations of approximately 689 to 695 feet above mean sea level (amsl). Historically the site has been disturbed and cultivated for agriculture, and contains only ruderal (i.e., weedy) vegetation and remnants of agricultural vegetation. Ruderal plant cover includes patches of disturbance-adapted species including cheeseweed (*Malva parviflora*), white tumbleweed (*Amaranthus albus*), several non-native grass species, and golden crownbeard (*Verbena encelioides* ssp. *encelioides*).
Modern landscaping refuse including gardening tarp scraps and PVC pipe fittings as well as concrete debris are present within the Project site. Additionally, a small pile of rocks and concrete was also noted in the southwest corner of the property, likely the result of clearing the surface for agricultural activities. A pump station is located in the southeast corner of the property within the Project site. A modern concrete storm drain culvert runs along the southern boundary just outside of the Project area.

Access to the site is provided by Wineville Avenue which abuts the eastern boundary of the site; Pat’s Ranch Road which abuts the western boundary of the site; and Shearwater Drive which abuts the southern boundary of the site.

Wineville Avenue adjacent to the site is a 2-lane roadway with an asphalt sidewalk. Pat’s Ranch Road adjacent to the site is a paved 2-lane roadway with curb, gutter, and sidewalk. The roadway terminates in a cul-de-sac just south of the Project site. Shearwater Drive adjacent to the site is a paved 2-lane roadway with a median and has a v-ditch for drainage purposes. Existing and surrounding land uses are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Vernola Family Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Shearwater Drive followed by single-family residences further to the south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>A water well is adjacent to the southeastern corner of the subject site. This well is operated by the Jurupa Valley Community Service Department for the Chino Desalter Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Wineville Avenue followed by single-family residences further to the East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Pat’s Ranch Road followed by Vernola Ranch further to the west</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Inspection, August, 2019

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

The Project site’s General Plan land use designation is OS-R-Open Space, Recreation. 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>OS-R (Open Space, Recreation)</td>
<td>R-5 (Open Area Combining Zone-Residential Developments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>OS-R (Open Space, Recreation)</td>
<td>CR (Commercial Retail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>MDR (Medium Density Residential)</td>
<td>R 1 (One Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>LDR (Country Neighborhood)</td>
<td>R-A (Residential Agricultural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>MDR (Medium Density Residential)</td>
<td>R-1 (One-Family Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Jurupa Valley-General Plan Land Use Map*
Project Location Map/Aerial Photo
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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 §15064f[5]).

The effects of the Project are then placed in the following four categories, which are each followed by a summary to substantiate why the Project does not impact the particular factor with or without mitigation. If "Potentially Significant Impacts" that cannot be mitigated are determined, then the Project does not qualify for a Mitigated Negative Declaration and an Environmental Impact Report must be prepared:
Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact
---|---|---|---
Potentially significant impact(s) have been identified or anticipated that cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance. An Environmental Impact Report must therefore be prepared. | 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. | No "significant" impact(s) identified or anticipated. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary. | No impact(s) identified or anticipated. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- [X] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [X] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Energy
- [ ] Geology and Soils
- [X] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology and Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use and Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Population and Housing
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [X] Transportation
- [X] Tribal Cultural Resources
- [ ] Utilities and Service
- [X] 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
City of Jurupa Valley

Signature

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

Agency

August 22, 2019
Date
### 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>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zoning and 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>No Impact</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:** No Impact.  
*Sources: General Plan, Google Earth, Project Application Materials*

**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 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. The nearest landmark meeting the definition of a “scenic vista” are the Jurupa Mountains located approximately 2.75 miles northeast of the Project site. Figure 4-23, Jurupa Valley Scenic Corridors and Roadways, of the General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element has designated certain roadway segments as providing views of scenic vistas. Neither Wineville Avenue, Pat’s Ranch Road, or Shearwater Drive adjacent to the Project site are designated as a scenic corridor or roadway. In addition, given the distance to the...
Jurupa Mountains and the intervening development between the Project site and the Jurupa Mountains, the Project will not obstruct any views to the Jurupa Mountains.

Based on the analysis above, there are no impacts to scenic vistas.

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 2010 Census Urban Area Reference Maps, Riverside-San Bernardino, CA (Census 2010), 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.

The Project has been reviewed by the Planning Department and has been found to be consistent with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. As such, 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 day 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 3.1-1 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 The Project shall implement the architectural and landscape design features as shown on the plans submitted for Project approval.

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 and parking lot. With implementation of PPP 3.1-1 and PDF 3.1-1, impacts relating to light and glare are less than significant.
### 3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>![Symbol]</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td>![Symbol]</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>![Symbol]</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td>![Symbol]</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>![Symbol]</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td>![Symbol]</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: Less Than Significant Impact

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 State Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Riverside County Important Farmland 2016, Sheet 1 of 3 (California Department of Conservation 2019a), the Project site is designated as Prime Farmland. Prime Farmland is defined as "having the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for the production of crops. It has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields of crops when treated and managed—including water management—according to current farming methods. Prime Farmland must have been used for the production of irrigated crops at some time during the two previous biennial update cycles (four years prior to the mapping date)."

Development of the Project site into a park will result in the conversion of approximately 8.8 acres of designated Prime Farmland. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, the CEQA Guidelines references the California Agricultural LESA Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation, as an optional methodology that may be used to assess the relative value of agriculture and farmland. The LESA uses a points-based approach for evaluating the relative importance of agricultural lands based on specific quantifiable elements. The LESA evaluates a project site's size, soil resource quality, water resource availability, surrounding agricultural lands, and surrounding protected agricultural resource land. These factors are then rated, weighted, and combined, resulting in a single numeric score. This score becomes the basis for making a determination of significance based on the following scoring thresholds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total LESA Score</th>
<th>Scoring Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 39 points</td>
<td>Not considered significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 59 points</td>
<td>Considered significant only if LE and SA subscores are each greater than or equal to 20 points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 79 points</td>
<td>Considered significant unless either LE or SA subscores is less than 20 points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 100 points</td>
<td>Considered significant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Conservation 1997
The following tables summarize the scores for the various LESA factors.

### Table 4. Project Soils Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Name (Map Unit)</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>LCC</th>
<th>LCC Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIA</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>IIe-1</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HhA2</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>Ile-4</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>IIle-1</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>36.91</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5. Storie Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Name (Map Unit)</th>
<th>Storie Index</th>
<th>Storie Index Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HhA2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storie Index Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>57.89</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6. Project Specific Size Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Name (Map Unit)</th>
<th>LCC Class I-II</th>
<th>LCC Class III</th>
<th>LCC Class IV-VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIA</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HhA2</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acres</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.65</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.01</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Size Scores</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Project Score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7. Water Resources Availability Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Option</th>
<th>Water Source</th>
<th>Proportion of Project Area</th>
<th>Weighted Availability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8. Zone of Influence Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Acres in Agriculture</th>
<th>Acres of Protected Resource</th>
<th>Percent (%) in Agricultural (A/B)</th>
<th>Percent (%) Protected Resources Land (A/C)</th>
<th>Surrounding Agricultural Land Score</th>
<th>Surrounding Protected Resource Land Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>43/5</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>18.51</td>
<td>18.51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. Final LESA Score Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor Scores</th>
<th>Factor Weight</th>
<th>Weighted Factor Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LE Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Capability Classification</td>
<td>89.77</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>22.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storie Index</td>
<td>57.89</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>14.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE Subtotal</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>36.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SA Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Size</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resource Availability</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Agricultural Land</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surround Protected Resource Land</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final LES Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the California LESA Model Scoring Thresholds as shown in Table 9 above, a LESA score between 40 to 59 points is considered significant only if the LE and SA subscores are each greater than or equal to 20 points. Because the SA subscore is less than 20 points, the Project is considered to have a less than significant impact with respect to converting Prime Farmland to non-agricultural use. The LESA score is indicative of the Project site having suitable soil and availability because the Project site is only 8.8 acres in size and located in an area that has undergone a transition from agricultural land to residential and park uses, the viability of agricultural uses is limited.

In addition, General Plan Policy COS 4.2 states: "Agricultural Land Conversion. Discourage the conversion of productive agricultural lands to urban uses unless the property owner can demonstrate overarching Community-wide benefits or need for conversion.

The expansion of the Vernola Family Park by the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District meet the intent of General Plar. Policy COS 4.2 because the park will provide a benefit to the community.

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

**Determination: No Impact.**

_Source: Riverside County Clerk of the Board._

**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 R-5 (Open Area Combining Zone-Residential Developments). According to Section 9.105.020. - Uses Permitted of the Municipal Code, agricultural uses are not listed as a permitted or conditionally permitted use in the R-5 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 was formerly part of the Mira Loma Agricultural Preserve No. 1 (Map 781). Map 781 was diminished pursuant to Amendment No. 11 on March 17, 1998. In addition, the California Department of Conservation, Riverside County Williamson Act FY 2015/2016 Map, the Project is identifies as “Non-Enrolled Land”, [Land not enrolled in a Williamson Act contract and not mapped by Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program (FMMP) as Urban and Built-Up Land or Water]. (California Department of Conservation 2019b). 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 R-5 (Open Area Combining Zone-Residential Developments). The Project site does not contain any forest lands, timberland, or timberland zoned as Timberland Production, nor are any forest lands or timberlands located on or nearby the Project site. Because no lands on the Project site are zoned for forestland or timberland, the Project has no potential to impact such zoning. Therefore, no impact would occur.
3.2 (d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

**Determination:** No Impact.

*Source: Field Survey.*

**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**

Vernola Ranch is located to the west of the Project site across Pat's Ranch Road. Vernola Ranch is currently being used for agricultural crops. Typically, changes in the existing environment that can contribute to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use include urbanization of land near forest or agriculture land; division of adjacent land into smaller parcels which encourages the conversion to other non-compatible uses; altering the habitat suitability of land and other ecosystems in close proximity to farmland; and changes in the surrounding hydrology of an area which impacts farmland.

The Project involves the expansion of the existing Vernola Family Park located immediately north of the Project site. The Project site is separated from the Vernola Ranch property by Pat's Ranch Road which is a paved 2-lane roadway. The main entrance to the proposed park is from Wineville Avenue on the eastern boundary of the Project site. There is no public access provided along Pat's Ranch Road. Surface runoff from the proposed park will be directed to two (2) bio-retention basins...
located on the southern portion of the Project site adjacent to Shearwater Drive. As such, the Project will not result in changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use.
### 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.


**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:
MA 18190
Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
September 3, 2019

- 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 10 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>
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 CBQA 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 OS-R (Open Space, Recreation). 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 open space/recreation use 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.

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 11 below.

#### Table 11. South Coast Air Quality Management District Air Quality Significance Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Regional Emissions (Construction) (pounds/day)</th>
<th>Regional Emissions (Operational) (pounds/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOx</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District CEQA Air Quality Significance Thresholds (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, PM10, and PM2.5 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 12 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>48.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Regional Threshold?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Air Quality, Energy, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact Analysis (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 ’13 below. Based on the results of the model, operational emissions associated with operation the Project will not exceed the thresholds established by SCAQMD.
Table 13. Maximum Operational Daily Emissions (lbs/day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Daily Emissions</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Threshold</td>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>26.35</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Regional Threshold?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Air Quality, Energy, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact Analysis (Appendix A)

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 (NOx), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter less than 10 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM10) and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM2.5). Localized Significance Thresholds 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 (NOx), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) 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 exceeded even if standards are not exceeded on a regional level. On-site area and energy sources were evaluated.

As shown in Table 14 below, emissions resulting from the Project will not exceed LST numerical thresholds established by the SCAQMD and no mitigation is required.
Table 14.
Localized Significance Threshold Emissions (lbs/day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>45.57</td>
<td>22.06</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Building Construction, Paving, and Architectural Coatings</td>
<td>36.83</td>
<td>33.64</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Local Threshold                            | 270  | 1,577| 13   | 8     |
| Exceeds Threshold?                         | NO   | NO   | NO   | NO    |

Source: Air Quality, Energy, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact Analysis (Appendix A)

CO Hot Spots

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

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

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.


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: Air Quality, Energy, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact Analysis (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 (e.g., 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 With Mitigation Incorporated.

*Source: Biological Resources and MSHCP Consistency Report (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

Existing Conditions

The entire Project site is disturbed, and is either unvegetated or is dominated by non-native, ruderal species, including cheeseweed, white tumbleweed, and golden crownbeard.

Special-Status Plant Species

No special-status plant species have potential to occur on site due to lack of native habitat and historical use of the project site for agriculture. The proposed Project will not impact native vegetation communities, including special-status communities. As noted above, the entire property is disturbed, with vegetated areas dominated by disturbed, non-native, ruderal species. Impacts on vegetation would be less than significant.

Special-Status Wildlife Species

No federally or state listed wildlife species were documented on or adjacent to the site during the biological survey on October 9, 2018.

Burrowing Owl Habitat Assessment

No burrowing owl individuals or burrowing owl sign were observed on site during the habitat assessment conducted on October 9, 2018. As noted above, burrowing owls or burrowing owl sign were not observed at the Project site during the habitat assessment. Although the Project site is located within burrowing owl survey area, absence of burrows and burrowing owl sign documented during the habitat assessment reduces need for protocol surveys. However, due to the presence of suitable habitat on site, pre-construction surveys will be required per Mitigation Measure BIO-1 below.

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

b. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies the presence of burrowing owls, then prior to the issuance of a grading permit and prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities on the property, the qualified biologist shall follow the methods recommended by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW, 2012) and Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP, 2006) for passive or active relocation of burrowing owls. Passive relocation, including the required use of one-way doors to exclude owls from the site and the collapsing of burrows, will occur if the biologist determines that the proximity and availability of alternate habitat is suitable for successful passive relocation. Passive relocation shall follow California Department of Fish and Wildlife relocation protocol. If proximate alternate habitat is not present as determined by the biologist, active relocation shall follow California Department of Fish and Wildlife relocation protocol. The biologist shall provide evidence in writing to the Planning Department that the species has fledged or been relocated prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 and 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: Biological Resources and MSHCP Consistency Report (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 proposed Project will not impact MSHCP riparian/riverine areas or vernal pools as these features do not occur onsite. 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: Biological Resources and MSHCP Consistency Report (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**

Two potential jurisdictional areas were observed on or adjacent to the site during the assessments for MSHCP riparian/riverine areas and vernal pools, and areas subject to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) jurisdiction pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) jurisdiction pursuant to Division 2, Chapter 6, Section 1600 – 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code. These areas are discussed in detail below.

An area with potential to seasonally pond exists in the northwestern corner of the site, approximately 32 fee: southeast of the western termination of the fence along the southern boundary of the existing Vernola Family Park. This feature is approximately 875 square feet (0.02 acre) in size and consists of a soil depression and historic tire ruts, which are evident upon viewing historical aerials via Google Earth (2018). The area around this feature appears to have been used as a staging area during recent historic agricultural operations. This feature was initially identified due to the presence of dried/cracked soils and lack of vegetation. No ponding was observed during the site survey on October 9, 2018; however, the feature was identified as an area that may seasonally pond and should be examined further. In taking a cautious and conservative approach with this feature, protocol surveys per USFWS guidelines (2015) for listed large branchiopods (fairy shrimp) were conducted from December 14, 2018 to March 15, 2019 for a total of nine (9) surveys.

Surveys were negative for all listed large branchiopods. Based on the results of the protocol surveys and long history of consistent and heavy disturbance of the soil from discing/tilling it was concluded this feature does not have potential to support listed branchiopod species in the future. This feature was artificially created through agricultural activities (including irrigation) and does not meet the MSHCP definition of a vernal pool per section 6.1.2.

A concrete-lined ditch occurs just outside of the southern site boundary, adjacent to Shearwater Drive. The ditch begins approximately 60 feet north of the southwestern corner of the site and receives no inputs from culverts or storm drains. The ditch runs south and turns east along the southern site boundary and terminates at the eastern end of the site as a storm drain. This ditch appears to have been utilized to collect runoff generated during historical agricultural operations on the site and does not meet the definition of a riparian/riverine area per the MSHCP Section 6.1.2.

Based on the analysis above, 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: Biological Resources and MSHCP Consistency Report (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 adjacent roads and development.

The proposed Project has the potential to impact active bird nests if vegetation is removed or ground disturbing activities are initiated during the nesting season (February 1 to August 31). The disturbed habitat on site, both vegetated and unvegetated, has the potential to support ground nesting avian species such as killdeer (*Charadrius vociferus*) and California horned lark (*Eremophila alpestris actia*). Impacts on nesting birds are prohibited by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code. The following Mitigation Measure is required.

**Mitigation Measure (MM)**

**MM-BIO-2- 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 migratory nesting bird survey of the Project’s impact footprint shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three business (3) days prior to initiating vegetation clearing or ground disturbance.

- A copy of the migratory nesting bird survey results report shall be provided to the City of Jurupa Planning Department. If the survey identifies the presence of active nests, then the qualified biologist shall provide the Planning Department with a copy of maps showing the location of all 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-2, impacts are less than significant.

**3.4(e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

**Determination: No Impact.**  
*Source: Field Inspection.*

**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**

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 With Mitigation Incorporated.**  
*Source: Biological Resources and MSHCP Consistency Report (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 *Biological Resources and MSHCP Consistency Report* (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 Mitigation Measure BIO-1 and 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?

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

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

*Source: Cultural Resources Investigation (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**

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.

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

As a result of the cultural resource records search and field visit, no historical or archaeological resources were identified within the Project site. However, in the event that potentially significant archaeological materials are encountered during Project-related ground-disturbing activities, 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(c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

**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(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made by the Coroner.

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

Construction Energy

The proposed Project would consume energy resources during construction in three (3) general forms:

1. Petroleum-based fuels used to power off-road construction vehicles and equipment on the Project Site, construction worker travel to and from the Project Site, as well as delivery and haul truck trips (e.g. hauling of demolition material to off-site reuse and disposal facilities);

2. Electricity associated with the conveyance of water that would be used during Project construction for dust control (supply and conveyance) and electricity to power any necessary lighting during construction, electronic equipment, or other construction activities necessitating electrical power; and,

3. Energy used in the production of construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials such as lumber and glass.

Construction-Related Electricity

During construction the proposed Project would consume electricity to construct the new building and infrastructure. Electricity would be supplied to the Project site by Southern California Edison and would be obtained from the existing electrical lines in the vicinity of the Project site. The use of electricity from existing power lines rather than temporary diesel or gasoline powered generators would minimize impacts on energy use. Electricity consumed during Project construction would vary throughout the construction period based on the construction activities being performed.
Various construction activities include electricity associated with the conveyance of water that would be used during Project construction for dust control (supply and conveyance) and electricity to power any necessary lighting during construction, electronic equipment, or other construction activities necessitating electrical power.

Such electricity demand would be temporary, nominal, and would cease upon the completion of construction. Overall, construction activities associated with the proposed Project would require limited electricity consumption that would not be expected to have an adverse impact on available electricity supplies and infrastructure. Therefore, the use of electricity during project construction would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary.

Since the Project site is located in a planned community that was designed to include development on the project site, it is anticipated that only nominal improvements would be required to SCE’s lines and equipment with development of the proposed Project. Where feasible, the new service installations and connections would be scheduled and implemented in a manner that would not result in electrical service interruptions to other properties. Compliance with SCE’s guidelines and requirements would ensure that the proposed Project fulfills its responsibilities relative to infrastructure installation, coordinates any electrical infrastructure removals or relocations, and limits any impacts associated with grading, construction, and development. Construction of the Project’s electrical infrastructure is not anticipated to adversely affect the electrical infrastructure serving the surrounding uses or utility system capacity. Impacts are less than significant.

**Construction-Related Natural Gas**

Construction of the proposed Project typically would not involve the consumption of natural gas. Natural gas would not be supplied to support construction activities, thus there would be no demand generated by construction.

**Construction-Related Transportation Energy**

Petroleum-based fuel usage represents the highest amount of transportation energy potentially consumed during construction, which would utilized by both off-road equipment operating on the Project site and on-road automobiles transporting workers to and from the Project site and on-road trucks transporting equipment and supplies to the Project site.

The off-road construction equipment fuel usage was calculated through use of the default off-road equipment assumptions from the CalEEMod model run that was prepared for the Project and the fuel usage calculations provided in the 2017 Off-road Diesel Emission Factors spreadsheet, prepared by CARR (CARR 2019 https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/msei/ordiesel.htm). Table 15 shows the off-road equipment utilized during construction of the proposed Project would consume 37,226 gallons of fuel.
Table 15. Off-Road Construction Equipment Modeled in CalEEMod and Fuel Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Equipment Quantity</th>
<th>Horse-Power</th>
<th>Load Factor</th>
<th>Operating Hours per Day</th>
<th>Total Operational Hours (t)</th>
<th>Fuel Used (gallons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Preparation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber Tired Dozers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber Tired Dozers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>5,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forklifts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5,520</td>
<td>5,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator Sets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>6,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,830</td>
<td>9,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>2,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paving</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving Equipment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Coatings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Compressor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Off-Road Fuel Used During Construction** 37,226

Notes: (1) Based on: 10 days for Site Preparation; 20 days for Grading; 250 days for Building Construction; 20 days for Paving; 20 days for Paving.

Source: CalEEMod Version 2016-3.2; CARB 2018.

Table 16 below shows the on-road construction vehicle trips modeled in CalEEMod and the fuel usage calculations, which shows that the on-road construction-related vehicle trips would consume 54,033 gallons of fuel.
Table 16. On-Road Construction Vehicle Trips Modeled in CalEEMod and Fuel Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Trip Types</th>
<th>Daily Trips</th>
<th>Trip Length (miles)</th>
<th>Total Miles Per day</th>
<th>Total Miles Per Phase</th>
<th>Fleet Average Miles Per Gallon (2)</th>
<th>Fuel Used (gallons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Preparation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Trips</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor Trips</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Trips</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor Trips</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Trips</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>3,484</td>
<td>810,297</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>33,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor Trips</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>147,591</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>19,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paving</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Trips</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Trips</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>13,818</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fuel used from On-Road Construction Vehicles (gallons)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54,033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(1) Based on: 10 days for Site Preparation; 20 days for Grading; 230 days for Building Construction; 20 days for Paving; 20 days for Paving.
(2) From EMFAC 2017 model. Worker trips based on entire fleet of gasoline vehicles and Vendor Trips based on only truck fleet of diesel vehicles.

Source: CalEEMod Version 2016-3.2; CARB 2018.

As shown above in Table 8 and Table 9, construction of the proposed Project would result in the consumption of 91,259 gallons of fuel. Construction activities associated with the proposed Project would be required to adhere to all State and SCAQMD regulations for off-road equipment and on-road trucks, which provide minimum fuel efficiency standards. As such, construction activities for the proposed Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts regarding transportation energy are less than significant.

Operational Energy

The on-going operation of the Project that includes development of a 38,000 square foot community center building, would require the use of energy resources for multiple purposes including, but not limited to, heating/ventilating/air conditioning (HVAC), refrigeration, lighting, appliances, and electronics. Energy would also be consumed during operations related to water usage, solid waste disposal, and vehicle trips.

Operations-Related Electricity

Operation of the proposed Project would result in consumption of electricity at the Project site. According to the CalEEMod model run prepared for the Project, operation of the proposed Project would utilize 360,626 kilowatt-hours per year of electricity. 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 (California Energy Commission, 2019, Electricity Consumption by County, 2018).
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.

It should be noted that, the proposed Project would comply with all Federal, State, and City requirements related to the consumption of electricity, that includes CCR Title 24, Part 6 Building Energy Efficiency Standards and CCR Title 24, Part 11: California Green Building Standards. The CCR Title 24, Part 6 and Part 11 standards require numerous energy efficiency measures to be incorporated into the proposed buildings, including enhanced insulation, use of energy efficient lighting and appliances as well as requiring a variety of other energy-efficiency measures to be incorporated into all of the proposed structures. Therefore, it is anticipated the proposed Project will be designed and built to minimize electricity use and that existing and planned electricity capacity and electricity supplies would be sufficient to support the proposed project’s electricity demand.

Thus, impacts with regard to electrical supply and infrastructure capacity would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

Operations-Related Natural Gas

Operation of the proposed Project would result in increased consumption of natural gas at the Project site. According to the CalEEMod model run prepared for the Project, operation of the proposed Project would utilize 1,060 million British thermal units (BTU) of natural gas per year. According to 2018 California Gas Report prepared by the California Gas and Electric Utilities (So Cal Gas 2019), SoCal Gas, projects total gas demand to decline at an annual rate of 0.74 percent from 2018 to 2035. The decline in throughput demand is due to modest economic growth, CPUC-mandated energy efficiency (EE) standards and programs, tighter standards created by revised Title 24 Codes and Standards, renewable electricity goals, the decline in commercial.

It should be noted that, the proposed Project would comply with all Federal, State, and City requirements related to the consumption of natural gas, that includes CCR Title 24, Part 6 Building Energy Efficiency Standards and CCR Title 24, Part 11: California Green Building Standards. The CCR Title 24, Part 6 and Part 11 standards require numerous energy efficiency measures to be incorporated into the proposed structures, including enhanced insulation as well as use of efficient natural gas appliances and HVAC units. Therefore, it is anticipated the proposed Project will be designed and built to minimize natural gas use and that existing and planned natural gas capacity and natural gas supplies would be sufficient to support the proposed Project’s natural gas demand. Thus, impacts with regard to natural gas supply and infrastructure capacity would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

In conclusion, the proposed project would comply with regulatory compliance measures outlined by the State and City related to Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG), Transportation/Circulation, and Water Supply. Additionally, the proposed Project would be constructed in accordance with all applicable City Building and Fire Codes. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. Impacts would be less than significant.
3.6(h) 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 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 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 Engineering Report (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 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 Engineering 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 Engineering 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.

In general, for the effects of liquefaction to be manifested at the surface, groundwater levels must be within 50 feet of the ground surface and the soils within the saturated zone must also be susceptible to liquefaction. The Geotechnical Investigation Report (Appendix E), indicated the groundwater level is greater than 50 feet below the ground surface and perched water was not observed to be continuous in the area despite nearby irrigation. Since the groundwater table is deeper than 50 feet, the potential for liquefaction is negligible. However, 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.

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 3.7-1. 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 site is relatively flat and slopes are anticipated to be less than 5 feet high. Along the margin with the existing park and slope, approximately 15 feet in height there is an approximate 65 feet set back from the new proposed park to the top of the existing park descending slope. Therefore, potential hazards from landslides are considered very low. 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: Project Application Materials.

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 excavation 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 paving and landscaping throughout the Project 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.7(c)</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Source: Geotechnical Engineering 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 does not contain 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. A screening analysis for lateral spreading of the adjacent basin slope (Bartlett and Youd, 2002) indicates a lateral displacement of less than 1 meter indicating a low potential for occurrence. 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 recom pacting 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. In the Project area, groundwater depths remain fairly deep and the current subsidence potential low. With implementation of PPP 3.7-1, 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 low to negligible. With implementation of PPP 3.7-1, 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, because the depth of groundwater is 50 bgs, collapse is not expected to occur. With implementation of PPP 3.7-1, 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 Engineering 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.

Near surface soils were tested for Expansion Index. Test results indicated the samples had an Expansive Index (EI) of the onsite soils ranging from “low” (borderline medium) to “medium”, as defined by ASTM D 4329.

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 Jurupa 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.

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 July 5, 2019, the Project site is classified as having a High B sensitivity for paleontological resources. "HIGH SENSITIVITY (HIGH B): SENSITIVITY EQUIVALENT TO HIGH A, BUT IS BASED ON THE OCCURRENCE OF FOSSILS AT A SPECIFIED DEPTH BELOW THE SURFACE. THE CATEGORY HIGH B INDICATES THAT FOSSILS ARE LIKELY TO BE ENCOUNTERED AT OR BELOW FOUR FEET OF DEPTH, AND MAY BE IMPACTED DURING EXCAVATION BY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES."

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 Engineering Report prepared for the Project (Appendix E), the Project site is relatively flat and the site is covered with shallow fill overlying naturally deposited soils. Fill and disturbed soils (fill) are typically within past use areas with surficial disturbance and were generally on the order of 2 to 5 feet thick. Native soils consist of a mix of alluvium (water transported) deposits (Qya) and eolian sands (Qye). Fill soils appear comprised of the native soils. In general, the observed sandy soils were loose to very dense to the depth explored. Fine grained soils were stiff to very stiff to the depth explored. Site soil moisture observations varied between damp to moist with lab moistures ranging between 4 and 36 percent. 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 or 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: Air Quality, Energy, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact Analysis (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:

- Park facility 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 17 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>N2O</th>
<th>CO2</th>
<th>CH4</th>
<th>CO2e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,257.81</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1,259.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>148.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>148.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22.06</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>54.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Wastewater</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>36.37</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>36.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-year Amortized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction GHG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,528.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed Threshold?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</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.**

**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 (8), which would require that the new buildings reduce water consumption, employ building commissioning to increase building system efficiencies, divert construction waste from landfills, and install low pollutant emitting finish materials. In addition, the City’s requires that all landscaping comply with water efficient landscaping requirements.

The implementation of these stricter building and appliance standards would result in water, energy, and construction waste reductions for the 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 no Plans, Policies, Programs applicable to the Project relating to this issue.

**Design Features (PDF)**

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

**Impact Analysis**

**Existing Hazardous Materials**

The subject site was observed to be vacant land that has been recently plowed or furrowed. The subject has been in agricultural use for row crops. A metal fence encloses the subject site along the northern side; Winelle Avenue borders the site along the eastern side; the western side is bordered by Pats Ranch Road; and the southern side is bordered by a concrete-lined ditch that is adjacent to newly developed Shearwater Drive. Additionally, a Jurupa Community Service District water well and pump system are located adjacent to the subject site within the southeast corner. No items or significant features are present at the subject site; however, a small volume of household refuse and construction materials have been dumped along the western side of the subject site. These items are not anticipated to pose a significant environmental concern to the subject site.

During the visual observations of the subject site, no significant volume of hazardous materials or wastes were observed on the subject site. Exposed surface soils did not exhibit obvious signs of discoloration. No obvious evidence (vent pipes, fill pipes, dispensers, etc.) of USTs was noted within the areas observed. No unusual standing water or major depressions were observed on the subject site.

Review of historical aerial photographs indicates the subject site has been used for agricultural uses (row crops) from at least 1967 until the recently. Although the potential exists that environmentally persistent pesticides/herbicides were historically applied to crops grown on the subject site in the past; 1) no structures were noted on historical aerial photographs of the subject site taken between 1931 to the present, and impacts from agricultural chemicals are most often identified in association with chemical mixing and storage areas (structures), 2) no material evidence of the use of environmentally persistent pesticides/herbicides was obtained during the course of this assessment, and 3) experience with similar properties indicates that the potential is low for elevated concentrations of environmentally persistent pesticides/herbicides related to row crop cultivation to exist in the near-surface soils. Consequently, the potential for elevated concentrations
of environmentally persistent pesticides/herbicides to currently exist in the near-surface soils of
the subject site at concentrations which would require regulatory action appears to be low.

Based on a review of historical aerial photographs, a site reconnaissance, and contacts with the
local regulatory agencies and the owner of the subject site, there is no evidence that recognized
environmental conditions exist in connection with the historical uses of the subject site. (A
Recognized Environmental Concern is one of the terms used to identify environmental liability
within the context of a Phase | 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 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

The operation of the proposed project is anticipated to include the minimal use of hazardous
materials, including janitorial and landscaping supplies, such as commercial cleansers, paints, and
lubricants. The use of these materials would be stored, handled, and disposed of in accordance with
applicable federal and state regulations. Accordingly, the Project would not expose people or the
environment to significant hazards associated with the disposal of hazardous materials at the
Project site. Long-term operation of the Project would not expose the public or the environment to
significant hazards associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and
impacts would be less than significant.
3.9(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 Sky Country Elementary School located approximately 0.65 miles east 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

The nearest airport is Ontario International Airport located approximately 5 miles northwest of the Project site. According to the LA/Ontario Land Use Compatibility Plan, Map 2-1, Compatibility Policy Map: Airport Influence Area, (Ontario 2019), the Project site is not located within an airport compatibility zone for Ontario International Airport. 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 Wineville Avenue which is an improved 4-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 Wineville Avenue. Although direct public access is not provided along Pat's Ranch Road, emergency vehicles could access the park site from Pat's Ranch Road.

In addition, 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 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.
### 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: Project Application Materials.*

**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 Water Quality Control Act (Wat. Code Section 13000 et seq.), Title 33 U.S.C. Section 1251 et seq. (Clean Water Act), any applicable state or federal regulations promulgated thereto, and any related administrative orders or permits issued in connection therewith.

Project Design Features (PDF)

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...
Operational Impacts

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

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

The Project will construct three (3) bio-retention basins on the southern portion of the site adjacent to Shearwater Drive. These basins will capture and treat stormwater runoff prior to entering the storm drain system.

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(h) 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 F), 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 supplies to the project area are provided by the Jurupa Community Services District, which obtains water supplies entirely from groundwater production. The largest source of groundwater is the Chino Groundwater Basin that supplies all of the District’s potable wells. In addition, a small amount of non-potable water is supplied from the Riverside Groundwater Basin.

The Chino Basin was adjudicated by the California Superior Court in 1978 to regulate the amount of groundwater that can be pumped from the basin by creating the Chino Basin Watermaster to oversee management of water rights. The Jurupa Community Services District currently has total production water rights of 14,659 AFY from the Chino Basin. In addition, the District has rights to
"carry over" supplies of water that was previously not used. Due to the existing regulations related to groundwater pumping that are implemented by the Chino Basin Watermaster, the Jurupa Community Services District would not pump substantial ground water amounts that could result in a substantial depletion of groundwater supplies.

The Project site would be served with potable water by the Jurupa Community Services District. Domestic water supplies from this service provider are reliant on groundwater from the Chino Groundwater Basin as a primary source. All municipal water entities that exceed their safe yield incur a groundwater replenishment obligation, which is used to recharge the groundwater basin with water from the State Water Project sources. Thus, the Project's demand for domestic water service would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.

Development of the Project would increase impervious surface coverage on the site which would in turn reduce the amount of direct infiltration of runoff into the ground. This would have a less than significant impact on groundwater recharge in the areas of the Chino Groundwater Basin that are managed for that purpose, since those recharge areas do not encompass the Project site.

Water supplies to the project area are provided by the Jurupa Community Services District, which obtains water supplies entirely from groundwater production. The largest source of groundwater is the Chino Groundwater Basin that supplies all of the District's potable wells. In addition, a small amount of non-potable water is supplied from the Riverside Groundwater Basin.

The Chino Basin was adjudicated by the California Superior Court in 1978 to regulate the amount of groundwater that can be pumped from the basin by creating the Chino Basin Watermaster to oversee management of water rights. The Jurupa Community Services District currently has total production water rights of 14,659 AFY from the Chino Basin. In addition, the District has rights to "carry over" supplies of water that was previously not used. Due to the existing regulations related to groundwater pumping that are implemented by the Chino Basin Watermaster, the Jurupa Community Services District would not pump substantial ground water amounts that could result in a substantial depletion of groundwater supplies. Since no development is proposed on proposed Parcels 3, 4, 5, and 6, subdividing of these parcels will not have an impact on groundwater. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Based on the above analysis, impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
3.10(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:

(i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

(ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

(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?

(iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

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

Impact Analysis
The Project will construct three (3) bio-retention basins on the southern portion of the site adjacent to Shearwater Drive. These basins will capture and treat stormwater runoff prior to entering the storm drain system.

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.

3.10(d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

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.

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. (California Department of Conservation 2019-3). 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 seiche. As such, there is no impact.
3.10(e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

**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>yes</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>no</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 surrounded on all sides by existing development or land uses. To the north is the existing Vernola Family Park; to the south is Shearwater Drive followed by single-family residential development; to the east is Wineville Avenue followed by single-family residential development; and the west is Pat's Ranch Road followed by Vernola Ranch. 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 With Mitigation Incorporated.**

*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 for the site is OS-R (Open Space, Recreation). The zoning classification for the site is R-5 (Open Area Combining Zone-Residential Developments). The Project has been determined to be consistent with the General Plan land use designation and zoning regulations.

With respect to conflicting with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, 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 with implementation of the following:

Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP)

All of the Plans, Policies, and Programs identified in the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program apply.

Mitigation Measures:

All of the Mitigation Measures identified in the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program apply.
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 located in an area that is within Mineral Resource Zone (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.

**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:** No Impact.

*Source: General Plan, Zoning Map.*

**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.

Mineral Resources
Impact Analysis

No mineral resource extraction activity is known to have ever occurred on the Project site. The General Plan land use designation for the site is OS-R (Open Space, Recreation). The zoning classification for the site is R-5 (Open Area Combining Zone-Residential Developments). As such, no locally important mineral resource recovery site exists on the site nor is the site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan for mineral resource extraction activities.
### 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 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?</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 land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</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 Analysis (Appendix G).*

#### 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 vehicle traffic along Wineville Avenue and Interstate 15 are the primary sources of noise impacting the site and the surrounding area. Noise data indicates the ambient noise level ranges between 52.1 dBA Leq to 66.5 dBA Leq. The measured average CNEL ranges between 60.8 dBA to 69.8 dBA. Both the daytime and nighttime average noise levels at the nearby residential uses, south of the project site currently exceed the City’s residential noise standards of 55 dBA Leq during the daytime and 45 dBA Leq during the nighttime.

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 18 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>


The construction activities for the proposed project are anticipated to include site preparation and grading of the Project site, building construction of the community center building, a play area, a
restroom, two picnic shelters, a pump track, paving of the onsite roads and parking areas, and application of architectural coatings. Noise impacts from construction activities associated with the proposed Project would be a function of the noise generated by construction equipment, equipment location, sensitivity of nearby land uses, and the timing and duration of the construction activities. The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are single-family homes located as near as 50 feet to the south of the project site. There are also homes as near as 90 feet to the east of the project site, located on the east side of Wineville Avenue.

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, noise impacts would occur during the grading phase of construction, with a noise level as high as 75 dBA Leq at the nearest homes to the south and as high as 72 dBA at the nearest homes to the east of the Project site.

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 (On-Site)**

The proposed Project consists of an 8.8-acre public park expansion to the existing 22-acre Vernola Park facility. The proposed park expansion would include development of a 38,000 square foot community center building, a 314 stall parking lot, a promenade, a play area, a restroom structure,
two picnic shelters, a pump track, and bio-retention basins. The operation of the proposed Project will create an increase in noise levels from noise created from onsite from parking lot activities, rooftop mechanical equipment, and from children playing in the play areas, to the nearby homes that are located on the south and east sides of the proposed park expansion area.

Section 11.05.040 of the City’s Municipal Code limits noise generated from onsite activities at the nearby residential properties to 55 dBA Leq between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. and 45 dBA Leq between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

In order to determine the noise impacts from rooftop mechanical equipment, parking lot activities, and playground activities, reference noise measurements were taken of each noise source and are shown below in Table 19. Table 19 also shows the anticipated noise level from each source at the nearest property line with a proposed land use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Noise Measurements</th>
<th>Noise Levels at Homes South of Project Site</th>
<th>Noise Levels at Homes East of Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise Source</td>
<td>Distance of Measurement (feet)</td>
<td>Noise Level (dBA Leq)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooftop Equipment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Playing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Noise Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Noise Standards (Day/Night)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed City Noise Standards (Day/Night)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The noise levels were calculated through use of soft site geometric spreading of noise from a point source with a drop-off rate of 7.5 dB for each doubling of the distance between the source and receiver.

Table 12 shows that the proposed onsite noise sources may create combined noise levels as high as 39 dBA Leq at the nearest homes located south of the Project site and as high as 32 dBA Leq at the nearest homes located east of the Project site. The calculated noise levels from onsite sources would be below both the daytime noise standards of 55 dBA Leq and nighttime noise standards of 45 dBA Leq. It should also be noted that the calculated onsite noise levels would be well below the measured daytime ambient noise levels of 60.0 dBA Leq at the nearby homes on the south side of the Project site and 66.5 dBA Leq on the east side of the Project site. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels from onsite noise sources. Impacts would be less than significant.

*Offsite Roadway Noise Impacts.*
Vehicle noise is a combination of the noise produced by the engine, exhaust and tires. The level of traffic noise depends on three primary factors (1) the volume of traffic, (2) the speed of traffic, and (3) the number of trucks in the flow of traffic. The proposed Project does not propose any uses that would require a substantial number of truck trips and the proposed project would not alter the speed limit on any existing roadway so the proposed Project’s potential offsite noise impacts have been focused on the noise impacts associated with the change of volume of traffic that would occur with development of the proposed Project.

Neither the City’s General Plan nor the CEQA Guidelines define what constitutes a “substantial permanent increase to ambient noise levels.” City policy has been to consider an increase of less than 3 dBA CNEI to be a barely audible change.

Project-generated traffic would increase the noise level along Wineville Avenue a maximum of 0.6 dBA CNEI; along Bellegrave Avenue a maximum of 0.2 dBA CNEI; along Shearwater Drive a maximum of 1.9 dBA CNEI; and along Park Center Drive a maximum of 1.3 dBA CNEI. Because the increase in traffic noise is less than 3 dBA CNEI, Impacts are less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.13(b)</th>
<th>Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

*Source: Noise Impact Analysis (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**

*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. Based on typical propagation rates, the vibration level at the nearest offsite receptor (50 feet away) would be 0.04 inch per second PPV. The vibration level at the nearest offsite receptor would be within the 0.20 inch per second PPV threshold detailed above. Impacts would be less than significant.

*Operational Vibration*

Noise
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: Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility 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

The nearest airport is Ontario International Airport located approximately 5 miles northwest of the Project site. According to the LA/Ontario Land Use Compatibility Plan, Map 2-1, Compatibility Policy Map: Airport Influence Area, (Ontario 2019), the Project site is not located within an airport compatibility zone for Ontario International Airport. As such, the Project will not result in exposing people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels.
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.


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 Jurupa Community Services District. Water service is available from an existing 16-inch diameter water line in Pat's Ranch Road and an existing 8-inch diameter water line in Wineville Avenue. The Project will connect to the existing waterline(s). 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 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>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1) Fire protection? | | | | | ![ ]
| 2) Police protector? | | | | | ![ ]
| 3) Schools? | | | | | ![ ]
| 4) Parks? | | | | | ![ ]
| 5) Other public facilities? | | | | | ![ ]

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 Glen Avon Fire Station No. 17 located approximately 3.9 roadway miles northeast of the Project site at 10400 San Sevaine Way in Jurupa Valley or by the Eastvale Fire Station No. 27 located approximately 3.2 roadway miles southwest of the Project site at 7067 Hamner Avenue in Eastvale.

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)

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 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. Consistent with General Plan Policy CSSF 2.1-2, the Project plans were routed to the Sheriff's Department for review. The Sheriff's Department did not indicate that new or physically altered Sheriff facilities are required to serve the Project.

Based on the above analysis, 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)

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 does not propose any housing and would not directly create additional students to be served by the Jurupa Unified School District. As such, impacts related to schools are less than significant.

PARKS

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 3.15(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)

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 3.15(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.

Based on the above analysis, 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)**

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 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. In addition, the Project would serve to increase the amount of park facilities which would offset the overuse of existing parks.

Based on the above analysis, 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 With Mitigation Incorporated.
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 consist of a proposed expansion of an existing 22 acre park on approximately 8 acres of vacant land which includes the following:

- Expansion of the parking area;
- New 38,200 sf community building (multi-purpose room, kitchen, gymnasiums); and
- New playground and other park amenities.

As demonstrated throughout this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, the construction or expansion of the recreational facilities proposed by the Project will not have an adverse effect on the environment with implementation of the Plans, Policies, and Programs and Mitigation Measures identified throughout this document. Impacts are less than significant and no additional 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></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.**

**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 3.75.020, 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 20 below shows the Level of Service (LOS) Thresholds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service (LOS)</th>
<th>Signalized Intersection</th>
<th>Unsignalized Intersection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>≤10 seconds</td>
<td>≤10 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10–20 seconds</td>
<td>10–15 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20–35 seconds</td>
<td>15–25 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35–55 seconds</td>
<td>25–35 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>55–80 seconds</td>
<td>35–50 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;80 seconds</td>
<td>&gt;50 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: County of Riverside Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines

Study Area Intersections

The following study intersections were included in the analysis as shown on Table 21 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bellegrave Avenue and Firebrush Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wineville Avenue and Bellegrave Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wineville Avenue and Elba Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wineville Avenue and Shearwater Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wineville Avenue and Park Center Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Driveway 1 and Wineville Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Driveway 2 and Shearwater Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Traffic Impact Analysis (Appendix H)

Trip Generation
The trip generation rates used in this analysis were determined based on rates contained in the *Trip Generation, 10th Edition*, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) for a recreational community center and public park. It is estimated that the Project will generate 1,139 total daily trips, 112 AM peak hour trips, and 132 PM peak hour trips.

**Traffic Scenarios Analyzed**

The *Traffic Impact Analysis* prepared for the Project examined the following scenarios:

- Existing Conditions Without Project/Existing Conditions With Project.

**Existing Conditions Without Project/Existing Conditions With Project Analysis**

This analysis documents the circulation system conditions within the study area of the project under the exiting without and with project scenarios. The Existing Conditions (2018) Without Project traffic volumes are developed using existing volumes counts. Project traffic volumes are then added to existing (2018) traffic volumes to develop the Existing Conditions (2018) With Project traffic volumes. All intersections analyzed under this scenario are determined to be operating at an acceptable level of service. Impacts are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

**Opening Year (2019) Conditions Without Project/Existing Conditions With Project Analysis**

This analysis documents the circulation system conditions within the study area of the Project under Opening Year (2019) Without and With Project scenarios. The Opening Year Conditions (2019) Without Project traffic volumes were developed by adding a compounded two percent per year growth over a two-year period and cumulative project traffic to the existing traffic volumes. Project traffic volumes are then added to the Opening Year Conditions (2019) Without Project traffic volumes to develop Opening Year Conditions (2019) With Project traffic volumes. All intersections analyzed under this scenario are determined to be operating at an acceptable level of service. Impacts are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

**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 Wineville Avenue, Pat’s Ranch Road, and Shearwater Drive. 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: 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**

Vehicle access to the site is from Wineville Avenue which is an existing improved roadway abutting the site. The Project will construct a new roadway improvement along Wineville Avenue which will be constructed to meet City standards.

In addition, the Project is located in an area that is primarily developed with residential uses with the primary exception being the Vernola Ranch which is located to the west of the site adjacent to Pat’s Ranch Road. The Vernola Ranch’s access point is from Bellegrave Avenue and farm equipment used on the Vernola Ranch site does not travel on Pat’s Ranch Road or Wineville Avenue.
As such, 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.

Based on the analysis above, the Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use. Impacts are 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 the expansion of a public park which will increase the need for emergency access to-and-from the site. Adequate emergency access would be provided to the Project site from Wineville Avenue and to some extent from Pat's Ranch Road (there are no public access driveways off Pat’s Ranch Road). 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>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>
</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>
</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)?

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: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
Source: Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix C).

Impact Analysis

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.

PaleoWest contacted the NAHC, as part of the cultural resource assessment, on March 18, 2019, for a review of the SLF. The objective of the SLF search was to determine if the NAHC had any knowledge of Native American cultural resources (e.g., traditional use or gathering area, place of religious or sacred activity, etc.) within the immediate vicinity of the Project area. The NAHC responded on April 4, 2019, stating that the SLF search resulted in a negative finding.

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 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)

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

MONITORING:
Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall contact the consulting Native American Tribe(s) that have requested monitoring through consultation with the City during the AB 52 process. The applicant shall coordinate with the Tribe(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.

TREATMENT OF DISCOVERIES:
If a significant tribal cultural resource is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). A representative of the appropriate Native American Tribe(s), the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented to protect the identified tribal cultural resources from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the tribal cultural resources in accordance with current professional archaeology standards. The
treatment plan shall require monitoring by the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during data recovery and shall require that all recovered artifacts undergo basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, whichever is appropriate. At the completion of the basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, any recovered tribal cultural resources shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility, or, the artifacts may be delivered to the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) if that is recommended by the City of Jurupa Valley. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department, the Eastern Information Center, and the appropriate Native American Tribe.

**DISPOSITION OF DISCOVERIES:**
In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this project. The following procedures will be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries:

- The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to tribal cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the Jurupa Valley Planning Department with evidence of same:

  a) A fully executed rebural agreement with the appropriate culturally affiliated Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future rebural area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed.

  b) A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.

  c) If more than one Native American Group is involved with the project and cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center by default.

  d) Should rebural 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.  
*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**

**Water**
Water service is available from an existing 16-inch diameter water line in Pat’s Ranch Road and an existing 8-inch diameter water line in Wineville Avenue. The Project will connect to the existing waterline(s).

Sewer

The Project will connect to an existing 10-inch diameter sewer line in Pat’s Ranch Road.

Storm Water/Drainage Improvements

The Project will construct three (3) bio-retention basins on the southern portion of the site adjacent to Shearwater Drive. These basins will capture and treat stormwater runoff prior to entering the storm drain system.

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.

Conclusion

The installation of the facilities 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: Jurupa Community Services District 2015 UWMP. Water and Sewer Availability Letter (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**
Water service would be provided to the Project site by the Jurupa Community Services District ("District"). According to the District’s 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, the District relies predominantly on groundwater and desalinated brackish groundwater from the Chino Groundwater Basin. According to the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, the District has 16 wells, 8 booster stations, and 15 reservoirs with 53.7 Million gallons of capacity. In order to ensure a continuing supply of good quality water for current citizens and also future development, the District participates in a Joint Powers Authority with other neighboring water purveyors, called the Chino Desalter Authority.

The Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) has estimated the Project’s water demand as follows:

- Average Demand = 1.04 gpm/ac x 8.8 acres = 9.15 gpm = 14.8 acre feet/year.
- Maximum Demand = 9.15 gpm x 2.7 = 24.7 gpm.

JCSD’s water supply exceeds the maximum day demand projected for the next five years. In addition, JCSD continues to develop additional water supply resources that are currently budgeted to meet the JCSD’s water demands. In addition, JCSD issued a Water and Sewer Availability Letter dated October 10, 2018. The letter states that JCSD has adequate water supplies to serve the Project provided that fees are paid and water improvements are constructed per JCSD’s standards.

Based on the analysis above, 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.

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 Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD). 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). JCSD is currently in the early planning stages for construction of additions to the plant. Quantities of wastewater collected and conveyed by JCSD to the RWQCP in 2015 was 2,212 AF/yr. The quantities projected to be conveyed by JCSD 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.

JCSD has estimated that the waste flow from the Project will be 0.03 MGD which is within the operational capacity of the RWQCP. 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 3.19-1** 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)**

**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 June 1, 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 108.68 tons of solid waste per year or 595 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 595 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 959 [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:

Utilities 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 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 June 1, 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(ies) 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.
3.20 WILDFIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WILDFIRE — If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, 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) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Due to slope, 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 not located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. 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:

---

**Mandatory Findings of Significance**
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, BIO-2, CR-1, 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 discussed throughout this ISMND, implementation of the proposed Project has the potential to result in effects to the environment that are individually limited, but cumulatively may be considerable. In all instances where the proposed Project has the potential to contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to the environment, mitigation measures have been imposed to reduce potential effects to less-than significant levels. As such, with incorporation of the mitigation measures imposed throughout this ISMND, the Project would not contribute to environmental effects that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable, and impacts would be less than significant.

As noted in the analysis throughout this ISMND, 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)

DIO-1, BIO-2, CR-1, CR-2, GEO-1, NOI-1, and TCR-1 shall apply.

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

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact 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.
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6.0 MITIGATION MONITORING REPORTING PROGRAM

PROJECT NAME: MA 18190 Vernola Family Park Expansion

DATE: September 3, 2019

PROJECT MANAGER: Annette Tam, Senior Planner

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Public Use Permit (PUP) 18001: Proposed expansion of an existing 22 acre park on approximately 8 acres of vacant land which includes the following:

- Expansion of the parking area
- New 38,200 sf community building (multi-purpose rooms, kitchen, gymnasiums)
- New playground and other park amenities.

PROJECT LOCATION: Project is located on the southwest corner of Bellegrave Avenue and Wineville Avenue. The Project site is identified by the following Assessor Parcel Number: 160-470-003.

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.
<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>AESTHETICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.1-1 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.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF 3.1-1 The Project shall implement the architectural and landscape design features as shown on the plans submitted for Project approval</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.3-1 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, &quot;Fugitive Dust.&quot; Rule 403 requires implementation of best available dust control measures during construction activities that generate fugitive dust, such as earth moving and stockpiling activities, grading, and equipment travel on unpaved roads.</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>During grading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.3-2 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1186 &quot;PM10 Emissions from Paved and Unpaved Roads and Livestock Operations&quot; and Rule 1186.1, &quot;Less-Polluting Street Sweepers.&quot; Adherence to Rules 1186 and 1186.1 reduces the release of criteria pollutant emissions into the atmosphere during construction.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP 3.3-3 The Project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 402 &quot;Nuisance.&quot; 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>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM-BIO-1: Pre-Construction Burrowing Owl Survey. Within 30 calendar days prior to grading, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey of the Project's</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MITIGATION MEASURE (MM)
#### PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP)
#### PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)

Proposed impact footprint and make a determination regarding the presence or absence of the burrowing owl. The determination shall be documented in a report and shall be submitted, reviewed, and accepted by the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit and subject to the following provisions:

a. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies no burrowing owls in the impact area, a grading permit may be issued without restriction.

b. In the event that the pre-construction survey identifies the presence of burrowing owl, then prior to the issuance of a grading permit and prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities on the property, the qualified biologist shall follow the methods recommended by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW, 2012) and Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP, 2006) for passive or active relocation of burrowing owls. Passive relocation, including the required use of one-way doors to exclude owls from the site and the collapsing of burrows, will occur if the biologist determines that the proximity and availability of alternate habitat is suitable for successful passive relocation. Passive relocation shall follow California Department of Fish and Wildlife relocation protocol. If proximate alternate habitat is not present as determined by the biologist, active relocation shall follow California Department of Fish and Wildlife relocation protocol. The biologist shall provide evidence in writing to the Planning Department that the species has fledged or been relocated prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

### MM-BIO-2: 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE (MM)</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>TIME FRAME/MILESTONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANS, POLICIES, OR PROGRAMS (PPP)</td>
<td>Engineering Department Planning Department</td>
<td>During grading in the event of discovery of human remains during grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES (PDF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conducted by a qualified biologist within three business (3) days prior to initiating vegetation clearing or ground disturbance.</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 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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CULTURAL RESOURCES**

**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.

| Engineering Department Planning Department | During grading in the event of discovery of human remains during grading | | |

**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.

| Planning Department | Prior to the issuance of a grading permit | | |

**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

| Engineering Department Planning Department | During grading in the event of discovery of resources during grading | | |

M-4
<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>Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented by the archaeologist to protect the identified archaeological resource(s) from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the archaeological resource(s) in accordance with current professional archaeology standards (typically this sampling level is two (2) to five (5) percent of the volume of the cultural deposit). At the completion of the laboratory analysis, any recovered archaeological resources shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department and the Eastern Information Center.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and during operation</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>Panning Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM-GEO-1: Paleontological Monitoring. A qualified paleontologist (the &quot;Project Paleontologist&quot;) 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</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 find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure GEO-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-GEO-2: Paleontological Treatment Plan</strong>. 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>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPP 3.8-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, California Energy Code</strong>, 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 As required by Municipal Code Section 9.283.010, Water Efficient Landscape Design Requirements</strong>, 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 As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010 (8), the Project proponent shall comply with the California Green Building Standards.</strong></td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>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</strong></td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Planning Department to confirm if Riverside County Department of Environmental Health requires a Business Plan</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>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>prior to occupancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

**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.

| Engineering Department | Prior to the issuance of grading permits |

**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.

| Engineering Department | Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during construction |

**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

<p>| Engineering Department | Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during operation |</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>do any of the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Increase permeable areas by leaving highly porous soil and low lying area undisturbed by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Incorporating landscaping, green roofs and open space into the project design;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Using porous materials for or near driveways, drive aisles, parking stalls and low volume roads and walkways; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Incorporating detention ponds and infiltration pits into the project design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Installing rain-gutters oriented towards permeable areas;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Designing curbs, berms or other structures such that they do not isolate permeable or landscaped areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Rain gardens may be proposed in-lieu of a water quality basin when applicable and approved by the City Engineer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>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.</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>During operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOISE

| PPP 3.13-1 As required by Municipal Code Section 11.05.020 (9), private construction projects located within one-quarter (¼) of a mile from an inhabited dwelling shall not perform construction between the hours of six (6:00) p.m. and six (6:00) a.m. during the months of June through September and between the hours of six (6:00) p.m. and seven (7:00) a.m. during the months of October through May. | Building & Safety Department | Prior to the issuance of a building permit |

| PPP 3.13-2 As required by Jurupa Valley Municipal Code Section 11.05.040, no person shall create any sound, or allow the creation of any sound, on any property that causes the exterior sound level on any other occupied property to exceed the sound level standards set forth in Table 1 of this section or that violates the special sound source standards set forth in Section 11.05. 060. | Building & Safety Department | During operation |

Mitigation Measure NOI-1-Construction Noise Mitigation Plan. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit 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. | 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>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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<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.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC SERVICES**

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fire Department</th>
<th>Prior to issuance of a building permit or occupancy permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Building &amp; Safety Department</th>
<th>Per Municipal Code Chapter 3.75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TRANSPORTATION**

M-10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE (NM) 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 3.17-1 Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Project Proponent shall make required per-unit fee payments associated with the Western Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF), and the City of Jurupa Valley Development Impact Fee (DIF).</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</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 Development Impact Fee to assist the City in providing revenue that the City can use to fund transportation improvements such as roads, bridges, major improvements and traffic signals.</td>
<td>Building &amp; Safety Department</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of building permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</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.

   b) **ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITOR:** Prior to the issuance of the grading permit, the applicant shall submit documentation that an archeological monitor meeting the professional standards of the 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 activites 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 Planning Department Engineering Department | Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and during grading |
### Disposition of Discoveries

Project Design Features (PD) / Plans, Policies, or Programs (PPP) / Mitigation Measures (MM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAME/MILESTONE</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILIZATION MEASURE (MM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ppp 3.19.1: The project shall comply with Section 4408 of the 2013 California Building Code.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT DESIGN/FEATURES (PPD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plans/Polices or Programs (PPD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE TIME</th>
<th>REACHMENT</th>
<th>FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILIZATION SERVICE SYSTEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Phase IV Monitoring report must be submitted to the Department of Health and Human Services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Center by default.

5. If no narrative or narrative comment is provided with the project, it shall be considered at the Western Science.

6. A climb agreement with an appropriate qualified position.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RE:</th>
<th>VERIFIED FRAME/MILESTONE FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

According with the approved construction waste management plan, volumes and types of wastes that were diverted from landfills in snow removal and verify the contractor's documentation that contains the city of Juniper Valley and prior to final building inspection, the City of Juniper Valley permits the City of Juniper Valley. Plan Policies OR Programs (PP) Mitigation Measures (MM)
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MAY 1, 2019
RECOMMENDATION

By motion, adopt Planning Commission Resolution 2019-10-23-02 recommending that the City Council approve General Plan Amendment No. 19005 to amend the 2017 General Plan Community Safety, Services, and Facilities Element to incorporate the City’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP).

BACKGROUND

On September 7, 2017, the Jurupa Valley City Council adopted the 2017 General Plan, the City’s first General Plan. The General Plan includes ten elements, including the Community Safety, Services, and Facilities Element which includes the State-mandated Safety Element as well as a discussion of public services and facilities in the City. According to the 2017 State General Plan Guidelines, the goal of the Safety Element is to: “reduce the potential short and long-term risk of death, injuries, property damage, and economic and social dislocation resulting from fires, floods, droughts, earthquakes, landslides, climate change, and other hazards.” The Element contains background information on these hazards in the City of Jurupa Valley as well as goals, policies and programs regarding how to protect the community.

On December 20, 2018, the City of Jurupa Valley adopted the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) Annex from the Riverside County Operational Area Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan as required by the Federal Disaster Mitigation and Cost Reduction Act of 2000. The LHMP assists public safety officials and city staff, elected officials, and members of the public understand the threats from natural and human-caused hazards in the community. The Plan also recommends specific actions to proactively decrease these threats before disasters occur. The LHMP was prepared pursuant to the requirements of the Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 to achieve eligibility and potentially secure mitigation funding through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Flood Mitigation Assistance, Pre-Disaster Mitigation, and Hazard Mitigation Grant Programs.

The California Disaster Assistance Act (CDAA) provides financial assistance from the state for
costs incurred by local governments as a result of a disaster event. The program also provides for the reimbursement of local government costs associated with certain emergency activities undertaken in response to a state of emergency proclaimed by the Governor. The program generally limits reimbursement to 75% of eligible costs unless a jurisdiction has adopted an LHMP as part of its Safety Element per Assembly Bill 2140 (AB 2140) in which case the Legislature may provide for a state share of local costs in excess of 75 percent.

On February 21, 2019, the City Council initiated a General Plan Amendment to adopt the City’s LHMP into the Community Safety, Services, and Facilities Element, pursuant to AB 2140.

ANALYSIS

The adopted 2017 General Plan Community Safety, Services and Facilities Element already contains a reference to the City’s LHMP. However, in order to strengthen the reference to the LHMP and ensure it meets State requirements, staff is proposing to amend the Element to add additional language regarding the LHMP and incorporate the LHMP “by reference.” As outlined in Attachment 2, charges are proposed to the Introduction to the Element (Page 8-2) as well as to the discussion on Disaster Preparedness (Page 8-23). These amendments are outlined in strike-out/underline format below:

New language to be added to the Community Safety, Services, and Facilities Element Introduction (Page 8-2):

“In addition to the Community Safety, Services, and Facilities Element, the City maintains and regularly updates the Jurupa Valley Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP), which is incorporated herein by reference. The LHMP has been prepared pursuant to the Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 and outlines a strategy for reducing the City’s vulnerability to the impacts of natural and manmade disasters. By incorporating the LHMP into this Element by reference, the City may be eligible to receive increased state recovery funding in the event of a disaster.”

In addition, the following revisions to paragraph 2 on page 8-23 under ‘5. Disaster Preparedness’ are proposed:

Hazard Mitigations Plans exist at the federal, state, regional, and local level. The California Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 requires state, local, and tribal governments to prepare Hazard Mitigation plans that address actions and strategies to mitigate hazards, risks and vulnerabilities. As outlined in the Introduction to this Element, the City of Jurupa Valley regularly updates its has adopted a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) which is incorporated herein by reference. In addition, the City and participates in the County of Riverside Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. Together, these plans set goals to mitigate potential risks from natural and man-made hazards, identify vulnerabilities, provide recommendations for actions, evaluate resources, and identify future mitigation planning and maintenance of existing plan.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

The City’s CEQA Administrator has determined that the proposed General Plan Amendment s
exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3), the "Common Sense Exemption," which states that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. Because the proposed amendment is limited to text changes in reference to the City's LHMP, there is no possibility that it may have a significant effect on the environment and is therefore not subject to CEQA.

CONCLUSION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 2019-10-23-02 recommending that the City Council approve General Plan Amendment No. 19005 to amend the 2017 General Plan Community Safety, Services, and Facilities Element to incorporate the City's LHMP.

Prepared by:

//s// Mary P. Wright

Mary P. Wright, AICP
General Plan Program Manager

Reviewed by:

//s// Serita Young

Serita Young
Assistant City Attorney

Submitted by:

Thomas G. Merrell, AICP
Planning Director

Attachments:
1. Draft Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-10-23-02
2. Draft 2017 General Plan Community Safety, Services, and Facilities Element Amendment (strikeout/underline format)
3. 2018 Jurupa Valley Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP)

Available on the City's Website:
4. Adopted 2017 General Plan (Includes Adopted Community Safety, Services, and Facilities Element)
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-10-23-02


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

Section 1. Project. The City has initiated General Plan Amendment No. 19005 to amend the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan Community Safety, Services, and Facilities Element to incorporate the City’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) (“Project”).

Section 2. General Plan Amendment.

(a) The City has initiated General Plan Amendment No. 19005 to amend the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan Community Safety, Services, and Facilities Element to incorporate the City’s LHMP.

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

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

(d) Section 9.30.040.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the initiation of proceedings for any amendment pursuant to Section 9.30.040 requires an order of the City Council, adopted by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the entire membership of the City Council. The City Council may adopt an order initiating amendment proceedings at any time. The adoption of an order by the City Council initiating amendment proceedings does not require a public hearing and does not imply any such amendment will be approved.
(e) Section 9.30.040.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that either the Planning Director or the Planning Commission may recommend that the City Council adopt an order initiating proceedings for an amendment pursuant to Section 9.30.040. All such recommendations must be in writing and submitted to the City Clerk for placement on the City Council agenda as a matter not requiring a public hearing.

(f) On February 21, 2018, upon recommendation by the Planning Director, the City Council ordered the initiation of proceedings for the General Plan Amendment No. 19005 by an affirmative vote of 5-0 of the City Council.

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

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

(i) Section 9.30.100(2) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after closing the public hearing, the Planning Commission shall make a recommendation for approval or disapproval within a reasonable time, by resolution, including therein its findings, and transmit it to the City Council with a copy mailed to the applicant. A recommendation for approval shall be made by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the total membership of the Planning Commission. If the Planning Commission cannot reach a decision within a reasonable time after closing the hearing, that fact shall be reported to the City Council and shall be deemed a recommendation to deny the proposal. Further, Government Code Section 65354 provides that the planning commission shall make a written recommendation on the adoption of a general plan, that a recommendation for approval shall be made by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the total membership of the commission, and that the planning commission shall send its recommendation to the legislative body.

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

(a) The Project was processed including, but not limited to, a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

(b) On October 23, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the Project, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing.
Section 4. California Environmental Quality Act Recommendations for Findings and Determinations. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby recommends that the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley make the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Project:

(a) The proposed General Plan Amendment No. 19005 is exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and the City’s CEQA Guidelines pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3) because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the proposed General Plan Amendment, incorporating the City’s LHMP into the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan Community Safety, Services, and Facilities Element, will have a significant effect on the environment. The proposed General Plan Amendment is an administrative process of the City that will not result in direct or indirect physical changes in the environment. The City Council has reviewed the administrative record concerning the proposed General Plan Amendment and the proposed CEQA exemption, and based on its own independent judgment, finds that the proposed General Plan Amendment set forth in this Resolution is exempt from the requirements of CEQA and the City’s CEQA Guidelines pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3).

Section 5. Findings for Recommendation of Approval of General Plan Amendment No. 19005. The Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby recommend that the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley find and determine that General Plan Amendment No. 19005 should be adopted because:

(a) The proposed amendments to the Community Safety, Services, and Facilities Element are consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan in that the Element already contains a discussion of disaster preparedness and the City’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan and the amendments will serve to strengthen that discussion and identify that the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan has been incorporated into the General Plan “by reference.”

Section 6. Recommendation of Approval of General Plan Amendment No. 19005. Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby recommends that the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley approve General Plan Amendment No. 19005 to amend the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan Community Safety, Services, and Facilities Element to incorporate the City’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan.

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 23rd day of October, 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
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8 – COMMUNITY SAFETY, SERVICES, AND FACILITIES ELEMENT

Figure 8-1: Glen Avon Regional Library in Jurupa Valley

A. INTRODUCTION

The Community Safety, Services, and Facilities Element contains goals, policies, and programs to ensure the safety of the community and the delivery of quality services and facilities to meet the City’s needs. Public facilities that help deliver these services and utilities, such as water, sewer, and storm drainage/urban runoff collection, are operated and maintained by multiple agencies and community services districts in Jurupa Valley. Jurupa Valley’s community services, facilities, and utilities are integral to individual and community well-being and to the City’s ability to attract and retain residents and businesses.

The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) addressed community safety, services, and facilities in-depth, as summarized in Appendix 5.0. The Committee acknowledged the important contributions of the many public safety professionals that serve Jurupa Valley citizens and protect the City from natural and man-made hazards. In addition, the Committee urged that public safety services be enhanced and maintained, as expressed in the adopted Community Values Statement.
City of Jurupa Valley Community Values Statement

Public Safety. Support for public safety, law enforcement and emergency medical services is a value that’s widely held by Jurupa Valley residents. We honor and respect the safety professionals who faithfully serve Jurupa Valley. We support strong, collaborative efforts to prevent crime and homelessness, enforce planning and building codes, and to improve the safety of neighborhoods, homes, public facilities, streets, trails, and other transportation facilities. We take proactive measures to cope with and recover from emergencies and natural and man-made disasters.

The Community Safety, Services and Facilities Element is a hybrid element of the General Plan, combining the state-mandated Safety Element with an optional element addressing community services and facilities. The Safety Element overlaps some topics covered in the Land Use Element and the Conservation/Open Space Element in that it also addresses the protection of the community from hazards and risks. Community services and facilities have also been included in this element, addressing local resources and services that influence the physical development and the quality of life of Jurupa Valley.

In addition to Community Safety, Services and Facilities Element, the City maintains and regularly updates the Jurupa Valley Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP), which is incorporated herein by reference. The LHMP has been prepared pursuant to the Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 and outlines a strategy for reducing the City’s vulnerability to the impacts of natural and manmade disasters. By incorporating the LHMP into this Element by reference, the City may be eligible to receive increased state recovery funding in the event of a disaster.

Goals and Policy Sections
1. Community Safety
2. Community Services and Facilities

B. BACKGROUND

Community Safety

Safety hazards are natural and man-made conditions that must be respected if life and property are to be protected as growth and development occur. As the ravages of wildland fires, floods, dam failures, earthquakes, and other disasters become clearer through the news, public awareness and sound public policy combine to require serious attention to these conditions.
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Portions of Jurupa Valley may be subjected to hazards such as flooding, dam inundation, seismic occurrences, and structure and wildland fire. These hazards are located throughout Jurupa Valley and pose varying degrees of risk and danger. Some hazards must be avoided entirely, while the potential impacts of others can be mitigated by special building techniques and other measures. Critical facilities and lifelines are those facilities that must remain operational after a disaster. Critical facilities include schools, hospitals, fire and police stations, emergency operation centers, communication centers, and industrial sites that use or store hazardous materials. Lifelines are utilities or networks that are essential to daily living such as transportation facilities, water and gas lines, electrical power, and communications networks. Critical facilities and lifelines must be sited and designed to reduce or avoid damage and plan for redundant and/or replacement facilities in the event they are compromised.

Community Services and Facilities

Community services and facilities are essential to maintain Jurupa Valley's quality of life and support existing and future development. Owing to the City's historical development as an unincorporated community in Riverside County, services and facilities are provided by a variety of public and private agencies. To facilitate ongoing coordination between the City and these agencies, regular inter-agency meetings are held to discuss service needs, share information, coordinate programs, and ensure the timely provision of services throughout the City.

This element addresses the provision and maintenance of the following major services and facilities in Jurupa Valley: City governance, police services, fire and emergency medical services, educational facilities, libraries, parks and recreation, social services, water, wastewater, storm water and solid waste disposal. Additional services and facilities provided in Jurupa Valley but not specifically addressed in the General Plan include natural gas, electricity, landscape maintenance, and telecommunication services.

C. Community Safety, Services, and Facilities Goals, Policies and Programs

Goals

CSSF 1 Minimize risks resulting from natural and manmade hazards to its residents and businesses.

CSSF 2 Honor and support our public safety professionals.
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CSSF 3 Provide a high level of community services and facilities to meet the existing and future needs of Jurupa Valley.

CSSF 4 Support the provision of excellent educational services and facilities to meet the existing and future needs of Jurupa Valley citizens.

Policies and Programs
CSSF 1 – Community Safety

1. Seismic and Geologic Hazards

The State of California requires that the General Plan Safety Element address seismic and geologic hazards and include policies to reduce the potential risk of death, injuries, property damage, and economic and social dislocation.

Seismic Hazards

Seismic hazards are related to earthquakes and earth movement, such as fault rupture, liquefaction, landslides, and rock falls. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act of 1972 requires the mapping of known surface faults to minimize the direct impact surface fault-rupture would have on structures designed for human habitation. Although Riverside County as a whole is considered seismically active, no known seismic faults exist within Jurupa Valley, nor is Jurupa Valley located within a mapped Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. While the potential earthquake risk is considered low, regional faults such as the Rialto-Colton, San Jacinto, and Chino faults pose earthquake risks to the West Riverside County area, including Jurupa Valley. New faults and fault traces may be identified in the future; consequently, new structures designed for human occupancy should be required to be set back from newly identified and potential seismic hazards. Figure 8-4 below shows the locations of mapped faults in northwestern Riverside County.

Seismic shaking can cause liquefaction, landslides, and rock falls. Liquefaction occurs primarily in saturated, loose, fine- to medium-grained soils in areas with a high groundwater table. Shaking can cause the soils to lose strength and liquefy. Most of Jurupa Valley has a high groundwater table and is considered to have a “High” liquefaction potential. While a general risk of liquefaction can be provided based on soil type and groundwater depth, site-specific geotechnical studies are the only practical and reliable way of determining the specific liquefaction potential of a site. Figure 8-5 below shows the locations of liquefaction susceptibility in Jurupa Valley.

Seismically induced landslides and rock falls could occur in Jurupa Valley in a major earthquake. Landslides and rock falls occur most often on steep, eroded or undercut, or disturbed hillsides. Factors controlling the stability of slopes include: 1) slope height and steepness; 2) engineering characteristics of the earth materials comprising the slope; and 3) the intensity of ground shaking. Field
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investigation enables identification of slide-prone areas before an earthquake occurs. Figure 8-6 below contains a map of landslide susceptibility in Jurupa Valley. Typically, areas with steep slopes pose a higher risk of slope instability in an earthquake. Within Jurupa Valley, the Jurupa Mountains are designated as having steep slopes of 30% slope or greater.
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Geologic Hazards

Geologic hazards also pose a safety risk in Jurupa Valley and include landslides, rock falls and debris flows, subsidence, expansive and collapsible soils, and wind erosion. Landslides, rock falls, and debris flows are associated with mountainous and hilly areas, and although natural processes, their risks are increased near housing and human activities. The Jurupa Mountains and the Pedley Hills are characterized by moderate to steep rocky slopes and are potentially prone to landslides, rock falls, and debris flows. The City’s building code establishes specific site investigation requirements for hillside development to reduce risks from landslides, rock falls, and debris flows.

Subsidence refers to the sudden sinking or gradual downward settling and compaction of soil and other surface material with little or no horizontal motion. This process can be gradual or rapid and can pose significant hazards to property and life. It may be caused by a variety of human and natural activities. In Jurupa Valley, ground subsidence and associated fissuring has resulted from rising and falling ground water tables.

Expansive and collapsible soils are also problematic for development. Expansive soils have a significant amount of clay particles, which can give up water (shrink) or take on water (swell), causing foundations and structures to crack, move, and/or fail. Geotechnical studies, appropriate grading, and construction methods can identify and mitigate adverse effects from expansive and collapsible soils.

Jurupa Valley is also susceptible to wind erosion. Wind erosion generates soil movement as blowing air exerts force against the surface of the ground, releasing soil particles, or dust. Atmospheric dust causes respiratory discomfort, may carry pathogens that cause eye infections and skin disorders, and reduces highway and air traffic visibility. Buildings, fences, roads, crops, trees, and shrubs can also be damaged by abrasive blowing soil.

Policies

CSSF 1.1 Fault Rupture Hazards. When reviewing new development, minimize fault rupture hazards through enforcement of Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act provisions and the following requirements:

1. Require geologic studies or analyses for new, critical structures, such as schools, medical facilities, senior or disabled housing, or other high-risk occupancies located within 0.5 mile of all active or potentially active faults.
2. Require geologic trenching studies for new developments within all designated Earthquake Fault Studies Zones, unless adequate evidence is presented and accepted by the City Engineer or a Building Official. The City may also require geologic trenching for new development located outside designated fault zones for especially critical or vulnerable structures or lifelines.

3. Require that critical infrastructure, including roads, bridges, and utilities be designed to resist, without failure, their crossing of a fault, if fault rupture occurs.

4. Encourage and support efforts by the geologic research community to better define the locations and risks of County faults. Such efforts could include data sharing and database development with regional entities, state and local governments, private organizations, utility agencies, or universities.

CSSF 1.2 **Geologic Investigations.** Require geological and geotechnical investigations as part of the environmental and development review process. This requirement shall apply to the development of any structure proposed for human occupancy or to unoccupied structures whose damage could cause secondary hazards in areas with potential for earthquake-induced liquefaction, landslides, or settlement.

CSSF 1.3 **Structural/Non-Structural Assessment.** Require structural and nonstructural assessment and, when necessary, mitigation for other types of potentially hazardous buildings that are undergoing substantial repair or improvements costing more than half of the assessed property value. Potential implementation measures could include:

1. Use of variances, tax rebates, fee waivers, credits, or public recognition as incentives.

2. Inventory and structural assessment of potentially hazardous buildings based on screening methods developed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

3. Development of a mandatory retrofit program for hazardous, high occupancy, essential, dependent, or high-risk facilities.


CSSF 1.4 **Structural Damage.** Utilize the latest approaches to minimize damage to structures located in areas
determined to have a high liquefaction potential during seismic events.

CSSF 1.5 **Hillside Development.** Encourage and, where possible, require, mitigation of potential erosion, landslide, and settlement hazards for existing public and private development located on unstable hillside areas, especially slopes with recurring failures where City property or public right-of-way is threatened from slope instability, or where considered appropriate and urgent by the City Engineer, CAL FIRE, or County Sheriff's Department.

**Programs**

CSSF 1.1.1 **Hazard Mitigation.** Mitigate potential seismic hazards through adoption and strict enforcement of current building codes, which will be amended as necessary when local deficiencies are identified.

CSSF 1.1.2 **Liaison Program.** Develop a liaison program with all water purveyors to prevent water extraction-induced subsidence.

CSSF 1.1.3 **Density Transfer.** Develop a program to allow the transfer of allowable density from high-risk areas to low-risk areas.

CSSF 1.1.4 **Unreinforced Masonry Buildings.** Inventory unreinforced masonry buildings in Jurupa Valley, develop retrofitting guidelines and research possible funding sources to assist with building retrofits.

2. **Flood Hazards and Inundation**

As identified by the GPAC, the Santa Ana River is tremendous asset to the City, providing open space, environmental, recreational, and visual amenities. It also presents the potential for flood hazards and inundation. Throughout the years, flooding events on the Santa Ana River have resulted in the loss of livestock, infrastructure, property, and even lives. To manage and minimize the risk of flooding, the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District was formed in 1945 to reduce the risks and damage due to flooding in western Riverside County.
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The District’s responsibilities include the maintenance and construction of flood control structures and facilities, and regulating development in and near floodplains. Despite major improvements in flood management methods and planning, portions of Jurupa Valley are still at risk of flooding during major events. It continues to be in the City’s best interest to regulate and monitor development in floodplain and flood prone areas. Waterways and drainage facilities existing in 2017 are shown in Figure 4-12 (page 4-21).

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) prepares Flood Insurance Rate Maps, or FIRM maps, to graphically show areas prone to flooding during 100-year and 500-year frequency floods. Figure 8-8 identifies the flood prone portions of Jurupa Valley based on FIRM maps and flood district data.

In addition to the Santa Ana River, the Riverside Basin (northeast of the Interstate 15/SR 60 interchange), and those areas bordering the Etiwanda Flood Control Channel, Pyrite Channel, and the Riverside Canal, are part of the 100-year floodplain. Most of these areas are also where a substantial amount of development exists or is intended to occur. Many techniques may be used to address the danger of flooding, such as preventing or limiting development in floodplains, reducing urban runoff, maintaining floodways, using special building techniques, elevating foundations and structures, and enforcing building setbacks.

One effective technique for maintaining floodways and reducing flood hazards is controlling the spread of *Arundo donax* (giant cane) and other non-native plant species. Giant cane is a highly invasive, non-native aquatic plant that grows in the Santa Ana River and other local drainage courses. The plant is hazardous from a flooding perspective because it grows quickly, clogs channels, and increases flood risks. Left unchecked, the plant can easily take over riparian areas, excluding native plants and damaging natural habitat. However, the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority (SAWPA), the County of Riverside, and other agencies have been working to eliminate giant cane from the Santa Ana River Watershed and restore natural habitat.

**Policies**

**CSSF 1.6 Flood Risk.** In reviewing new construction and substantial improvements within the 100-year floodplain, the City shall disapprove projects that cannot minimize the flood risks to acceptable levels in areas mapped by FEMA or as determined by site-specific hydrologic studies for areas not mapped by FEMA. The City shall:
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1. Prohibit the construction, location, or substantial improvement of structures in areas designated as floodways, except upon approval of a plan that provides that the proposed development will not result in any significant increase in flood levels during the occurrence of a 100-year flood; and
2. Prohibit the filling or grading of land for nonagricultural purposes and for non-authorized flood control purposes in areas designated as floodways, except upon approval of a plan, which provides that the proposed development will not result in any significant increase in flood levels during the occurrence of a 100-year flood discharge.

CSSF 1.7 **Floodway Alteration.** Require that any alterations of the floodway utilize naturalized edge treatments as outlined in the Conservation and Open Space Element (Policies 3.16 and 3.17).

CSSF 1.8 **Building Codes.** Enforce provisions of the Building Code in conjunction with the following guidelines:

1. Critical facilities shall not be permitted in floodplains unless the project design ensures that there are at least two routes for emergency ingress and egress, and minimizes the potential for debris or flooding to block emergency routes.

2. Development using, storing, or otherwise involved with substantial quantities of on-site hazardous materials shall not be permitted unless all standards for evaluation, anchoring, and flood-proofing have been satisfied; and hazardous materials are stored in watertight containers, not capable of floating, to the extent required by state and federal laws and regulations.

3. Specific flood-proofing measures that may be required include, but are not limited to: use of paints, membranes, or mortar to reduce water seepage through walls; installation of water tight doors, bulkheads, and shutters; installation of flood water pumps in structures; and proper modification and protection of all electrical equipment, circuits, and appliances so that the risk of electrocution or fire is eliminated. Fully enclosed areas that are below finished floors shall require openings to equalize the forces on both sides of walls.

CSSF 1.9 **Permanent Structures.** Prohibit construction of permanent structures for human housing or employment to the extent necessary to convey floodwaters without property damage or risk to public safety. Agricultural, recreational, or other similar, non-habitation uses are allowable if flood control and groundwater recharge functions are maintained.

CSSF 1.10 **Floodway Alteration.** Prohibit alteration of floodways and channelization unless alternative methods of flood
control are not technically feasible or unless alternative methods are already utilized to the maximum extent practicable. The intent is to balance the need for protection with prudent land use solutions, recreation needs, and habitat preservation requirements, and as applicable to provide incentives for natural watercourse preservation. Preservation incentives may include density transfer programs as may be adopted.

CSSF 1.11 **Modification of Water Courses.** Prohibit substantial modification to water courses, unless modification does not increase erosion or adjacent sedimentation, or increase water velocities, so as to be detrimental to adjacent property, nor adversely affect adjacent wetlands or riparian habitat.

CSSF 1.12 **Flood Control Improvements.** Direct flood-control improvement measures toward the protection of existing and planned development.

CSSF 1.13 **Environmental Protection.** Ensure that any substantial modification to a watercourse is accomplished in the least environmentally damaging manner possible to maintain adequate wildlife corridors and linkages and maximize groundwater recharge.

CSSF 1.14 **Ability to Withstand Flooding.** Require development within the floodplain to be capable of withstanding flooding and to minimize use of fill. Compatible uses shall not, however, obstruct flows or adversely affect upstream or downstream properties with increased velocities, flood heights, erosion backwater effects, or concentrations of flows.

CSSF 1.15 **Regional Storm Drain System.** All proposed development projects shall address and mitigate any adverse impacts on the carrying capacity of local and regional storm drain systems.

CSSF 1.16 **Neighboring Jurisdictions.** Encourage neighboring jurisdictions to require development occurring adjacent to the City to consider the impact of flooding and flood control measures on properties within the City.

CSSF 1.17 **Hazardous Materials Storage.** Require that facilities storing substantial quantities of hazardous materials within designated 100- or 500-year flood zones be adequately flood-proofed and that hazardous materials containers be anchored and secured to prevent flotation and contamination.

CSSF 1.18 **Lifeline Facilities.** Require that all lifeline and dependent care facilities, such as convalescent homes,
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group housing, police stations, fire stations, and emergency operation centers in designated flood zones be flood-proofed and to maintain and rehearse inundation response plans.

CSSF 1.19 Open Space Tools. Utilize various means of land acquisition tools and land use measures, such as density credit for open space and dedication of floodplain areas to the Riverside Conservation Agency, to create open space zoning in designated flood zones that are likely to be developed or redeveloped with uses that are more intensive.

CSSF 1.20 Risk Assessment. Continue to assess and upgrade inundation risk and protection in the City.

CSSF 1.21 Flood Hazard Zones. Encourage periodic reevaluation of the 500-year, 100-year, and 10-year flood hazard zones by state, federal, county, and other sources and use such studies to improve existing protection, review flood protection standards for new development and redevelopment, and update emergency response plans.

CSSF 1.22 Specific Plans. Encourage the use of specific plans to allow increased densities in certain areas of a proposed development and to transfer density to locate residential, commercial, industrial, and public facility uses outside of natural hazard areas; and to direct appropriate uses to these areas, such as open space, passive recreational uses, or other uses compatible with these hazards.

Programs

CSSF 1.1.5 Property Acquisition. As resources allow, acquire property in high-risk flood zones and designate the land as open space for public use or wildlife habitat.

CSSF 1.1.6 Giant Care and Other Invasive Plant Species. Encourage and, as resources allow, support the efforts of SAWPA, the County of Riverside, and other agencies to remove Giant Cane and other invasive, non-native plant species from the Santa Ana River corridor and restore native riparian habitat.

CSSF 1.1.7 Lifeline Facilities. Develop an inundation response plan for any lifeline facilities and dependent care facilities located in designated flood zones.

CSSF 1.1.8 Risk Assessment. Assess and upgrade inundation risk and protection, and utilize information and research from regional planning agencies and others focusing on resiliency after a disaster.
CSSF 1.1.9 **Emergency Response Plans.** Periodically review and update emergency response plans to reflect current flood protection standards.

3. **Fire Hazards**

Due to the rural and somewhat mountainous nature of the City, and some of the flora, such as oak woodlands and chaparral habitat, the foothill areas and mountainsides are subject to a risk of fire hazards. The lush riparian vegetation of the Santa Ana River also poses conditions conducive to wildfires, and giant cane, where present in the watershed, is even more combustible than native species. The highest danger of wildfires can be found in the most rugged terrain where, fortunately, development intensity is relatively low. Methods to address this hazard include such techniques as not building in high-risk areas, creating setbacks that buffer development from hazard areas, maintaining brush clearance to reduce potential fuel, establishing low fuel landscaping, and applying special building techniques. In still other cases, safety-oriented organizations, such as the California Fire Safe Council, can provide assistance in educating the public and promoting practices that contribute to improved public safety.

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 Figure 8-10, 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.

*Figure 8-9: CAL FIRE strike crew fighting a wildland fire*
Figure 8-10: Wildfire severity zones in Jurupa Valley
Policies

CSSF 1.23 Fire Prevention. Develop and enforce construction and design standards that ensure that proposed development incorporates fire prevention features through the following:

1. All proposed construction shall meet minimum standards for fire safety as defined in the City Building or Fire Codes, or by City zoning, or as dictated by the Building Official or the Transportation Land Management Agency based on building type, design, occupancy, and use.

2. In addition to the fire safety provisions of the Uniform Building Code and the Uniform Fire Codes, apply additional standards for high risk, high occupancy hospital and health care facilities, dependent care, emergency operation centers, and other essential or “lifeline” facilities, per county or state standards. These shall include assurance that structural and nonstructural architectural elements of the building will not:
   a. Impede emergency egress for fire safety staffing/personnel, equipment, and apparatus; nor
   b. Hinder evacuation from fire, including potential blockage of stairways or fire doors.

3. Proposed development in Hazardous Fire areas shall provide secondary public access, unless determined unnecessary by CAL FIRE or City Building Official.

CSSF 1.24 Adjacent Natural Vegetation. Development that adjoins large areas of native vegetation will require drought tolerant landscaping that blends with the natural vegetation to the greatest extent possible.

CSSF 1.25 Wildfire Hazards. Encourage and, as resources allow, support CAL FIRE and other agency efforts to reduce wildfire hazards and improve fire-fighting capacity to successfully respond to multiple fires.

CSSF 1.26 Gas Shutoff. Require automatic natural gas shut-off earthquake sensors in high-occupancy industrial and commercial facilities and encourage their installation in all residences.

CSSF 1.27 Coordination. During preparation and implementation of the City’s capital improvement programs, encourage coordination between CAL FIRE and Community Services Districts providing water services in Jurupa
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Valley to improve firefighting infrastructure, by proposing or requiring, when appropriate:

1. Replacement and/or relocation of old cast-iron pipelines and inadequate water mains when street improvements are planned;
2. Assessment of impact fees as a condition of development; and
3. Redundant emergency distribution pipelines in areas of potential ground failure or where determined to be necessary.

CSSF 1.28 **Fire Protection Master Plan.** Continue to utilize the Riverside County Fire Protection Master Plan and Jurupa Emergency Response Plan as the base documents to implement the goals and objectives of the Community Safety Element.

CSSF 1.29 **Water Resources.** Encourage and, as resources allow, support efforts to utilize existing water bodies, tanks, and water wells in the City for emergency fire suppression water sources.

CSSF 1.30 **Brush Clearance.** Utilize ongoing brush-clearance fire inspections to educate homeowners on fire prevention tips.

**Programs**

CSSF 1.1.10 **Fire Safety Planning.** Conduct and implement long-range fire safety planning, including updating building, fire, subdivision, and municipal code standards, improved infrastructure, and improved mutual aid agreements with the private and public sectors.

CSSF 1.1.11 **Fire Response Agreements.** Review inter-jurisdictional fire response agreements, and improve firefighting resources as recommended in the County Fire Protection Master Plan, to keep pace with development and to ensure that:

1. Fire reporting and response times do not exceed those listed in the County Fire Protection Master Plan identified for each of the development densities described;
2. Fire flow requirements (water for fire protection) are consistent with Insurance Service Office (ISO) recommendations; and
3. The planned deployment and height of aerial ladders and other specialized equipment and apparatus are sufficient for the intensity of development anticipated.
CSSF 1.1.12  **Fire Safety Education.** Work with the California Fire Safety Council, CAL Fire, FEMA and others to educate and promote fire safety practices.

4. **Hazardous Materials**

Hazardous materials are those substances that have the potential to cause harm to humans, animals, or the environment, by themselves or through interaction with other factors (Institute of Hazardous Materials Management). In Jurupa Valley, hazardous materials include petroleum products, solvents, pesticides, and other substances used in or generated by commercial, industrial, agricultural, or residential activities. State and federal laws govern the storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials.

Contaminated sites are another source of hazardous materials in Jurupa Valley. The Stringfellow Remediation Site near SR 60 and Pyrite Street is perhaps the most well-known contaminated site in the region. The former hazardous waste disposal site leached toxins into the environment and has been undergoing remediation through the federal Superfund process. In addition to contaminating the surface and soil, the site leaked toxins into Pyrite Creek and the groundwater basin, which traveled in a southwest-trending “plume” to the community of Glen Avon and other areas. The remediation effort includes monitoring and remediation of groundwater supplies.

**Policies**

CSSF 1.31  **Federal/State Laws.** Comply with federal and state laws regarding the management of hazardous waste and materials.

CSSF 1.32  **Hazardous Waste Storage/Disposal.** Identify, assess, and mitigate safety hazards from the storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials through the development review process.

CSSF 1.33  **Hazardous Waste Collection.** Encourage and, as resources allow, support household hazardous waste collection activities.

CSSF 1.34  **Stringfellow Remediation Site.** Encourage and support state and federal efforts to complete the clean-up of the Stringfellow Remediation Site and related groundwater and soil contamination.

CSSF 1.35  **Information Dissemination.** Disseminate information to the public on the storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials through working with non-agencies, special districts and other agencies and organizations.
5. Disaster Preparedness

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) defines disaster preparedness as “a continuous cycle of planning, organizing, training, equipping, exercising, evaluating, and taking corrective action in an effort to ensure effective coordination during incident response.” Disaster preparedness is important to Jurupa Valley to establish the most effective and efficient ways to address hazards and minimize the effects of hazards on life and property, reduce the potential for disasters, and recover from the effects of disasters as quickly as possible.

Hazard Mitigation Plans exist at the federal, state, regional, and local level. The California–Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 requires state, local, and tribal governments to prepare Hazard Mitigation Plans that address actions and strategies to mitigate hazards, risks, and vulnerabilities. As outlined in the introduction to this Element, the City of Jurupa Valley regularly updates its has adopted—a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) which is incorporated herein by reference. In addition, the City and participates in the County of Riverside Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. Together, these plans set goals to mitigate potential risks from natural and man-made hazards, identify vulnerabilities, provide recommendations for actions, evaluate resources, and identify future mitigation planning and maintenance of existing plan.

The City also has an Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) that addresses how the City will respond to emergency situations ranging from minor incidents to large-scale disasters. The plan addresses four primary phases of emergency operation including Preparedness, Response, Recovery, and Mitigation. The plan discusses the activation and management of the City’s Emergency Operations Center (EOC), which may be set up during an emergency to manage the event and coordinate with other EOCs such as the Riverside County EOC. The EOC also coordinates the sharing of resources under the California Mutual Aid Agreement.

The City also participates in the County of Riverside’s HAZUS Program, which is a standardized methodology for earthquake loss estimation based on geographic information systems (GIS). HAZUS, which stands for Hazards – United States, is designed for use by state, regional, and local governments in planning for earthquake loss mitigation, emergency preparedness, response, and recovery.

Policies

CSSF 1.36 Multi-Hazard Functional Plan. Strengthen the Multi-Hazard Functional Plan and maintain mutual aid agree-
ments with federal, state, local agencies and the private sector to assist in:
1. clearance of debris in the event of widespread slope failures, collapsed buildings or structures, or other circumstances that could result in blocking emergency access or regress;
2. heavy search and rescue;
3. tire suppression;
4. hazardous materials response;
5. temporary shelter;
6. geologic and engineering needs;
7. traffic and crowd control; and
8. building inspection.

CSSF 1.37 Hazardous Waste Handling. Require businesses, utilities, and industrial facilities that handle hazardous materials to:
1. install automatic fire and hazardous materials detection, reporting, and shut-off devices; and
2. install an alternative communication system in the event power is out or telephone service is saturated following an earthquake.

CSSF 1.38 Self-Sufficiency. Use incentives and disincentives to persuade private businesses, consortia, and neighborhoods to be self-sufficient in an emergency by:
1. maintaining a fire control plan, including an on-site firefighting capability and volunteer fire response teams utilizing community organized Neighborhood Watch groups, CERT teams or similar teams to respond to and extinguish small fires; and
2. identifying medical personnel, employees, or local residents who are capable and certified in first aid and CPR.

CSSF 1.39 Critical Facilities. Ensure that critical facilities such as City Hall, Sheriff's Substations, City Fire Stations, electrical substations, community services district offices, and water and sewer facilities are subject to the following design considerations:
1. Require that special development standards, designs, and construction practices be implemented to reduce risk of compromise in a disaster to acceptable levels for capital improvements, utility projects, and development projects involving critical facilities, large-scale residential development, and major commercial or industrial development. Special standards should be applied through conditional use permits and the subdivision review
process and, where appropriate, impact fees should be assessed to finance required actions.
2. Require mitigation measures to reduce potential damage caused by ground failure for sites determined to have potential for liquefaction. Such measures shall apply to critical facilities, utilities, and large commercial and industrial projects as a condition of project approval.
3. Require that planned lifeline utilities, as a condition of project approval, be designed, located, structurally upgraded, and fit with safety shutoff valves; be designed for easy maintenance, and have redundant back-up lines where unstable slopes, earth cracks, active faults, or areas of liquefaction cannot be avoided.
4. Review proposed uses of fault setback areas closely to ensure that City infrastructure (roads, utilities, sanitary and storm sewers) are not unduly placed at risk by the developer. Insurance, bonding, or compensation plans should be used to compensate the City for the potential costs of repair.

CSSF 1.40 Strengthen Utilities/Lifelines. Encourage the strengthening of planned and existing utilities and lifelines, the retrofit and rehabilitation of structurally unsound utility structures and public facilities, and the relocation of certain critical facilities where appropriate.

CSSF 1.41 Alternative Facilities. Encourage alternatives that improve site safety for the protection of critical facilities, including property acquisition for open space, change in building use or occupancy, or other appropriate measures that can reduce risks posed by hazards.

CSSF 1.42 Critical Facilities in Inundation Areas. Discourage development of critical facilities that are proposed in dam failure inundation areas, and apply hazardous materials safety guidelines within such zones.

CSSF 1.43 Santa Ana River Levees. Ensure that the City’s emergency preparedness plans include response protocols for the breaching of the Santa Ana River levees.

CSSF 1.44 Rebuilding After Disaster. Allow rebuilding after a disaster consistent with the General Plan allowing exceptions on a case-by-case basis for previously non-conforming uses and structures when such an action would be consistent with public safety goals and in the City’s best interests.
Programs

CSSF 1.1.13 Post-Disaster Recovery. Develop plans for short-term and long-term post-disaster recovery utilizing information and research from regional planning organizations and other organizations focusing on resiliency after disaster.

CSSF 1.1.14 Safeguard Infrastructure. Coordinate with the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) and/or utilize the Capital Improvement Program, to strengthen, relocate, or take other appropriate measures to safeguard high-voltage lines, water, sewer, natural gas and petroleum pipelines, and trunk electrical and telephone conduits that:

1. Extend through areas of high liquefaction potential;
2. Cross active faults; or
3. Traverse earth cracks or landslides.

CSSF 1.1.15 Earthquake Drills. Conduct City earthquake drills and, where appropriate:

1. Develop internal scenarios for City emergency response, including emergency drills; and
2. Test back-up power generators in public facilities and other critical facilities taking part in emergency drills.

CSSF 1.1.16 Information Dissemination. Improve management and emergency dissemination of information using portable computers with geographic information systems and disaster-resistant Internet access, to obtain:

1. Hazardous Materials Disclosure Business Plans regarding the location and types of hazardous materials;
2. Real-time information on seismic, geologic, or flood hazards; and
3. The locations of high-occupancy, immobile populations, potentially hazardous building structures, utilities, and other lifelines.
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CSSF 2 – Provide a High Level of Community Services and Facilities to Serve the Existing and Future Needs of Jurupa Valley

1. General

Jurupa Valley's community services and facilities are a source of pride for the community and directly affect public health and quality of life, and values, economic and environmental health, and sustainability of the City. Due to the City's recent history as a newly incorporated entity, there is a need to work with existing and private agencies and service districts, because of this, close coordination is needed to ensure that existing and future needs of the City are met.

Policies

CSSF 2.1 Provide Facilities and Services. Work with community services agencies and districts on the planning and provision of adequate community facilities and services.

CSSF 2.2 Concurrency with Development. Ensure the provision of sufficient public facilities and services prior to, or concurrently with, new development.

CSSF 2.3 Facility Design. Work with service agencies to ensure that new public facilities are well designed, energy efficient and compatible with adjacent land uses.

CSSF 2.4 Fair Share. Ensure that new development pays its fair share of public facilities and service costs.

CSSF 2.5 Joint Use. Promote the joint use of public facilities to meet multiple needs of the community.

2. City Governance

After the incorporation of Jurupa Valley on July 1, 2011, the City began operating out of a small commercial storefront building in the De Anza Marketplace. City Council meetings were initially held at the Jurupa Valley Unified School District Education Center. However, in 2012, the City Council began meeting at the vacant Sam’s Western Wear, a vintage, western-themed building located at 8930 Limonite Avenue in the Pedley community. Soon thereafter, the City began converting Sam’s Western Wear into City Hall with offices, public counters, meeting rooms, and enhanced Council chambers. City staff and consultants moved into the new City Hall in early 2015, and a grand opening was held to celebrate the important milestone in February of 2015.

The City prides itself on providing quality municipal services in a cost-effective manner. The City is responsible for police (including crime and traffic), fire suppression and prevention, street
construction, maintenance and repair, building and grading permits and inspections, code enforcement, zoning and planning, water quality management, business registrations, and finance. The City of Jurupa Valley provides these services at City Hall through the following departments: City Manager, City Attorney, Finance, City Clerk, Engineering, Public Works, Building and Safety, Code Enforcement, Planning, and Economic Development. The City provides for police services through the Riverside County Sheriff's Department, and fire services are provided by the Riverside County Fire Department and the Rubidoux Community Services District. In addition, the City Council and the Planning Commission operate from City Hall and conduct their meetings in the Council chambers. Regular City Council meetings are held on the first and third Thursdays of the month, and Planning Commission meetings are held on the second and fourth Wednesdays of the month.

**Policies**

CSSF 2.6 **Municipal Services.** Continue to consolidate municipal services at City Hall to meet the needs of Jurupa Valley citizens.

**Programs**

CSSF 2.1.1 **Evaluate Municipal Services.** Allocate municipal resources to evaluate the need, cost, and feasibility of the City assuming responsibility for providing facilities or services currently provided by other agencies.

**3. Police Services**

One of the primary benefits of the City’s incorporation in 2011 was to achieve enhanced police services. The Riverside County Sheriff’s Department provides police services in Jurupa Valley and throughout much of Riverside County. The department is the second largest Sheriff’s Office in California and includes ten stations, five correctional facilities and other facilities. Sheriff services are provided to Jurupa Valley through a contract with the City from the Jurupa Valley Sheriff’s station located at 7477 Mission Boulevard. The station also serves the cities of Norco, Eastvale, and several unincorporated areas of the County and is led by a commander who serves as the Police Chief for the area.

As of 2017, the Jurupa Valley Sheriff’s Station responds to approximately 35,000 total calls per year. Calls are broken down by priority level. Priority 1 calls are urgent calls that involve a threat to human life or property and have the potential for serious injury. Priority 2 calls involve circumstances that are urgent but not life threatening. Priority 3 and Priority 4 calls involve non-urgent nor life threatening issues. The Department’s 2015 response times for
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Priority 1 and Priority 2 calls within the service area of the Jurupa Valley Sheriff’s Station are shown in Table 8.1.

**Table 8.1: 2015 Police Response Times, Jurupa Valley Sheriff's Station**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Emergency Call</th>
<th>2015 Response Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority 1</td>
<td>7.57 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 2</td>
<td>21.31 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Captain Jason Horton, Riverside County Sheriff's Department, 2/17/16

**Graffiti.** The Sheriff's Department and the JCSD regularly patrol the City for graffiti to enable quick eradication and limit its proliferation. In addition, residents in Jurupa Valley are encouraged to report graffiti vandalism to the City of Jurupa Valley or JCSD as soon as it is encountered. The City contracts with the JCSD to paint out graffiti in the City. The Sheriff’s Department also actively pursues conviction of graffiti vandals in accordance with local and state laws.

**Homelessness.** As of January 2017, there were estimated to be 129 homeless individuals living within the City limits with 20 homeless encampments identified. A number of the encampments are located within the Santa Ana River as well as on public and private property along SR 60 and in other areas of the City. Homelessness is associated with a number of negative issues, including crime, blight, trash, unsanitary conditions, and illegal fires. In 2014, the Sheriff’s Department created a Homeless Outreach Team to identify homeless individuals, reduce the homeless population, and coordinate the delivery of resources to the homeless. The Sheriff’s Department coordinates homeless outreach with a number of additional agencies including, but not limited to, the City of Jurupa Valley, the Riverside County Department of Social Services, the Probation Department, the Department of Veteran’s Affairs, and the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

**Residential Noise Complaints.** Every weekend, the Sheriff’s Department receives numerous complaints about noise resulting from loud parties that keep residents awake at night. Residents have expressed concerns about loud parties with amplified music that last well into the night and early morning hours and disturb the peace. The Sheriff’s Department maintains a two-deputy noise unit on weekends that specifically deals with residential noise complaints and enforces the City’s Noise Ordinance.

**Community-Oriented Policing.** The Jurupa Valley Sheriff’s Department actively engages in Community-Oriented Policing, which brings together law enforcement professionals with the community in a variety of outreach efforts to reduce crime. In addition, the Department assists the City incorporate Crime Prevention through Environmental Design, or CPTED, techniques in new development. CPTED is a concept supported by law enforce-
ment officers, city planners, designers, and other professionals to
design the physical environment in ways that discourage criminal
activity and increase safety. The concept is based on three
principles: natural surveillance, territoriality, and access control.
When incorporated into development projects, these principles
serve to eliminate hiding places and enhance visibility so that law-
abiding people can easily watch over the physical environment and
discourage criminal activities. For example, one effective design
strategy to deter crime is to design buildings and sites to maximize
visibility of public areas and avoid designs that create hidden
entries or site areas that are difficult to monitor or secure.

**Policies**

CSSF 2.7 **Community Safety.** Coordinate with the Riverside
County Sheriff’s Department on an ongoing basis to ensure the continued safety of the City.

CSSF 2.8 **Criminal Activity.** Support efforts to develop innovative
methods to reduce criminal activity and increase safety in the community.

CSSF 2.9 **Graffiti.** Support efforts of the Sheriff’s Department and
the JCSD to identify and remove graffiti and prosecute graffiti vandals.

CSSF 2.10 **Homelessness.** Support efforts to reduce the homeless
population and provide outreach services to the homeless.

CSSF 2.11 **Residential Noise Complaints.** Discourage loud parties
with amplified music in residential neighborhoods and support the Sheriff Department’s efforts to do the same.

CSSF 2.12 **CPTED.** Incorporate CPTED principles in the design of
new development to encourage natural surveillance and reduce crime.

**Programs**

CSSF 2.1.2 **Planning Applications.** Route new Planning
applications to the Sheriff’s Department to increase
public safety and maintain close coordination with the
Sheriff’s Department and law enforcement programs.

4. **Fire and Emergency Medical Services**

The Riverside County Fire Department, in cooperation with the
California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE),
provides full service municipal and wildland fire protection,
emergency medical response, technical rescue services, and
response to hazardous materials discharges in Jurupa Valley. The
Community Safety, Services, and Facilities

Department operates 97 fire stations throughout the County of Riverside with four of those located in Jurupa Valley, as shown in Table 8.2.

Table 8.2: Jurupa Valley Fire Stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Number</th>
<th>Name/Location</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pedley Fire Station</td>
<td>9270 Limonite Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Glen Avon Station</td>
<td>10400 San Sevalne Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Rubidoux Station</td>
<td>5721 Mission Boulevard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2016, the Department responded to 10,342 calls for service with the majority for emergency medical assistance (73%), traffic collisions (11%), and false alarms (7%) (Riverside County Fire Department 2016 Annual Report).

Policies

CSSF 2.13 Fire Safety Techniques. Incorporate fire-safety techniques in new development

CSSF 2.14 Fire Department Review. Involve the Fire Department in the review of development applications in fire prone areas.

CSSF 2.15 Coordination. Coordinate with the Fire Marshal on fire prevention throughout the community.

CSSF 2.16 Adequate Facilities. Work with the Fire Department to ensure the provision of adequate fire stations, personnel, and equipment to meet the City's needs over time.

CSSF 2.17 Public Education. Support efforts to educate the public about fire safety and prevention.

5. Educational Facilities

A well-educated population is essential to maintain and enhance the City's overall quality of life and economic vitality. Educated citizens are more likely to participate in youth programs, community-based volunteer organizations, and civic affairs. In a very real sense, these citizens form the foundation of what it means to be a "community." Local schools strengthen and support the City's social fabric and are leaders in maintaining an educated and informed citizenry.

Two school districts provide public educational services in Jurupa Valley. They are the Jurupa Unified School District (JUSD) and the Corona-Norco Unified School District (CNUSD). JUSD serves most of Jurupa Valley as well as a small portion of Eastvale west of I-15. The JUSD's Benita B. Roberts Education Center is located at 4850 Pedley Road. Named after a former JUSD Superintendent, the Center contains district offices and the Board of Education meeting room. The District operates 15 elementary schools, 3 middle schools, and

Figure 8-12: Jurupa Valley High School
4 high schools including one continuing education high school. Total student enrollment during the 2016/17 school year was 19,352.

CNUSD serves students living in the southwestern area of Jurupa Valley, as well as students living in the cities of Corona, Norco, and Eastvale, and portions of unincorporated Riverside County. The CNUSD Education Center is located in the City of Norco. The District operates one school in the City of Jurupa Valley: VanderMolen Fundamental Elementary School located at 6744 Carnelian Street. Older students living in this area attend River Heights Intermediate School and Roosevelt High School, both of which are located in Eastvale.

During the General Plan preparation process, the GPAC identified several issues related to schools. Community members pointed out that schools should ideally be community centers and serve as focal points where the community comes together for education, recreation, and other activities. The GPAC also identified the need to modernize and remodel several additional schools within JUSD and to provide a community college, occupational training institute, or similar facility. In addition, as most students walk, bike, or are driven to schools, community members identified the need to ensure the safety of travel routes to schools.

There are currently no institutions of higher education in Jurupa Valley. However, through a partnership between the Jurupa Unified School District and the Riverside Community College District, Rubidoux High School includes the Rubidoux Early College High School or RECHS where students can begin their college coursework in their junior year and complete their high school diploma while earning college credit at the same time. Other institutions of higher education in the area include Norco College, Riverside City College, and the University of California, Riverside. The GPAC stated a strong desire to build a satellite college campus and/or trade school in Jurupa Valley, and to provide other venues offering adult education.

**Policies**

- **CSSF 2.18 Coordination with School Districts.** Coordinate with JUSD and CNUSD in planning for the current and future needs of Jurupa Valley students.
- **CSSF 2.19 Modernization.** Encourage efforts of JUSD to modernize and renovate schools within the district.
- **CSSF 2.20 Safe Routes to School.** Work with the school districts to ensure the safety of travel routes to and from schools.
- **CSSF 2.21 Schools as Neighborhood Centers.** Develop new schools, as needed, that also serve as neighborhood centers and that are pedestrian- and bicyclist-friendly.
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CSSF 2.22 Joint Use. Encourage school districts to allow joint use of schools for after-school sports, classes, childcare, or other uses to maximize the community value of these important public investments.

CSSF 2.23 Review of Development Proposals. Involve the school districts in the review of large residential development proposals to ensure that adequate schools are provided without affecting existing facilities.

CSSF 2.24 Higher Education. Encourage institutions of higher education, and other adult education providers, to locate facilities and programs in Jurupa Valley.

CSSF 2.25 Vocational and Trade Schools. Encourage and accommodate to the greatest extent possible the development and location of vocational and trade schools to broaden the local pool of skilled and technical workers.

Programs

CSSF 2.1.3 Incentivize Advanced Educational Opportunities. Review the Zoning Ordinance to identify potential zones, locations, development incentives, and requirements for advanced educational and occupational training schools and similar facilities. Make this information available to potential applicants, real estate and development professionals, marketing and construction firms, and local school districts.

6. Libraries

Libraries are sources of lifelong learning and enrichment. Jurupa Valley's public libraries provide free access to collections of books and media in a wide range of subjects, titles and formats. In so doing, they provide the community with universal access to resources that are integral for education, leisure, personal growth, health, skill building, and vocational training. As community centers, libraries can also foster social interaction, community involvement, and lifelong learning for residents of all ages.

The Riverside County Library System provides library services in Jurupa Valley and throughout Riverside County. Overall, the Library System operates 35 libraries and 2 bookmobiles. Library facilities in Jurupa Valley include the Glen Avon Library located at 9244 Galena Street and the Louis Robidoux Library located at 5840 Mission Boulevard. The GPAC stressed the importance of Jurupa Valley's libraries and their desire to provide additional libraries in underserved areas of the City such as the southwestern quadrant of the City. They also expressed a desire to develop libraries as

Figure 8-13: Louis Robidoux Library, Jurupa Valley
focal points of the community with good access to pedestrian and bicycle routes, and public transit.

**Policies**

CSSF 2.26 **Provide Adequate Facilities.** Work with the Riverside County Library System to provide adequate facilities and services for the current and future population of Jurupa Valley and to promote and use the libraries for community meetings and events.

CSSF 2.27 **New Libraries.** Encourage the development of new libraries in underserved areas of the city.

CSSF 2.28 **Libraries as Community Centers.** Design new library facilities as community centers with access to pedestrian and bicycle routes as well as public transit.

CSSF 2.29 **Educational Programming.** Encourage the County of Riverside to provide reading and literacy programs and other educational programs at the local library branch or via other means for those who cannot visit library facilities.

CSSF 2.30 **Funding.** Encourage County of Riverside efforts to provide adequate funding for improvements to local library facilities and programs through county, state, and federal funding, private and corporate donations, or other resources.

CSSF 2.31 **Technology.** Encourage the adoption of technological advances that can provide improved access to library resources.

7. **Parks and Recreation**

Parks, sports fields, trails, recreation facilities, special events, and programs are at the core of Jurupa Valley’s quality of life and provide residents with a healthy alternative to the built environment. Jurupa Valley’s active and passive parks, recreational facilities, and programs reflect the City’s local culture and unique history, and benefit residents and local businesses by promoting health and wellness, nurturing the City’s agricultural/ equestrian heritage, and fostering community interaction and pride. Recreational facilities help define who we are as a community and serve as gathering spaces for celebration, sport, and relaxation. In describing the Community’s values, the GPAC emphasized the importance of recreation in residents’ lives:
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Figure 8-15: Jurupa Area Recreation and Parks District (JARPD) parks

Active Outdoor Life. Many Jurupa Valley residents were drawn here because of the City's unique outdoor setting and the recreation opportunities it offers. Our parks and recreation facilities are essential to maintain and improve our health and quality of life. We place high value on our public parks, sports fields, pedestrian and equestrian trails and support facilities, golf courses, outdoor use areas, historic sites and nature centers, campgrounds, and airport and joint use school facilities.

In Jurupa Valley, parks and recreation facilities and programs are provided primarily by the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District (JARPD). Formed in 1984, the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District (JARPD) provides parks and recreational facilities in Jurupa Valley and a portion of Eastvale. The District offices are located at 4810 Pedley Road and offers a wide variety of year-round recreational programs and opportunities at numerous facilities throughout the City. In 2017, a new park is planned at the south end of Downey Street to enhance access to the Santa Ana River and open space. Though not yet officially named, it initially includes 26 acres, eventually to be expanded to 41 acres with development of the Paradise Knolls residential project.

Similar facilities and programs are provided by the Riverside County Regional Parks and Open Space District. Additional playground and sports field areas are made available to the public through joint use agreements with the Jurupa Unified School District.

The JARPD offers a diverse range of parks, playgrounds, greenbelts, trails, and recreation facilities. Figure 8-16 shows the locations of Jurupa Valley area parks managed by multiple agencies. JARPD owns and maintains over 125 acres of parkland, 173 acres of undeveloped parks and open space, and about 23 acres of trails, Citywide. Figure 8-17 (page 8-35) summarizes the JARPD's
recreation facilities and acreages. In addition, at the time of General Plan adoption (2017) a new City Park is being developed at Downey Street to enhance Santa Ana River Access and Open Space use.
# Facilities and Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Community Center</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa State Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4810 Pecley Rd., Jurupa Valley 92509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Thompson Arena</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8629 Jurupa Rd., Jurupa Valley 92509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agate Park/ Harvey Field</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8629 Jurupa Rd., Jurupa Valley 92509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalon Park - Cliff Wannamaker Gymnasium</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 Avondale St., Jurupa Valley 92509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Park</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8029 Hauenstein Dr., Jurupa Valley 92509</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowles Field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Polaris Rd., Jurupa Valley 92509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laramore Park and Arena</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11380 Little Dipper, Jurupa Valley 91752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans/Memorial Community Center/Pool</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4555 Riverview Dr., Jurupa Valley 92509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Ball Fields, 4540 Pacific Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Mira Loma Park</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3206 Wyocho Ln., Jurupa Valley 91752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wineville Park</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5335 Trail Canyon Dr., Jurupa Valley 91752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felgar Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5832 Felgar, Jurupa Valley 92509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limone-Meadows Park</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6556 Park’s Ranch Rd., Jurupa Valley 91752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7330 Jurupa Rd., Jurupa Valley 92509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Lake Park (Dry)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6789 Lakeside Ave., Jurupa Valley 92509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon River Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6859 Moon River St., Eastvale 91752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delware Greenbelt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6986 Delaware River Dr., Eastvale 91752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambria Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5471 Harmony Dr., Eastvale 91752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5641 Tressure Dr., Eastvale 91752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Avon Heritage Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7581 Mission Blvd., Jurupa Valley 92509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrona Family Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5211 Verrona Ave., Jurupa Valley 91752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepard Park &amp; Tot Lot - Coming Soon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley 92509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnleaf Community Park - Coming Soon</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley 91752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esplanade Park (Phase 1) - Coming Soon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley 91752</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Park - Coming Soon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley 91752</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Under construction
* Undeveloped
* Temporarily Closed
* Splash Pad Open Memorial Day weekend through Labor Day

Figure 8-17: JARPD facilities and parks
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The Riverside County Regional Park and Open Space District operates several important recreation facilities in Jurupa Valley that are available to all residents. These are:

1. **The Louis Robidoux Nature Center.** The Center is located at 5370 Riverview, in the heart of the Community of Rubidoux area, about 2 miles southeast of Limonite Avenue. Named after a Frenchman born in St. Louis, Missouri in 1796, the Louis Robidoux Nature Center provides educational programs and tours for the public and school groups on a variety of natural history topics, including Native American history, native plants and animals, astronomy, the environment, and local history.

2. **Rancho Jurupa Regional Sports Park.** Located at 5249 Crestmore Road, the Rancho Jurupa Regional Sports Park provides 32 acres of well-maintained, natural, and synthetic turf fields. It comprises four large marked and lighted synthetic turf fields, two large natural turf fields, plus nine smaller natural turf fields, with a plaza with picnic shelters, restrooms, a snack bar, and two playgrounds. The Park provides individual, team, and group play facilities year around.

3. **Rancho Jurupa Park and Campground.** Located at 4800 Crestmore Road, Rancho Jurupa Park and Campground is a 200-acre regional park and serves as a popular destination for local campers and anglers as well as out-of-town visitors. The Park offers 140 camping sites, 5 cabins, and two 3-acre lakes. Rancho Jurupa Park offers many amenities, including a "splash pad" for water play, rock climbing, picnic areas, children's playgrounds, miniature golf and a disc golf course, and fishing.

4. **Historic Crestmore Manor.** The historic Crestmore Manor, located at 4600 Crestmore Road, is a 10,830-square-foot colonial-style mansion built in the mid-1950s by W.W. "Tiny" Naylor, a restaurateur, and the state's second-leading thoroughbred horse breeder of the time. The Manor, a California Historical Landmark, is owned by the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District and is available for community, group, or individual events, such as meetings, festivals, shows,
weddings, receptions, parties, and other special events, and can accommodate up to 400 guests.

5. The Cove Waterpark. Located at 4310 Camino Real, The Cove is operated by a private concession under the auspices of the County of Riverside Park and Open-Space District. It was developed in partnership with the Economic Development Agency and the Jurupa Unified School District. Also called the Jurupa Aquatic Center, the facility consists of 7.5 acres with a waterpark and a competition sports pool. The Caribbean-themed waterpark consists of children's activity pool and splash playground, river rafting, a water slide, a wave machine for surfing, a multi-purpose room, restrooms and lockers, a picnic area, and concessions.

In cooperation with community services districts, the County of Riverside, the Jurupa Unified School District, and other agencies, the City helps meet the diverse recreation needs of existing and new residents by requiring the dedication and improvement of new parks and recreation facilities as a condition of new development. The City also promotes recreation and healthy exercise by providing equestrian, bicycle, and walking paths within the public right of way and by requiring new residential neighborhoods to include pedestrian and equestrian paths, where appropriate. In California, local governments play a critical role in the effort to set aside parkland and open space for recreational purposes. Under the Quimby Act (California Government Code §66477), local governments can adopt ordinances requiring developers to set aside land, donate conservation easements, or pay fees for park improvements. Generally, the parkland dedication standard is 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 new residents. The Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District uses a standard parkland dedication requirement of 5 acres per 1,000 new residents. Frequently, developers choose to pay fees “in lieu” of actually providing parkland. The fees are set by the local agency and are equivalent to the value of the parkland dedication required. Special districts must work with cities to receive parkland dedications or in-lieu fees insasmuch as only cities and counties have the authority to tie such requirements to new development project entitlements.
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As a young city, Jurupa Valley faces special challenges in meeting existing parks and recreation needs. Residents in some communities, such as Pedley, Mira Loma, and Glen Avon, are largely built out but remain underserved in terms of neighborhood-oriented park and recreation facilities. In addition, park administration and maintenance through multiple agencies can pose difficulties in meeting growing and/or changing park and recreation needs. In its new role as a city, Jurupa Valley seeks to play a more direct role in ensuring that residents' park and recreation needs are met and in adopting the goals and standards to help improve and expand residents' access to parks, playgrounds, trails, recreation facilities, and open space.

**Policies**

CSSF 2.32 **Evaluation of User Needs.** Encourage park and recreation service providers to evaluate user feedback, track facility use, and utilize projections to understand park and recreation facility needs and plan for future acquisition and development.

CSSF 2.33 **Park and Recreation Facilities Maintenance.** Encourage park and recreation service providers to maintain parks, trails, and other recreation facilities in good condition and strive to meet Council-adopted community parks and recreation goals.

CSSF 2.34 **Joint Use Agreements.** Maintain and improve joint-use recreational agreements with school districts and public agencies and seek new opportunities for joint recreational uses.

CSSF 2.35 **Universal Access.** Encourage responsible agencies to provide, where feasible, inclusive recreation facilities that meet or exceed accepted standards for universal access for all persons and abilities, and encourage others to do likewise.

CSSF 2.36 **Users.** Encourage responsible agencies to provide parks and recreation facilities and programs that meet the needs of all residents, regardless of income levels, ages, and abilities, and encourage others to do likewise.

CSSF 2.37 **Historic Sites.** Celebrate historic sites with recreational learning opportunities in parks and recreation facilities.

CSSF 2.38 **Natural Environment.** Protect and, where possible, utilize parks, trails, and open spaces for learning opportunities and passive recreation in conjunction with our environmental goals.

CSSF 2.39 **Street Closures/Public Spaces.** Support temporary and, where safe and appropriate, long-term street closures
to create or expand public spaces and to accommodate street fairs, farmers’ markets, art shows, and other special community events.

**CSSF 2.40 Equestrian Heritage.** Work with community groups to encourage, promote, and as resources allow, help support projects that celebrate the City’s equestrian heritage, such as trails, staging areas, hitching posts, corrals, exercise areas, and performance arena.

### Programs

**CSSF 2.1.4 Master Plan.** In cooperation with JARPD, County of Riverside and other responsible agencies, prepare and adopt a Joint Recreational Opportunities and Open Space Master Plan that identifies recreation goals, priorities for park expansion, acquisition, improvement, and funding. The Plan will be adopted within 2 years of General Plan adoption and updated at least every 10 years.

### 8. Social Services

Riverside County provides a variety of public assistance programs in Jurupa Valley. The County’s Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) operates several offices in the region including a Department office at 5961 Mission Boulevard and the Rubidoux Community Resource Center at 5473 Mission Boulevard. DPSS offers a number of programs to assist City residents become self-sufficient and access needed services. Services include the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids program, or CalWORKS, which provides temporary financial assistance to eligible families with minor children who have lost or had a reduction in their income. Other services include Medi-Cal, which provides no-cost or low-cost health care coverage for eligible participants, CalFresh/SNAP, which provides healthy food for needy families and child protective services. The California Family Life Center also operates the Youth Opportunity Center in Rubidoux which provides outreach services and career counseling to at-risk youth. The Rubidoux Family Resource Center, located at 5498 Mission Boulevard, offers on-site services for prenatal care, family planning, parenting classes, public health nurse in home visitation, nutrition and cooking classes, adult education, ESL classes, Healthy Children Connection, Healthy Families/Medi-Cal enrollment, free immunization clinic, utility assistance, Christmas baskets, WIC information, and Workforce Development (job search/job training programs).
Community Safety, Services, and Facilities

Policies

CSSF 2.42 Social Services. Support Riverside County to assist Jurupa Valley residents with social services and other programs.

9. Water

Jurupa Valley is fortunate that it does not rely on imported water to provide its domestic needs. Instead, it relies on local groundwater from the Chino and Riverside Groundwater Basins. Three main agencies, as well as private water companies, provide water to the City of Jurupa Valley. The agencies are the Jurupa Community Services District, the Rubidoux Community Services District, and the Santa Ana River Water Company. These agencies rely on groundwater supplies for both “potable” and “non-potable” water. Potable water is that which is drinkable and fit for human consumption. Non-potable water contains chemicals or other contaminants that make the water unhealthy for humans and animals, but that with proper treatment, may be used for irrigation, manufacturing, and other purposes. Imported water is used by other agencies to recharge local groundwater supplies.

Although local groundwater supplies are forecast to meet Jurupa Valley’s water needs for the foreseeable future, ongoing drought conditions in California have severely impacted water supplies and the ability of water purveyors to meet various water demands. In response, water purveyors throughout California, including Jurupa Valley’s local community services districts, have implemented emergency water conservation regulations to eliminate or reduce water-wasting practices and to conserve precious water resources on an ongoing basis.

Policies

CSSF 2.43 Grey Water Systems. Facilitate the utilization of grey water systems.

CSSF 2.44 Drought-Tolerant Landscaping. Require the use of drought-tolerant landscaping in all new development.

CSSF 2.45 Reclaimed Water. Encourage the development and use of reclaimed water for landscape irrigation and other uses.
CSSF 2.46 Public Education. Support public education efforts to promote water conservation throughout the community.

CSSF 2.47 Water Storage. Encourage local water purveyors to expand local domestic water storage and recycling capabilities.

CSSF 2.48 Water Conservation Ordinance. Implement and enforce the City’s Landscape Water Conservation ordinance.

CSSF 2.49 Water Conservation. Make use of state-of-the-art water conservation technology in all City facilities and landscaping, and require new developments to include drought-tolerant landscaping, permeable paving and water-saving systems and fixtures.

Programs

CSSF 2.1.5 Urban Water Management Plan. Work with local water purveyors to prepare a unified Urban Water Management Plan for Jurupa Valley and to ensure that the Plan is updated as needed.

CSSF 2.1.6 Alternative Water Resources. Explore the feasibility of desalination and other regional projects as additional sources of local water.

10. Wastewater

The Jurupa Community Services District and the Rubidoux Community Services District provide wastewater service to most of Jurupa Valley. However, some areas in the City, particularly in Old Mira Loma and Sky Country, still rely on private septic systems. The community services districts collect and distribute wastewater through a system of pipes, mains, lift stations, force mains, and pump stations. Wastewater is transported to two nearby municipal wastewater treatment plants. The Riverside Water Quality Control Plant is located in, and operated by, the City of Riverside. The Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority (WRCRWA) operates the Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, which is located in the City of Corona. As of 2017, both treatment plants were undergoing expansion projects to serve future population growth.

The two treatment plants treat the majority of wastewater to very clean tertiary levels, which can then be discharged into the Santa Ana River. In addition, some of the wastewater is treated to recycled, or reclaimed, levels for irrigation purposes. The use of reclaimed water for irrigation has several environmental benefits including reducing the demand for potable (drinkable) water for
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landscaping, reducing the amount of groundwater withdrawal, and increasing the quality of groundwater supplies by reducing outflow.

Salty water produced through groundwater extraction and through commercial and industrial processes is transported to the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority’s (SAWPA) Inland Empire Brine Line, which runs through Jurupa Valley. The Brine Line helps to maintain the water quality of the Santa Ana River Watershed by reducing the salt content of water that percolates into the groundwater basin.

Policies

CSSF 2.50 Adequate Wastewater Conveyance. Work with the Jurupa Community Services District and the Rubidoux Community Services District to ensure sufficient wastewater conveyance and pumping capacity to meet the existing and future needs of the City.

CSSF 2.51 Septic Systems. Work with the Jurupa Community Services District to convert areas of the City relying on septic systems to municipal wastewater service.

CSSF 2.52 Recycled Water. Encourage the continued production and expansion of recycled water for irrigation and other purposes.

CSSF 2.53 Wastewater Treatment Capacity. Encourage efforts of the City of Riverside and the Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority (WRCRWA) to provide adequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve the existing and future needs of the City.

CSSF 2.54 Fair-Share Costs. Require new development to contribute fair-share costs for the provision of wastewater infrastructure and treatment.

CSSF 2.55 Brine Line. Support the continued maintenance and use of the Inland Empire Brine Line to transport salty wastewater to the ocean and maintain the quality of the Santa Ana River Watershed.

11. Storm Water

The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District serves as the regional flood management agency for western Riverside County. It was formed in 1945 largely in response to the devastating floods of 1938, which destroyed most of the bridges

Figure 8-702014: Flood levee along Santa Ana River in Jurupa Valley
across the Santa Ana River including the Van Buren Bridge. The District provides flood protection including the identification of flood hazards, the regulation of floodplains, watercourse and drainage planning, and the design, construction, and maintenance of flood control facilities. The District operates a series of storm drains and channels throughout Jurupa Valley that collect runoff water and ultimately direct it to the Santa Ana River. As shown in Figure 8-19, a levee was built along portions of the Santa Ana River to prevent reoccurrence of catastrophic flooding.

As runoff enters the storm drain system, it collects trash, debris, and pollutants, which ultimately make their way to the Santa Ana River. The Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Jurupa Valley, and other permittees along the Santa Ana River are regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) as well as a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit issued by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. These regulations require the agencies to implement storm water management techniques to reduce the amount of pollutants entering the storm water system.

During preparation of the General Plan, the GPAC addressed issues of flooding and storm water. The GPAC generally agreed that storm water facilities in Jurupa Valley are adequate, except in some areas where flooding occurs, such as Old Miraloma. In addition, a recurring theme among GPAC members was the desire to utilize property along flood control channels and creeks for walking, bicycling, and potentially even equestrian travel. These facilities crisscross the community and offer unimpeded routes to the Santa Ana River. While flood control, pollution prevention, and safety are paramount with these facilities, the potential for additional community use should be explored.

**Policies**

CSSF 2.56 **Adequate Facilities.** Work with the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District to develop and maintain adequate flood control facilities to reduce the potential for flooding and protect the quality of the Santa Ana River and other natural drainage courses.

CSSF 2.57 **New Development.** Require new development to implement on-site measures to clean and contain storm water runoff.

CSSF 2.58 **Public Education.** Support public education and other efforts to inform the community about the hazards of runoff pollution.
CSSF 2.1.7  **Multi-Modal Trails.** Develop a multi-agency program with the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District, and the City for the use of flood control channels and associated maintenance and accessways for pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian trails.
12. Solid Waste Disposal

Waste and recycling disposal in Jurupa Valley is provided by private companies. Residential, commercial, and industrial subscription services are provided as well as specialized services such as dumpsters, construction containers, neighborhood clean-up events and twice-yearly residential bulk item pick-up days. Trash from 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. Community members may drop off waste, recycling, and bulk items at the Agua Mansa Station. Residents may also dispose of hazardous household wastes, such as petroleum products, garden chemicals, and paint, on Saturdays at the Riverside County Regional Household Hazardous Waste Facility located at 1780 Agua Mansa Road.

The semi-rural nature of many areas of the City has attracted individuals and businesses to dispose of unwanted items or construction materials along local roadways and vacant lots. This practice creates visual blight, health and safety issues and must be prevented to maintain the quality of life desired by those who live and work in the community. In addition to strict enforcement of anti-dumping regulations, a program is needed to facilitate the proper means of disposing of solid waste. Such a program could include free pick up on certain days several times per year or establishing small local disposal stations in key locations in the community.

Policies

CSSF 2.59 **Solid Waste Services.** Work with private disposal companies to ensure the continued provision of adequate solid waste and recycling services in Jurupa Valley, including the availability of adequate landfill capacity to meet the City’s future needs.

CSSF 2.60 **Waste Reduction.** Encourage the diversion of waste from landfills through reduction, reuse, and recycling efforts.

CSSF 2.61 **Waste Management.** Encourage new development to employ construction waste management techniques to divert construction materials and debris away from landfills.

CSSF 2.62 **Public Education.** Encourage and, as resources allow, support public education efforts to inform the public about waste reduction, reuse, and recycling.
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CSSF 2.63 **Neighborhood Clean-Up Efforts.** Sponsor and/or participate in neighborhood clean-up efforts and anti-littering campaigns/strategies.

CSSF 2.64 **Commercial Recycling.** Expand mandatory recycling for commercial customers consistent with state requirements.

CSSF 2.65 **Rubberized Asphalt.** Consider using rubberized asphalt and recycled aggregate for City street projects, as appropriate.

CSSF 2.66 **Waste Diversion.** Achieve at least the minimum construction and demolition waste diversion requirement of 75%.

CSSF 2.67 **Litter and Recycling Containers.** Place public litter and recycling containers at key locations in the public right of way, as resources allow. Encourage other responsible agencies and service districts to do likewise.

CSSF 2.68 **Anti-Littering Campaigns.** Support and participate in anti-littering strategies and campaigns to encourage residents and other stakeholders to dispose of litter and debris properly.

CSSF 2.69 **Illegal Dumping.** Strictly enforce the laws and ordinances to prohibit illegal dumping along streets and highways or on vacant private property, establish convenient alternatives for local residents and businesses and consider increasing fines for littering and illegal dumping.

###
CONTACT INFORMATION

City of Jurupa Valley

Name: Terri Rollings
Title: Emergency Services ManagerPIO
Address: 8930 Limonite Ave.
City, State, Zip: Jurupa Valley, CA 92509

Direct Contact: (951) 332-6464 ext, 249
Fax: (951) 332-6995
Email: trollings@jurupavalley.org
PLAN ADOPTION/RESOLUTION

The City of Jurupa Valley will submit plans to Riverside County Emergency Management Department (EMD) who will forward to California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) for review prior to being submitted to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). In addition, we will wait to receive an "Approval Pending Adoption" letter from FEMA before taking the plan to our local governing bodies for adoption. Upon approval, the City of Jurupa Valley will insert the signed resolution.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this local hazard mitigation plan is to identify the City's hazards, review and assess past disaster occurrences, estimate the probability of future occurrences and set goals to mitigate potential risks to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to people and property from natural and man-made hazards.

The plan was prepared pursuant to the requirements of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 to achieve eligibility and potentially secure mitigation funding through Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") Flood Mitigation Assistance, Pre-Disaster Mitigation, and Hazard Mitigation Grant Programs.

City's continual efforts to maintain a disaster-mitigation strategy is on-going. Our goal is to develop and maintain an all-inclusive plan to include all jurisdictions, special districts, businesses and community organizations to promote consistency, continuity and unification.

The City's planning process followed a methodology presented by FEMA and Cal OES which included conducting meetings with the Operational Area Planning Committee (OAPC) coordinated by Riverside County Emergency Management Department (EMD) comprised of participating Federal, State and local jurisdictions agencies, special districts, school districts, non-profit communities, universities, businesses, tribes and general public.

The plan identifies vulnerabilities, provides recommendations for prioritized mitigation actions, evaluates resources and identifies mitigation shortcomings, provides future mitigation planning and maintenance of existing plan.

The plan will be implemented upon FEMA approval.
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LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN
MAY 2018
SECTION 1.0 - COMMUNITY PROFILE

1.1 CITY MAP

1.2 GEOGRAPHY AND CLIMATE DESCRIPTION

The City of Jurupa Valley covers a 44 square mile area and is approximately 5 miles west of the County seat, the City of Riverside. Jurupa Valley is approximately 60 miles east of the City of Los Angeles and approximately 90 miles north of San Diego. The City borders San Bernardino County to the north, Riverside and Norco to the east and south and the City of Eastvale to the West. Portions of the Santa Ana River traverse the southern portion of the city. Two primary transportation corridors traverse the City, Interstate 15 which runs north and south, and State Highway 60, which runs east and west.

The City of Jurupa Valley has a moderate climate with annual rainfall at approximately 2 – 3.5 inches per year. Vegetation is green and bountiful in the winter but can become dry and dense during the summer months. Summers are warm and can reach temperatures above 109 degrees during the peak of the day and remain in the high 80's during the evenings. Winter weather is mild averaging 65 – 76 degrees during the day and dropping down into the mid 30's or 40's in the evenings. Throughout most of the year, you can usually count on warm sunny days, with occasional mild to gusty winds throughout the late summer, fall, and early winter seasons.
1.3 BRIEF HISTORY

The City of Jurupa Valley was incorporated on July 1, 2011 by a group of passionate community volunteers. It is proud to be the 482nd City in California and the 28th City in Riverside County. The City of Jurupa Valley has a long history stretching back to the earliest days of California. Originally part of the vast Mexican land grant known as “Rancho Jurupa”, the area evolved from the days of the caballeros to a place today with a population of over 101,000 people. Its history includes ranching, farming, dairy, mining, and urban growth while maintaining a rural atmosphere. Most of the agricultural areas have been subdivided and formed into many smaller communities such as Glen Avon, Pedley, Mira Loma, BellTown, Rubidoux, Sunnyslope, West Riverside, Granite Hill, Sky Country, and Indian Hills, to name a few.

The City of Jurupa Valley today reflects an equestrian lifestyle that is a mix of high and low density residential development, rural farming and other agricultural activities, and a mix of commercial retail and industrial activity. Many areas have large lots that allow the keeping of horses and other farm animals. Residents here enjoy the close proximity of the Santa Ana River bottom for trail riding and hiking as well as the numerous trails, golf courses, parks, and open areas located throughout the city.

The City of Jurupa Valley has significant capacity for expansion of both residential and commercial development activity. It has been in recent years that residential development and economic activity have increased in particular in the areas adjacent to the I-15 and Hwy 60. The City is a general-law form of government with Council-Manager administration and the City Manager appointed by the five council-members elected at-large.

1.4 ECONOMY DESCRIPTION

Although primarily a bedroom community which limits the sales and property tax base, the City of Jurupa Valley has a diverse business and job base that includes the non-manufacturing sector of agriculture, retail, trucking/warehouse distribution centers, and other support services. The largest employers in the area are the local school district, community service agencies, retail and grocery stores, and smaller manufacturing companies. The area’s labor force includes professional, skilled, and semi-skilled workers.

Expanding commercial and residential opportunities in Jurupa Valley will be a major City focus over the next several years. The majority of residents currently travel to other areas to shop, decreasing the taxable income of the city. As a brand new city, Jurupa Valley will be able to offer excellent retail sites, fast-track development processing, and future housing growth opportunities. With a continually growing population base, this makes the City very attractive to retailers and other commercial users.
**JURUPA VALLEY**

**ECONOMIC AND LABOR FORCE CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Labor Force Participation (%)</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013*</td>
<td>Preliminary Estimate 2021</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employment/Jobs Projections (%)**

- 2020: 34,317
- 2035: 53,466

* Jobs within city boundary

**2011 Employment/Jobs by Industry Sector (%)**

- Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting: 99
- Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction: 9
- Utilities: 55
- Construction: 2,302
- Manufacturing: 2,575
- Wholesale Trade: 1,616
- Retail Trade: 2,506
- Transportation and Warehousing: 5,098
- Information: 264
- Finance and Insurance: 173
- Real Estate and Rental and Leasing: 229
- Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services: 515
- Management of Companies and Enterprises: 269
- Administration & Support, Waste Mgt and Remediation: 840
- Educational Services: 2,341
- Health Care and Social Assistance: 1,117
- Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation: 316
- Accommodation and Food Services: 1,261
- Other Services (excluding Public Administration): 1,409
- Public Administration: 216

**Total All Jobs**: 13,300

**Median Household Income**

- 2000: $48,000
- 2011: $58,560

**Taxable Sales in 1,000s of Dollars (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$184,926</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
1. CA Employment Development Department (City residents working anywhere. Data are not seasonally adjusted)
2. U.S. Census Bureau Local Employment Dynamics
3. Riverside County Projections (RCP10)
4. Decennial Census, US Census Bureau (in 1999 inflation-adjusted dollars)
6. State Board of Equalization

Note: Totals might not add up due to rounding.

Comparing data between years may be problematic because of incorporations & annexations.

Projections are based on April 1, 2010 boundary; therefore, current or future employment in the annexed area may not be reflected in these projections.
Total Jobs
Total Jobs: 2007 - 2015

Sources: California Employment Development Department, 2007 - 2015; InfoGroup; and SCAG

- Total jobs include wage and salary jobs and jobs held by business owners and self-employed persons. The total job count does not include unpaid volunteers or family workers, and private household workers.

- In 2015, total jobs in the City of Jurupa Valley numbered 27,131, an increase of 21.5 percent from 2007.
1.5 POPULATION AND HOUSING

According to the most current State Department of Finance Report released in May 2017, the City of Jurupa Valley has a current population base of 101,315.

Figure 1.5A City of Jurupa Valley Population Characteristics

- In 2016, the total population of the City of Jurupa Valley was 98,177.
- 4.2% of the total population of Riverside County is in the City of Jurupa Valley.
- The City of Jurupa Valley was incorporated in 2011, therefore data for previous years is not available.
III. Households

Number of Households (Occupied Housing Units)

Number of Households: 2012 - 2016

- In 2016, the total number of households in the City of Jurupa Valley was 24,936 units.
- 3.5 percent of Riverside County's total number of households are in the City of Jurupa Valley.
- In 2016, the city's average household size was 3.9, higher than the county average of 3.2.

1.6 DEVELOPMENT TRENDS AND LAND USE

With a population of approximately 101,315 the Jurupa Valley has tremendous potential for commercial development to serve the local communities as well as freeway related commercial development.

The Riverside County Economic Development Strategic Plan identified that the area suffers from significant retail leakage to outside communities. A large amount of prime vacant land is available for such commercial development locations in Mira Loma, Glen Avon and Pedley.

Some of these potential development locations are near Pedley Road at the 60 Freeway, Limonite at Interstate 15, Limonite Avenue at Van Buren Boulevard, Mission Boulevard at Pedley Road and Limonite Avenue at Clay Street. In addition, the Mission Boulevard Revitalization Program in Rubidoux will stimulate the rebuilding of the central business core.
Through redevelopment, a project area will receive focused attention and financial investment to reverse deteriorating trends and structures, create jobs, revitalize the business climate, rehabilitate and add to the affordable housing stock, and gain active participation and investment by citizens which may not otherwise occur in areas where the private sector are less inclined to invest without governmental assistance.

SECTION 2.0 - PLANNING PROCESS

2.1 LOCAL PLANNING PROCESS

Representatives from multiple City departments met on a regular basis to identify and prioritize hazards and appropriate mitigation strategies. All Stakeholders were invited to participate through phone calls, emails, and meetings.

City Departments represented at these meetings included:

- City Manager
- Emergency Services Manager/PIO
- Jurupa Valley Sheriff’s Department Deputy and Lieutenant
- Riverside County Fire Department, Battalion Chief
- City Engineer/Public Works Director
- Chief Building Office

2.2 PARTICIPATION IN REGIONAL (OA) PLANNING PROCESS

The City of Jurupa Valley is California’s newest incorporated city as of July 1, 2011. We did not come into the LHMP planning process until the end of October of 2011. The hiring of consultants to staff the numerous city positions did not occur right away however, staff and council realized the importance of participation within the LHMP, and the identification and development of the city’s LHMP plan became a priority.

Planning:

- May 11, 2017 - One on one meeting with EMD LHMP Team
- OAPC – Meets quarterly
- Riverside County Emergency Management Department LHMP Workshop – June 6th
  2016, EMD Riverwalk building, Riverside CA. 9 a.m. to 10 a.m.

2.3 DATES AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

This document will be published on the City’s social media account and website at www.jurupavalle.org. Screenshot of this is included under Appendix A. The document will also be available at City Hall with a comment box nearby. Photos of this display are included under Appendix A. Further, the City of Jurupa Valley intends to allow an organized forum for public comment when such activities can be scheduled during the 2018 calendar year.
2.4 PLANS ADOPTED BY RESOLUTION

Upon approval by FEMA, the LHMP will be presented to the Jurupa Valley City Council in a public meeting for adoption via an official Resolution.

SECTION 3.0 – MITIGATION ACTIONS/UPDATES

3.1 UPDATES FROM 2012 PLAN

There are no significant changes in priorities. All items listed in the mitigation strategies have been addressed and are complete or updated.

3.2 LIST OF COUNTY AND CITY HAZARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riverside County Hazards</th>
<th>Final Ranking</th>
<th>Jurupa Valley Hazards</th>
<th>Final Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandemic Flu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pandemic Flu</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildland Fire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wildland Fire</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Failure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Electrical Failure</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent Disease/Contamination</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Emergent Disease/Contamination</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber Attack</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorist Event</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Terrorist Event</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Failure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Communications Failure</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Civil Disorder</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Disorder</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Drought</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nuclear/Radiological Incident</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear/Radiological Incident</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Extreme Weather</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Weather</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Transportation Failure</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Failure</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Water Supply Disruption/Contamination</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dam Failure</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqueduct</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Insect Infestation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornado</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>HazMat Incident</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insect Infestation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pipeline Disruption</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail/Prison Event</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dam Failure</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline Disruption</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Acqueduct</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tornado</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HazMat Incident</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cyber Attack</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply Disruption/Contamination</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Jail/Prison Event</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 BRIEF STATEMENT OF UNIQUE HAZARDS

The hazards in the City of Jurupa Valley are very similar to Riverside County, including earthquake, flooding, and fire threats. Additionally, the City of Jurupa Valley has potential transportation related hazards since State HWY 60, a major east-west transportation corridor and I-15 both run through the borders of the city. There are major rail line corridors within the city, a Metrolink commuter rail service and station, and numerous freight branch lines. Jurupa Valley is also one of the largest trucking hubs in the State of California with over 44 carriers residing in the city and numerous warehouse distribution centers. Another concern for the city would be the risk of wildfires occurring within the large expanse of the Santa Ana Riverbed that runs through the southern portion of the city.

The most prominent hazards faced by residents of City of Jurupa Valley are a major earthquake, flooding potential from 100 year storm events in winter months along the Santa Ana River bank, and windstorms causing power outages. A long term power outage in summer months could produce life threatening extreme heat conditions for residents without access to air conditioning.

The City could also be impacted by terrorism or bio-terrorism that initially targets the Chino, Flabob and Ontario Airports and then spreads the impact to surrounding communities.

Riverside County has experienced severe flooding many times throughout its history, resulting in the loss of lives and millions of dollars in property damage. Floods are caused by rivers and creeks overflowing their banks, and most property damage has occurred where development has been allowed without regard for flood hazard.

Earthquake risk is very high in western Riverside County (which includes Jurupa Valley), due to the presence of two of California’s most active faults: the San Andreas and San Jacinto.
Figure 3.3A City of Jurupa Flood Hazard Map

Figure 3.3B City of Jurupa Valley Fire Hazard Map
Figure 3.3C City of Jurupa Valley Earthquake Fault Zones
### 3.4 Mitigation Project Updates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Fund (Budget)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCFCD</td>
<td>Day Creek Channel, Stage 6</td>
<td>Construction: Under Const</td>
<td>Lucretia closed b/twn 65th &amp; 66th until mid-Nov 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JV/RCFCD 9</td>
<td>Pyrite St Pave/ment Rehab (See RCFCD Pyrite Ck SD Bypass)</td>
<td>Gas Taxi($470k)</td>
<td>PS&amp;E: 11/15/12 Bid Award: Jan- Feb/Mar 2013 Construction: May-Jul 2013</td>
<td>1. Included street work in coord w/ RCFCD Pyrite Channel Bypass project allocate $310,000 to coop agmt. const admin by RCFCD 2. Consider reallocation $160,000 to Local Streets pavement rehab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCFCD</td>
<td>Day Creek Channel, Line J, Stage 2</td>
<td>Construction: Under construction Feb 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCFCD</td>
<td>Mira Loma-Beach St Storm Drain</td>
<td>PS&amp;E: Approved Bid Award: Ongoing- Nov 6 BOS Award Construction: Dec 15, 2012-Dec 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Plans approved by City/Coop Agreement apvd by City 2. Utility relocations Nov 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCSD Upstream</td>
<td>Jurupa Rd Trunk Sewer-</td>
<td>PS&amp;E: 100% Bid Award: Dec 2012-Jan 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCSD</td>
<td>Area B Trunk Sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCSD</td>
<td>Sky Country Trunk Sewer, Wineville (65th-641th), 64th (Wineville-Smith), Smith (64th 63rd), Easement (63rd Limonite) &amp; Limonite (E) to Sky 3 Lift Sta</td>
<td>PS&amp;E: Approved Bid Award: Jan/Feb 2013 Construction: March 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Monitor JCSD schedule; coord construction of Limonite Ave. project, relocate water line to clear deep SS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 4.0 - Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

#### 4.1 Critical Facilities and Infrastructures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Facilities Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Treatment Plant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Well /Tank Sites</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Distribution Plant</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Lift Stations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAS – Blue Rhino</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation – Flabob Airport</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Transit RTA bus stops throughout the city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellular Towers</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Stations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Station / EOC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Yards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroads – Metrolink Station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroads- intersect throughout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City – Union Pacific, Burlington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Santa Fe</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges – Van Buren/Limonite</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio-Motorola</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Elderly Facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2 ESTIMATING POTENTIAL LOSS

Map show parcels exposed to flood plain hazards in terms of value of structures. Riverside County’s assessor’s data can be used to calculate the improved value of parcels. (Please refer to Riverside County Operational Area Estimated Property Loss Values by City Table in Section 4.5.

### 4.3 TABLE REPLACEMENT VALUES

City of Jurupa Valley owns one 26-acre park along the Santa Ana River and four acres along 68th Street. We currently rent office space and as a full "contract city," both Sheriff and Fire services are contractually procured; the two Community Service Districts and the Jurupa Area Recreation and Parks District are governed by their own board of directors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF ASSET</th>
<th>REPLACEMENT VALUE</th>
<th>OCCUPANCY</th>
<th>HAZARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITY HALL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Jurupa Valley City Hall</td>
<td>Lease - Unknown</td>
<td>On-File</td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Rubidoux High</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nueva Vista Continuation Figh</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Fire Hazard Severity Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Patriot High</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Jurupa Valley High</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rio Vista Continuation High</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mission Middle</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Jurupa Middle</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mira Loma Middle</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Camino Real Elementary</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Glen Avon Elementary</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Granite Hill Elementary</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ina Arbuckle Elementary</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Indian Hills Elementary</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Mission Bell Elementary</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Pacific Avenue Elementary</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Pedley Elementary</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Peralta Elementary</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Rustic Lane Elementary</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Sky Country Elementary</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Stone Avenue Elementary</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Sunnyslope Elementary</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Fire Hazard Severity Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Facility Name</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Risk Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Troth Street Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Van Buren Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, High Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>VanderMolen Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, High Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>West Riverside Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Blue Rhino</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Flabob Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pedley Metrolink Station</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, Low Hazard of Flooding Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fire Protection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Riverside County Fire Department CAL-FIRE Station 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Riverside County Fire Department CAL-FIRE Station 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, High Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Riverside County Fire Department CAL-FIRE Station 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, Low Hazard of Flooding Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Riverside County Fire Department CAL-FIRE Station 38</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, Low Hazard of Flooding Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jurupa Community Services District</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, High Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jurupa Community Services District</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rubidoux Community Services District</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other Government Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eddie D Smith Senior Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Western Riverside and City Animal Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, High Hazard of Flooding Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rubidoux Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>California Family Life Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jurupa Family Health Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, High Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jurupa Unified School District</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Ground Shaking, Low Hazard of Flooding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN
MAY 2018
4.4 IDENTIFICATION OF RISKS AND VULNERABILITIES

The jurisdictions were asked to rate the potential and severity using a scale of between 0 and 4 (4 being the most severe). The jurisdictions were also asked to rank the listed hazards as they relate to their jurisdiction (1 being the highest overall threat to their jurisdiction). Please see Riverside County MJHMP Section 5 for past occurrences of hazards affecting Jurupa Valley.

1. Flood – Severity – 3, Probability – 3, Ranking-1

The Santa Ana River is normally a small meandering slow moving water system which becomes a raging river whenever there is substantial rainfall. The City is working in conjunction with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District to identify and mitigate areas that may cause or have the potential to cause damage or destruction of property.

Heavy rain events can also lead to problems with storm drainage systems and create localized flood problems. According to the City of Jurupa Valley Storm Drain Master Plan, there are several flooding problem areas in the City. These areas are primarily a result of undersized pipes where the runoff exceeds the pipe capacity even for minor storms. Compounding the storm water run-off, the geological features of Jurupa Valley is that everything slopes in a southwesterly direction. Storm water from the City of Riverside and surrounding areas northeast of Jurupa Valley are draining westward into Jurupa Valley storm water facilities. (Please see Riverside County MJHMP Section 5.3.9)

2. Earthquake - Severity – 4, Probability – 3, Ranking-2

City of Jurupa Valley is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone. The nearest active earthquake fault is the San Andreas Fault located on the northern part of the city.

In the past, Jurupa Valley has experienced tremendous and damaging earthquakes in December 1899 and in April 1918. The quakes each had magnitudes of approximately 6.6 on the Richter scale and caused substantial damage to existing buildings, including several deaths related to the events. There have been several noticeable ground movements in recent years, most notably the Landers and Big Bear earthquakes in 1992,
and the Northridge earthquake in 1994, but no local damage was sustained during these more recent events. (Please see Riverside County MJHMP Section 5.3.1).

3. Wild Fire - Severity -3, Probability -4, Ranking-3

A Wildfire is an uncontrolled fire spreading through vegetative fuels, posing danger and destruction to property. Wildfires can occur in undeveloped areas and spread to urban areas. The City of Jurupa Valley is in a High Fire Hazard Zone and has potential impact due to the vegetation in the Santa Ana River bottom. The Community Services District is responsible for the maintenance to remove the vegetation. (Please see Riverside County MJHMP Section 5.3.3).

5. Severe Weather - Heat/Wind/Cold - Severity -2, Probability -4, Ranking-4

The City of Jurupa Valley utilizes the local Jurupa Area Recreation and Parks District community centers as cooling stations working closely with Riverside County Office of Emergency Services during severe heat events.

Severe Weather: The city has not recently experienced a severe heat related weather event. (Please see Riverside County MJHMP Section 5.3.13).


Along with the potential for death and injuries from large-scale motor vehicle accidents, there is the potential for hazardous material spills or fires as numerous commercial transportation vehicles travel intra-city roadways with various types and quantities of hazardous materials, fuels, and chemicals. (Please see Riverside County MJHMP Section 5.3.14).

6. Drought - Severity -3, Probability -2, Ranking-6

Although the City of Jurupa Valley has never experienced a severe drought event, the city has established an ordinance to manage general public water usage, to include irrigation restrictions during severe weather related events. (Please see Riverside County MJHMP Section 5.3.11).

7. Agricultural Hazards - Severity -4, Probability -2, Ranking-7

A small area of Jurupa Valley is dedicated to agricultural businesses. Production of fruits, vegetables, flowers/trees, sod, and other produce items are grown within the city. Crop losses in the surrounding area due to hazards have economic impacts in Riverside County. Some of the businesses in jurisdiction are agricultural based including other dairy/poultry industry related businesses which have a substantial impact on the city’s
economy; to include Riverside County in general. Our agriculturally based economy is vulnerable to freezes, heat waves, flooding, and insect infestations.

Any time a hazard-related event results in reduced crop or product production, the City of Jurupa Valley is negatively impacted by loss of revenue to major businesses, to include labor force reductions. The associated unemployment affects the crime rate, housing market, local businesses, and the City's sales tax revenues. (Please see Riverside County MJHMP Section 5.3.13.5)

SECTION 5.0 – COMMUNITY RATING SYSTEM

5.1 REPETITIVE LOSS PROPERTIES

There are zero repetitive loss properties in the City of Jurupa Valley reported to date.

5.2 NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROPERTIES

a. Describe participation in NFIP, including any changes since previously approved plan.

The City is compliant with the NFIP Program. We will provide NFIP Brochures to residents within the High Flood Zones and also during outreach events.

b. Date first joined NFIP. 9/23/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CID</th>
<th>COMMUNITY NAME</th>
<th>INIT FHBM</th>
<th>INIT FIRM IDENTIFIED</th>
<th>CURR EFF MAP DATE</th>
<th>REG-EMER DATE</th>
<th>IDENTIFIED TRIBAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>060286#</td>
<td>JURUPA VALLEY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>08/18/14</td>
<td>08/18/14</td>
<td>09/23/13</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Identify actions related to continued compliance with NFIP.

Initiated CLOMRS for developing properties.

d. CRS member? No.

e. CRS class? N/A

f. Describe any data used to regulate flood hazard area other than FEMA maps.

Engineering studies and consultation with Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCWCD).
g. *Have there been issues with community participation in the program?*

No, we need revised and updated maps.

h. *What are the general hurdles for effective implementation of the NFIP?*

We currently are waiting for a BAO letter from FEMA for hydrology and hydraulic studies performed for the Santa Ana River by the RCFCWCD.

i. *Summarize actions related to continued compliance with NFIP*

Distribute map information, participate in development reviews, consult with RCFCWCD.

ii. *Repetitive Loss Properties*

None. Residents who have property within mapped areas are eligible to purchase flood insurance.

**SECTION 6.0 - CAPABILITIES ASSESSMENT**

**6.1 REGULATORY MITIGATION CAPABILITIES**

Capabilities are the programs and policies currently in use to reduce hazard impacts or that could be used to implement hazard mitigation activities. This capabilities assessment is divided into five sections –

- Regulatory Mitigation Capabilities
- Administrative And Technical Mitigation Capabilities
- Fiscal Mitigation Capabilities
- Mitigation Outreach And Partnerships
- Funding Sources

The City of Jurupa Valley is a recently incorporated City and currently working on the development of our own regulatory plans, including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Tool</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adopted in September 2017, this plan outlines the future changes in the City such as new infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning ordinance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Incorporated into Municipal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision ordinance</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>County of Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site plan review requirements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth management ordinance</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>County of Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain ordinance</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>F.E.M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other special purpose ordinance (stormwater, water conservation,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficient Landscape Irrigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildfire)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ordinance required by MS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Code</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>State code adopted with amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department ISO rating</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>BCEGS submitted, pending reply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion or sediment control program</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Informally address sediment issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stormwater Ordinance required by MS4 City Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Emergency Operations Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other special plans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Insurance Study or other engineering study for streams</td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water Quality Management Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.2 ADMINISTRATIVE/TECHNICAL MITIGATION CAPABILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Resources</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Department/Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planner/engineer with knowledge of land development/land management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Planning Director/City Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer/professional trained in construction practices related to</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>City Engineer and Building Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buildings and/or infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner/engineer/scientist with an understanding of natural hazards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>City Engineer via Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel skilled in GIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time building official</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Building Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain manager</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 FISCAL MITIGATION CAPABILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Resources</th>
<th>Accessible/Eligible to Use (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grants</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital improvements project funding</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority to levy taxes for specific purposes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>With voter approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees for water, sewer, gas, or electric services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fees for new development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incur debt through general obligation bonds</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>With voter approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incur debt through special tax bonds</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>With voter approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incur debt through private activities</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withhold spending in hazard prone areas</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 MITIGATION OUTREACH AND PARTNERSHIPS

The City of Jurupa Valley serves as a host for CERT training with the help of the Riverside County Emergency Management Department. In addition, the City has many volunteers and active Rotary and council outreach meetings. The City of Jurupa Valley is also works with the following agencies: Riverside County Flood Control District (RCFD), Riverside County EDA (RCEDA), Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD), Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD), Jurupa Area Recreation and Parks District (JARPD), and Santa Ana River Water Co.

The City of Jurupa Valley has a Public Works Department that is in charge of owned infrastructure, like streets, bike lanes, sidewalks, storm drains, and traffic signals. Any mitigation actions that involve retrofitting infrastructure to prevent hazards such as earthquake or fire would fall under this department's responsibility.
6.5 FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

The City of Jurupa Valley has the same funding opportunities as Riverside County Operational Area. Please refer to Section 7.4 of the Riverside County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan for list of funding sources available.

SECTION 7.0 - MITIGATION STRATEGIES

7.1 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The City of Jurupa Valley has created list of Mitigation Strategies and Goals for the primary hazards previously identified.

Goal 1: Implement mitigation policies and strategies contained in the City of Jurupa Valley

Objective 1.1: Implement new development ordinances.

Goal 2: Continue to educate the general public in mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery activities.

Objective 2.1: Continue training city staff on emergency preparedness to include: Emergency Operation Center activities, Emergency Operations Plan through the Standardized Emergency Management System (S.E.M.S.) and the National Incident Management System (N.I.M.S.).

Objective 2.2: Continue to provide general public training on emergency awareness and preparedness through CERT programs.

Objective 2.3: Continue emergency preparedness training activities in coordination with surrounding agencies, special districts, community groups, and school districts.

7.2 MITIGATION ACTIONS

The City has implemented and provided mitigation efforts below in sections 7.2, 7.3, and 7.4 based only on hazards that are considered high priority such as, flood, earthquake, and fire. These efforts include the following:

- The separate water service agencies have installed auxiliary power sources on various municipal water wells and sewer lift stations.

  Priority: High

  Responsible Dept: JCSD/RCSD
Timeframe: completed
Funding/cost: unknown – funded by other agencies
Hazard: Structural (earthquake)

- The City's Code Enforcement Office proactively responds and enforces city ordinances related to weed abatement violations to reduce fire threat.

Priority: High
Responsible Dept: Building & Safety Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding/cost: unknown
Hazard: Structural (earthquake), flood, and fire.

- The City has remodeled its police station to include a functional Emergency Operation Center (EOC) with alternative power source, internet connections, and media screens to enhance operations.

Priority: High
Responsible Dept: Sheriff's Department
Timeframe: complete
Funding/cost: unknown – funded by other agencies
Hazard: General

- The Police Department / Riverside County Sheriff's Department have mutual aid agreements in place to include valuable resources such as hazardous materials unit, air support, and search and rescue units among others.

Priority: High
Responsible Dept: Sheriff's Department
Timeframe: ongoing
Funding/cost: covered in general funding of contract police services
Hazard: General
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Hazard</th>
<th>Mitigation Action</th>
<th>Lead Department/Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Status Update</th>
<th>Potential Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Flood** | Day Creek Channel, Stage 6 Phase 2 Project No. 221-1-8-00250-06-12  
The project is located in the city of Jurupa Valley, Riverside County and begins within Goose Creek Golf Club, approximately 1,150 lineal feet downstream of Lucretia Avenue. The improvements extend upstream and tie into the existing concrete lined channel locate approximately 600 lineal feet downstream of Limonite Avenue. Improvements where made below the existing bridges at Holmes Avenue and 64th Street to provide 100-year storm conveyance capacity. | Riverside County Flood Control | Completed 4/23/13 | NA |
| **Flood** | Mira Loma - Beach Street Storm Drain, Stage 2 Project No. 221-1-8-00137-01-12  
The project consisted of approximately 6,800 feet of an underground storm drain, inlets and outlet works. Located along Beach Street between 59th Street and 53rd Street, along Rutile Street, 54th Street and ends at Cedar Street in the incorporated residential area of Mira Loma in the city of Jurupa Valley of Northwestern Riverside County. | Riverside County Flood Control | Completed 9/1/15 | NA |
| **Flood** | Pyrite Channel Bypass, Pyrite Street Storm Drain, Stage 1 Project No. 221-1-8-00109-01-12  
This project consists of 1,700 feet of underground storm drain within Pyrite Street in the city of Jurupa Valley. The drain connects Pyrite Street Storm Drain upstream of Pyrite Street to Jurupa Channel. | Riverside County Flood Control | Completed 1/16/15 | NA |
| **Flood** | Jurupa - Pyrite MDP Line A-2 Project No. 1-8-00234 Stage 1  
Master planned lateral storm drain to Jurupa Channel. Project is east-west drain crossing Agate Street about 1,000 feet south of Jurupa Road. Outlet point at Jurupa Channel is unimproved and likely to remain so | Riverside County Flood Control | 30% Plans & R/W Acquisition as of February 2018 | Property taxes/Capital Improvement Program |
7.3 ON-GOING MITIGATION STRATEGY PROGRAMS

Rubidoux Community Services District is currently designing a new $2.8 million dollar 6MG water storage tank, a $10 million dollar sewage conveyance facilities damaged during the 2005 flood, and a $150,000 water service replacement project.

Priority: High

Responsible Dept: Rubidoux Community Services District (separate agency)

Timeframe: ongoing

Funding/cost: RCSD water restricted capital fund (outside agency)

Hazard: Structural (earthquake), fire

Project #1: Reduce the level of risk to loss of life, personal injury, public and private property damage, economic and social dislocation, and disruption of vital community services that would result from earthquake.

Goal 1: Adopt all of Riverside County Ordinances and Resolution including Land Ordinances. The City has completed this part of the process by adopting and implementing Ordinance No. 2011-01. Additional ordinances are adopted as needed on an ongoing basis to address issues that arise.

Objective: Amend the Building and Zoning Codes to incorporate specific standards for siting, seismic design, and review of Critical Facilities.

Action: Require all new developments, existing critical facilities and structures to comply with the most recent California Building Code seismic design standards.

Priority: High

Responsible Dept: Planning and Building Departments

Timeframe: Ongoing for the life of the plan 2018-2022. This action will be reevaluated during the updating stage of the plan.

Funding/cost: Current funding; cost unknown

Hazard: Earthquake
Project #2- Improve the Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) Program in Jurupa Valley to educate people about disaster preparedness for hazards that may impact their area and train them in basic disaster response skills to respond in our community.

Objective: Partner with Riverside County Fire – Office of Emergency Services and neighboring communities to host CERT Trainings.

Action: Build a team of volunteers who are personally prepared for a disaster and provide CERT training for them to respond in our communities.

Priority: High

Responsible Dept: City of Jurupa Valley and Riverside County Fire- Office of Emergency Services

Timeframe: Ongoing for the life of the plan 2018-2022. This action will be reevaluated during the updating stage of the plan

Funding/cost: Homeland Security/Pre-mitigation funding

Hazard: All Hazards

7.4 FUTURE MITIGATION STRATEGIES

Project #1 - Enhanced proactivity in enforcement of vacant land weed abatement

Goal: Reduce risk of wildland fires.

Objective: Focused enforcement of non-compliance.

Action: Direct chief Building Official to increase enforcement priority on vacant land.

Priority: High

Responsible Dept: Code Enforcement

Timeframe: Ongoing for the life of the plan 2018-2022. This action will be reevaluated during the updating stage of the plan

Funding/cost: Current funding; cost unknown

Hazard: Wildland Fires

Project #2 – Local Drainage Flood Control Capital Projects

Goal: Reduce local flooding and road closure incidents.
Objective: Continue focus on improving local drainage issues to mitigate flooding and road closures to protect property and infrastructure.

Action: Prioritize future capital projects focused on mitigating flood risk of flood-prone areas.

Priority: High

Responsible Dept: Engineer/Public Works

Timeframe: Ongoing for the life of the plan 2018-2022. This action will be reevaluated during the updating stage of the plan.

Funding/cost: Current funding; cost unknown

Hazard: Flooding

SECTION 8.0 - PLAN IMPLEMENTATION AND MAINTENANCE PROCESS

Upon adoption and approval by City Council, the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) will be reviewed, evaluated and monitored by LHMP committee members a minimum of once per year. The LHMP committee made up of City staff members and general public representatives will propose revisions to the LHMP. After every review, the committee will provide for a public hearing and submittal to City Council for approval and adoption of such recommendations to the LHMP. If we discover changes have occurred during the evaluation, the City will submit the most current copy to Riverside County Emergency Management Department to submit to Cal CES and FEMA. A comprehensive review, evaluation and update of the LHMP will occur every five years.

The methodology to update the plan will be the following:

- The goals and objectives and address current and expected conditions.
- If the nature, magnitude, and/or type of risks have changed, we will update plan as necessary.
- Current resources for implementing the plan and explore new resources implementation problems, such as technical, political, legal, or coordination issues with other agencies.
- The outcomes to ensure they are in line with the expected outcome, if not we will modify plan.
- Changes in Federal, State and local ordinances, if laws and regulations have changed, we will make changes to reflect current regulations.
- Involve public by posting notices on websites and announcements during public meetings intent to review and update Local Hazard Mitigation Plan allowing for public comment and input.
SECTION 9.0 - INCORPORATION INTO EXISTING PLANNING MECHANISMS

The City of Jurupa Valley will be incorporating mitigation strategies and considerations into the development of their future plans such as a General Plan and Emergency Operations Plan. It is already implemented into the following planning mechanisms:

- Building and Construction Codes
- Fire Codes
- Capital Improvement Plan
- Storm Drain Master Plan
- Stormwater Ordinance required by MS4
- Efficient Landscape Irrigation Ordinance required by MS4
- City Stormwater Procedural Manual
- Local Implementation Plan
- Facilities Management Plan
- Water Quality Management Plan

SECTION 10.0 - CONTINUED PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The general public will have access to the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) online via City website with the ability to send comments, or ability to review hard copies available at public areas within City Hall and other city facilities. Approximately every 10-12 months after initial adoption by City Council, the LHMP will be reviewed and evaluated by staff members and general public members represented on the LHMP committee, to review, evaluate and monitor the LHMP, and to evaluate and incorporate all public comments on the Plan.
APPENDIX A – PUBLIC OUTREACH OPPORTUNITIES & JURUPA VALLEY BOUNDARY PLAN MAP

Local Hazard Mitigation Plan

Plan Overview

The City of Jurupa Valley maintains an active Local Hazard Mitigation Plan ("LHMP"). The LHMP is the primary reference document for the City when preparing for emergency situations. The document is also referenced as emergency situations unfold. Currently, the City is accepting comments on this plan. Please review the draft copy below before commenting. Comments may also be made at City Hall, located at 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509.

Local Hazard Mitigation Plan ("LHMP") (2017)

Comment on Local Hazard Mitigation Plan

- First Name
- Last Name
- Are you a Jurupa Valley resident?
- Comment

Submit Cancel