RESOLUTION NO. 2024-102

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY CERTIFYING AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, MAKING FINDINGS, AND ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS AND A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 16001, SPECIFIC PLAN (SP16001), A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CANADIAN PACIFIC LAND, LLC, A FLORIDA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, RMD INLAND INVESTORS, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, , AND MV AVALON, LLC, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NOS. 37074 AND 38639 TO PERMIT THE DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 1,697 NEW RESIDENTIAL UNITS, 1,269,774 SQUARE FEET OF LIGHT INDUSTRIAL LAND USE, 1,428,768 SQUARE FEET OF BUSINESS PARK LAND USE, 510.8 ACRES OF NATURAL OPEN SPACE, 14.3 ACRES OF PARK AND RECREATIONAL AMENITIES, AND 13.4 ACRES FOR A PUBLIC SCHOOL SITE GENERALLY LOCATED NORTH OF STATE ROUTE 60, BETWEEN ARMSTRONG ROAD AND RUBIDOUX BOULEVARD (RIO VISTA PROJECT)

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

Section 1. **Project**.

(a) Richmond Planned Communities (the "Applicant") has applied for Master Application No. 16054 (MA No 16054) which consists of General Plan Amendment No. 16001; Specific Plan No. 16001 replacing the existing Rio Vista Specific Plan No. 243 that was adopted by the County of Riverside with new land planning areas, objective design and development standards and development plans; Development Agreement No. 16001; and Tentative Tract Map Nos. 37074 and 38639 to allow the development of up to 1,697 new residential units on 204.4 acres, 1,269,774 square feet of light industrial land use on 58.3 acres, 1,428,768 square feet of business park land use on 82 acres, 510.8 acres of natural open space, 14.3 acres of park and recreational amenities and 13.4 acres of public school site (the "Project"). The Project site consists of approximately 917.3 acres and is located north of State Route (SR) 60, between Armstrong Road and Rubidoux Boulevard.

Section 2. **Procedural Findings**.

(a) The application for the Project was processed including, but not limited to, a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and local law, including the California Environmental Quality Act.

(b) On June 26, 2024, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on MA No. 16045 at which time all persons interested in the Project had the

opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. The Planning Commission hearing was subsequently continued to July 10, 2024 and July 24, 2024 where staff, the Applicant, and the public had an opportunity and did address the Planning Commission regarding the project. Following the receipt of public testimony on July 24, 2024, the Planning Commission closed the public hearing, and voted 4-1 to adopt Resolution No. PC-2024-15 recommending that the City Council approve the Project.

(c) On August 15, 2024, the City Council of the City of Jurupa opened the public hearing on the Project and continued the hearing to September 5 2024. On September 5, 2024 to the City Council held a duly noticed public hearing on the Project at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity to and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing.

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

Section 3. **California Environmental Quality Act Procedural Findings**. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley makes the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the proposed Project:

(a) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21000 *et seq.*) and the State CEQA Guidelines (the "Guidelines") (14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15000 *et seq.*), the City is the lead agency for the proposed Project because it is the public agency with the authority and principal responsibility for reviewing, considering, and potentially approving the proposed Project.

(b) The City determined that an environmental impact report (EIR) would be required for the proposed Project and issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on November 26, 2021. The NOP was sent to the State Clearinghouse (SCH #2016051062), responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and interested parties and posted on the City's website on November 26, 2021. The thirty (30)-day public review period ran from December 6, 2021 to January 4, 2022 with the purpose to receive comments and input from interested public agencies and private parties on issues to be addressed in the EIR for the proposed Project.

(c) In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15082(c)(1), a scoping meeting was held during the NOP review period, on December 14, 2021, to solicit additional suggestions on the scope of the Draft EIR. Attendees were provided an opportunity to identify verbally or in writing the issues they felt should be addressed in the Draft EIR; no verbal or written comments were received during the scoping meeting.

(d) Thereafter, the City contracted for the independent preparation of a Draft EIR for the proposed Project, including preparation and review, as applicable, of all necessary technical studies and reports in support of the Draft EIR. In accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the City analyzed the proposed Project's potential impacts on the environment, potential mitigation, and potential alternatives to the proposed Project.

(e) Upon completion of the Draft EIR on October 19, 2020, the City initiated a public comment period by preparing and sending a Notice of Availability ("NOA") to all responsible agencies, trustee agencies, the Riverside County Clerk, other interested parties, and

organizations and individuals who had previously requested the NOA to inform recipients that the Draft EIR was available for a forty-five (45)-day public review period beginning October 19, 2023 and ending on January 5, 2024. The NOA also was published in The Press Enterprise.

(f) The City also sent a Notice of Completion ("NOC") and copies of the Draft EIR to the California Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse, on October 19, 2023.

(g) Copies of the Draft EIR were sent to various public agencies, as well as to organizations and individuals requesting copies. In addition, copies of the documents have been available for public review and inspection at the Jurupa Valley City Hall and two Jurupa Valley Public Library facilities (Glen Avon Library, and Louis Rubidoux Library). The Draft EIR was also made available for download via the City's website: http://www.jurupavalley.org.

(h) In response to the Draft EIR, written comments were received from various agencies, individuals, and organizations. In compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, written responses to all comments that were timely received on the Draft EIR were prepared. None of the comments present any new significant environmental impacts or otherwise constitute significant new information requiring recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

(i) The Final EIR consists of the Draft EIR and all of its appendices, the comments and responses to comments on the Draft EIR, and clarifications/revisions to the Draft EIR. The Final EIR was made available to the public and to all commenting agencies at least 10 days prior to certification of the Final EIR, in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21092.5(a).

(j) Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that the City, before approving a project for which an EIR is required, make one or more of the following written finding(s) for each significant effect identified in the EIR accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding:

1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final EIR; or,

2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency; or,

3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

(k) These required written findings are set forth in Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by reference as if set forth in full.

(l) CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 requires that if a project will cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts, the City must adopt a Statement of Overriding

Considerations prior to approving the project. A Statement of Overriding Considerations states that any significant adverse project effects are acceptable if expected project benefits outweigh unavoidable adverse environmental impacts. The Statement of Overriding Considerations is attached to this Resolution as Exhibit "B" and is herein incorporated by reference as if set forth in full, and is hereby adopted.

(m) CEQA Section 21081.6 requires the City to prepare and adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for any project for which mitigation measures have been imposed to ensure compliance with the adopted mitigation measures. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is attached to this Resolution as Exhibit "C" and is herein incorporated by reference as if set forth in full, and is hereby adopted.

(n) Prior to taking action on this Resolution, the City Council has heard, been presented with, reviewed, and considered the information and data in the administrative record, including any comments on the EIR, staff reports and presentations, and all oral and written testimony presented during the public hearings on the proposed Project.

(o) Custodian of Records. The City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley is the custodian of records, and the documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are located at the Office of the City Clerk, City of Jurupa Valley, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California, 92509.

Section 4. **California Environmental Quality Act Substantive Findings**. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley, California does hereby:

(a) Declare that the above Procedural Findings are true and correct, and hereby incorporate them herein by this reference.

(b) Find that agencies and interested members of the public have been afforded ample notice and opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR and the proposed Project.

(c) Find and declare that the City Council has independently considered the administrative record before it, which is hereby incorporated by reference and which includes the Final EIR, staff reports, all appendices to the Draft EIR and technical reports supporting the analysis, clarifications/revisions to the Draft EIR, and all testimony related to environmental issues regarding the proposed Project.

(d) Find and determine that the Final EIR fully analyzes and discloses the potential impacts of the proposed Project, and that those impacts have been mitigated or avoided to the extent feasible for the reasons set forth in the Findings attached as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by reference, with the exception of those impacts found to be significant and unmitigable as discussed therein.

(e) Find and declare that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City Council. The City Council further finds that the additional information provided in the staff reports and the evidence presented in written and oral testimony does not constitute new information requiring recirculation of the EIR under CEQA. None of the information presented has deprived the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial environmental

impact of the proposed Project or a feasible mitigation measure or alternative that the City has declined to implement.

(f) The City Council hereby certifies the Final EIR as being in compliance with CEQA, adopts the Findings pursuant to CEQA and the Statement of Overriding Considerations as set forth in Exhibit "B" and adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program attached as Exhibit "C." The City Council further determines that all of the findings made in this Resolution are based upon the information and evidence set forth in the Final EIR and upon other substantial evidence that has been presented at the hearing before the Planning Commission, and in the record of the proceedings. The City Council further finds that each of the overriding benefits stated in Exhibit "B" by itself, would individually justify proceeding with the proposed Project despite any significant unavoidable impacts identified in the Final EIR or alleged in the record of proceedings.

(g) The City Council hereby imposes as a condition on the Project each mitigation measure specified in Exhibit "C" and directs City staff to implement and to monitor the mitigation measures as described in Exhibit "C."

(h) The City Council directs staff to file a Notice of Determination as set forth in Public Resources Code Section 21152.

Section 5. **Certification**. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 5th day of September, 2024.

Guillermo Silva
Mayor

ATTEST:

Victoria Wasko
City Clerk, CMC

CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE) ss.
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY)

I, Victoria Wasko, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2024-102 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 5th day of September, 2024 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: **ALTAMIRANO, BARAJAS, SILVA**

NOES: **BERKSON, CARMONA**

ABSENT: **NONE**

ABSTAIN: **NONE**

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, this 5th day of September, 2024.

Victoria Wasko, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley

Exhibit A

CEQA Findings

Findings for the Rio Vista Specific Plan Project

Required under the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.)

1 Introduction

The California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code [PRC], Section 21000 et seq.) (CEQA), provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects" and that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of Projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects." (PRC, § 21002.) A project may be approved despite its significant environmental effects if there are specific economic, social, or other considerations which justify approval notwithstanding unmitigated impacts. (PRC, § 21081.)

The mandate and principles established under CEQA are implemented, in part, through the requirement of Public Resources Code section 21081 which states that, before approving projects, agencies must: 1) make written findings with regard to each significant impact; and 2) if significant unavoidable impacts remain after mitigation, identify overriding considerations explaining why the benefits of the project outweigh such effects. For each significant environmental effect identified in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for a Project, the approving agency must make a written finding supported by substantial evidence reaching one or more of three conclusions, as described in CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Section 15000, et seq.). CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 specifically provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

> (a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:
>
> > (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.
> >
> > (2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
> >
> > (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.
>
> (b) The findings required by subsection (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

The "changes or alterations" referred to in the CEQA Guidelines may be mitigation measures, alternatives to the project, or changes to the project by the project proponent. The Final EIR for the Project identifies mitigation measures that will reduce significant effects of the Project. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting

Program (MMRP) will also be adopted by the City to ensure that the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and these findings will be implemented.

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. As defined by CEQA, "feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors (PRC, § 21061.1; see also CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(f)(1) (determining the feasibility of alternatives)). It can also take into account underlying goals and objectives of the project in addition to the merits of the alternatives. (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(f).)

As required under CEQA, the EIR describes the Project, adverse environmental impacts of the Project, and mitigation measures and alternatives that would substantially reduce or avoid those impacts. Each member of the City Council was provided a complete copy of the Final EIR for the Project in advance of the hearing on the Project. The City hereby finds that the Final EIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA and reflects its independent judgment and analysis. The City also finds that it has independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR prior to taking final action with respect to the Project.

The City Council hereby adopts the following Findings.

2 Description of the Proposed Project and Objectives

2.1 Project Description

The Project site is located north of State Route (SR) 60, between Armstrong Road and Rubidoux Boulevard, in the City of Jurupa Valley (City), in Riverside County, California. The Project site is approximately 917.3 acres and consists of the Rio Vista Specific Plan Area. Regional access to the site is available off SR-60 from the south, via Armstrong Road and Rubidoux Boulevard. Interstate 10 (I-10) also provides regional access to the site from the north, via Sierra Avenue and Cedar Avenue. The Project site includes the following 17 Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs): 175-080-010 and -021, 175-090-001, -002, -003, -004, and -005, 175-100-003, -005, and -006, 175-150-002, 175-160-001 and -005, 177-030-012 and -0014, and 177-040-002 and -008.

The County of Riverside approved the Rio Vista Specific Plan No. 243 and certified the associated EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 1988122608–Comprehensive GPA No. 174 and Specific Plan No. 243, Rio Vista) on April 14, 1992. The Specific Plan area was, at that time, located in unincorporated Riverside County. When the City of Jurupa Valley was incorporated in 2011, the Rio Vista Specific Plan Area was included within the City's boundaries. The Project involves a new Rio Vista Specific Plan to replace the existing Rio Vista Specific Plan approved by the County of Riverside in 1992.

The Project involves a master planned community consisting of Very Low Density Residential (VLDR), Medium Density Residential (MDR), Medium High Density Residential (MHDR), High Density Residential (HDR), Highest Density Residential (HHDR), Light Industrial and Business Park, a public K-8 educational facility, open space and recreation areas, and circulation improvements. For the residential portions of the Project, a combination of attached and detached units is proposed, and maximum building heights would vary between 30 and 45 feet.

The Project includes the following major land use components on the 917.3 acres:

- Up to 1,697 dwelling units (du) on 204.4 acres, yielding an average density of 1.8 du per acre (du/acre).
- 1,269,774 square feet of Light Industrial building square footage on 58.3 acres.
- 1,428,768 square feet of Business Park building square footage on 82.0 acres.
- 510.8 acres of natural open space.
- 14.3 acres of recreational amenities.
- 13.4 acres for a new public elementary school.

Eleven Planning Areas (PAs) are planned for residential development. One PA (PA 18) would be reserved for a K-8 school development by Jurupa Unified School District (JUSD). If the JUSD does not proceed with the development of a school, the Planning Area would be available for recreational or residential development under its MDR land use designation.

Light Industrial and Business Park

Five PAs would be developed as a contemporary commerce center on 140.3 acres located in the eastern portion of the site. This would include Light Industrial uses (PAs 12 and 13) on approximately 58.3 acres, with a maximum of 1,269,774 square feet of building space, and Business Park uses (PAs 14, 15, and 16) on 82 acres, with a maximum of 1,428,768 square feet of building space. The maximum square feet includes approximately 391,476 square feet associated with the Inland Empire Technical Trade Center (IETTC), which is intended to be constructed and operated by the Riverside Community College District (RCCD).

Open Space

The Project would include approximately 529.2 acres (58 percent of the total acreage) of Open Space and Recreational land uses. In addition, a bike path and soft-surface trail would be provided within a 30-foot-wide easement along 20th Street in the central area of the Project site. Open Space and Recreational land uses would include the following:

- Approximately 510.8 acres of open space, consisting of a combination of natural open space, revegetated manufactured slopes, and regraded and revegetated slopes. Many of the existing informal trails would remain, and no new trails into the open space would be created.
- Recreational amenities on 18.4 acres would include a 14.3-acre community park (PA 19) with sports fields, open turf play areas, sports courts, a tot lot/playground, and picnic areas; and approximately five Neighborhood Parks ranging from around 0.75 acre to 1 acre, located throughout the community, with features such as benches, planters, and open lawn areas.
- An integrated system of hard and soft-surface (decomposed granite) trails would provide access from the residential neighborhoods to the school site, Community Park, and informal dirt trails located in the Open Space. Trails for equestrians, bicyclists, and pedestrians would be provided.

Circulation

The Project would include the construction of approximately 19.6 acres of roadways, including an approximately 1.3-mile extension of 20th Street to be developed as a Modified Secondary Highway (100-foot right-of-way) and enhanced with a 30-foot-wide trail easement; as well as Collector Roads (74-foot right-of-way) and Local Streets (56-foot right-of-way).

Utilities

The utility providers listed below would service the Project. Water and sewer are discussed in greater detail below.

- Electricity: Southern California Edison (SCE)
- Gas: Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas)
- Water: Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD), and Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) for PA 7 only
- Sewer: RCSD and JCSD for PA 7 only

Off-site Improvements

Off-site sewer and stormwater drainage improvements would connect the Project site to existing infrastructure. No off-site water improvements would be included as part of the Project.

Phasing

The Project is anticipated to be developed in four phases, which would be timed to respond to market demands and to provide for a logical and orderly extension of roadways, public utilities, and infrastructure. Development would generally start in the northwestern area of the Specific Plan, proceed east in Phase 2, then move to the southwest in Phases 3 and 4. PA 7, located in the far northwest portion of the Project site, would likely be developed as part of Phase 5. However, the phases could be implemented in any order that would allow for logical and orderly development.

Phase 1 would include the development of residential PAs 4, 5, 6, as well as water tanks and a potential public school in PAs 17 and 18 respectively; recreational open space in PA 19; and a water basin open space area in PA 20. Phase 2 would include the development of residential PAs 1, 2, and 3.

The proposed extension of 20th Street would be part of Phase 1, with full width improvements to be completed in Phase 2. The proposed Business Park, consisting of PAs 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16, would be developed under Phase 3, as would the residential PA 9. Finally, Phase 4 development would include residential PAs 7, 8, 10, and 11.

2.2 Project Objectives

As stated in the Rio Vista Specific Plan, the underlying purpose of the Project would establish a mixture of residential and employment generating land uses arranged in a functional and efficient manner which complements the surrounding community and provides convenient access to the nearby regional circulation system. Specifically, the objectives of the Project are to:

1. Provide a long-range comprehensive planning approach to guide the development of Rio Vista.
2. Assist the City in meeting its housing goals and reflect anticipated market needs and public demand, by providing a diverse range of home types with the intent to blend into the City of Jurupa Valley's rural character.
3. Anticipate market demand by providing for a mixture of residential, light industrial, and business park land uses that are marketable and financially feasible within the City's evolving economic profile.

4. Provide economic growth and employment opportunities with the City by authorizing the development of light industrial and business park land uses at a sufficient scale to attract financially stable, long-term tenants and fund the necessary proposed critical infrastructure improvements that will serve Rio Vista and the greater Jurupa Valley community.
5. Adopt a Specific Plan that allows for a range of industrial uses, research and development uses, business park and other nonresidential uses that would encourage private capital investment sufficient to support the significant public infrastructure improvements proposed on the Project site.
6. Provide for the establishment of a mixed-use master planned community that is sensitive to the environment and is aesthetically pleasing.
7. Create a community design that complements the land's topography by respecting and preserving the geology, rock formations, and basic landforms.
8. Protect valuable scenic resources within large expanses of open space, thereby preserving Rio Vista's character and identity and the surrounding region.
9. Provide a potential JUSD school site to serve the needs of Rio Vista and the surrounding area, if JUSD determines it is needed to serve projected demand.
10. Provide a community park and neighborhood parks to meet the needs of Rio Vista residents and surrounding neighborhoods.
11. Establish a cohesive trail system that promotes active recreational uses and provides pedestrian links between the school site, parks, residential neighborhoods, and open space.
12. Provide guidelines for architecture, landscaping, entry treatments, walls, fencing, parks, and trails that reinforce this community's identity and its relationship to the City of Jurupa Valley.

3 Record of Proceedings and Location of Record

The City of Jurupa Valley is the lead agency for the Project. The scoping process for this EIR was initiated on November 26, 2021, when the City submitted the Notice of Preparation (NOP) to the California State Clearinghouse for distribution to the necessary parties. The purpose of the NOP is to solicit participation from relevant agencies and from the public in determining the scope of an EIR. The scoping period for this EIR ended on January 4, 2022, and a public scoping meeting was held on December 14, 2021, at the City of Jurupa Valley City Council Chamber (8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509).

Consistent with CEQA's requirements, the Draft EIR was made available to the public and regulatory agencies for review and comment during a comment period that was noticed for 45-days as required by CEQA, beginning October 19, 2023, and, originally closing at 5:00 p.m. on December 4, 2023. Subsequently, the City voluntarily extended the public comment period to January 5, 2024, for a total public comment period of 78 days.

A Planning Commission meeting was held on [June 26, 2024], to provide information about the Draft EIR, respond to general questions about the Draft EIR analysis, and accept oral comments on the Draft EIR.

The Final EIR was prepared in accordance with CEQA and contains responses to each comment received and resulting revisions to the Draft EIR. All written comments received during the public review period are

responded to in Chapter 3, *Responses to Written Comments,* of the Final EIR. Revisions to the Draft EIR are contained in Chapter 4, *Errata,* of the Final EIR.

The documents and other materials that constitute the record upon which the City's decision and these findings are based can be reviewed in person at the following location:

City of Jurupa Valley
Planning Department
8930 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509

4 Findings Regarding Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Upon approving the Project, the City must adopt findings of fact regarding the significant effects identified in the Final EIR. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, the City is also adopting an MMRP for the mitigation measures that are the City's responsibility to implement. The MMRP establishes a program to ensure that the adopted mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR will be implemented.

4.1 Findings Regarding No Impacts or Less-Than-Impacts Without Mitigation

4.1.1 Aesthetics

Impact AES-1: Aesthetics. The project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

Finding: The Project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

Facts in Support of Finding: The General Plan defines a scenic vista as points or corridors that are accessible to the public and provide a view of scenic areas and/or landscapes. The City's General Plan specifies the Pedley Hills, Jurupa Mountains, the San Gabriel and San Bernardino mountain ranges, and Santa Ana River as scenic resources, and publicly accessible vantage points that provide views of these scenic resources are considered scenic vistas.

As determined by the City's significance criteria, the Project could have a potentially significant impact if it would substantially block public views of a scenic vista visible from a scenic corridor as identified by General Plan Figure 4-23, Jurupa Valley Scenic Corridors and Roadways. As indicated therein, the closest scenic corridors are Limonite Avenue (located approximately 0.44 mile to the southwest), 46th Street (located approximately 1.25 miles to the south and southeast), and Camino Real (located approximately 2.18 miles to the west and southwest). General Plan Figure 3-30, Scenic Corridors, also designates Sierra Avenue as a scenic corridor from its intersection with Armstrong Road, approximately 0.45 mile west of the Project site, continuing northwest to the City of Fontana city limits.

A substantial portion of the Project site (510.8 acres) would be designated as open space, thereby prohibiting development on higher elevations within the Project site and maintaining views of the Project site as seen from scenic corridors and roadways. Furthermore, views of development within the Project site, if any, would

only represent a small portion of the view from the scenic corridors and roadways due to distance and such views would likely be seen from moving vehicles, which further reduces the viewer's focus on specific points off in the distance.

Therefore, due to the distance from and intervening features between the scenic corridors and roadways and the preservation of undeveloped lands within the Project site, the Project would not substantially block or alter public views of the Project site as seen from established Scenic Corridors or Roadways identified by General Plan Figure 4-23 or Figure 3-10. Impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

In addition, the Project includes the designation of 510.8 acres as Open Space-Conservation (OS-C), thereby preserving a significant portion of the Project site's natural topography and character from which scenic resources may be seen. The Project does not propose development within the OS-C areas and would retain the existing unimproved informal trails enabling their continued use by the public including future residents of the Project. Urban development proposed as a part of the Project would be situated in lower elevation areas, avoiding the prominent on-site peaks including Rattlesnake Mountain, Pepe's Peak, as well as other prominent visual features.

Scenic vistas as seen from publicly accessible areas within the Project site would change in that lower-lying areas, outside the OS-C designated areas, would be developed with various land uses and densities. Development within the Project site area would be regulated by the Rio Vista Specific Plan Design Guidelines and the Municipal Code regarding building height limitations and would therefore not include new development that would obstruct views from Rattlesnake Mountain and Pepe's Peak. As viewed from on-site publicly accessible trails, this development would be consistent with other existing development in the City's lower-lying hillside areas. Furthermore, views of the development would be viewed at a distance and as a part of, and consistent with, the overall mix of urban and undeveloped lands typical in the City. For these reasons, scenic views from on-site trails would not be significantly impacted by the Project. Therefore, the Project would not obstruct scenic views or scenic vistas as viewed from the Project site and impacts would be less than significant.

Impact AES-2: Aesthetics. The project would substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a State Scenic Highway.

Finding: The Project will not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a State Scenic Highway.

Facts in Support of Finding: Pursuant to the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if located within a State Scenic Highway corridor, pursuant to the Streets and Highways Code, Sections 260 through 263 and the project will damage trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings.

The nearest designated or eligible State Scenic Highways are approximately 11.65 miles southwest of the Project site, and approximately 12.5 miles northeast of the Project site. Because of distance and intervening geography and development, the Project would not have impact on views from these State Scenic Highways. There are no officially designated or eligible State Scenic Highways surrounding the Project site or within the Project area.

In addition, according to the General Plan Figure 3-30, Scenic Corridors, and Figure 4-23, Jurupa Valley Scenic Corridors and Roadways, there are no City-designated Scenic Corridors or Roadways within the Project site. Further, the Project site is not visible from the nearest City-designated Scenic Corridor due to distance and intervening urban development. Therefore, there would be no impact on scenic resources.

Impact AES-3: Aesthetics. The project, which is located in in an urbanized area, would conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

Finding: The Project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site is located in an "urbanized area" as defined by Public Resources Code Section 21071 because the City is an incorporated city with a population of at least 100,000 persons. As such, the Project would be subject to the City's applicable regulations governing scenic quality. Under the City's local significance threshold, the project would have significant effects if the Project is inconsistent with General Plan policies or Municipal Code requirements pertaining to scenic quality.

The Project would generally be consistent with General Plan Policies related to project design, visual character, scenic quality, and scenic vistas, as provided in Table 3.1-1 of the Draft EIR.

With respect to Municipal Code requirements, the Project is, and all future development within the Project is required to be, consistent with the Specific Plan (SP) zoning designation. The Project includes residential, commercial, open space, institutional and industrial uses, all of which are permitted uses within the SP Zone. Consistent with the SP Zone regulations, future development within the Project site would be required to conform to the development standards, conditions, and any special restrictions contained in the adopted specific plan and any amendments thereto. As such, the Project would be consistent with the SP Zone. Future development within the Project site would also be subject to applicable Municipal Code regulations pertaining to scenic quality, including with respect to construction impacts and architectural style. The Project would be consistent with applicable scenic quality regulations related to construction and architectural design. During Project construction, Project-related changes to local visual character and quality would be less than significant due to the temporary nature of construction activities. Further, the temporary presence of construction equipment within a property under construction is common and would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. Further, the Project's architecture incorporates five unique architectural styles that adhere to the overall Community Theme as well as design guidelines that would reduce the appearance of building massing in the commerce center. Additionally, the Project's landscape design guidelines contain key community components that ensure a high-quality and cohesive thematic aesthetic for the community.

As such, the Project would not conflict with any General Plan policies or Municipal Code requirements pertaining to scenic quality. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Impact AES-4: Aesthetics. The project would create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Finding: The Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if the Project is inconsistent with General Plan Policy COS 10.1, which requires outdoor lighting to be shielded and prohibits outdoor lighting that: (1) Operates at unnecessary locations, levels, and times; (2) Spills onto areas off-site or to areas not needing or wanting illumination; (3) Produces glare (intense line-of-sight contrast); (4) Includes lighting frequencies (colors) that interfere with astronomical viewing; and (5) Includes building materials that create glare.

Because the Project site is vacant and undeveloped, no light or glare sources are present on-site. Light and glare from surrounding uses are limited to residential uses to the northeast, southeast, west, and south of the Project site, as well as industrial uses and undeveloped land to the north, east, south, and west. Additionally, surrounding roadways are sources of light and glare from vehicle headlights and street lighting.

With respect to future development on the Project site, the Project designates approximately 57.7 percent (529.2 acres) of the site for Open Space and Recreational land uses. For the remaining portion of the site, new sources of light would be installed to provide nighttime illumination for residential homes and buildings, streetlights, and sidewalks. These new sources of light and glare would be visible from surrounding areas and would create new sources of light and glare on the Project site. However, all proposed lighting plans would comply with City requirements, including those listed in General Plan Policy 10.1, reducing potential impacts. Additionally, Project-related lighting would adhere to the proposed Rio Vista Specific Plan development standards and design guidelines related to lighting, such as exterior lighting, outdoor lighting, and residential architectural elements.

The Rio Vista Specific Plan Design Guidelines would minimize or prevent glare and light pollution while enhancing safety for pedestrians and drivers and providing exterior nighttime lighting for future residents. Furthermore, additional requirements, such as a requirement that roof materials should have a matte finish to reduce glare, would contribute to minimization of this potential.

As set forth in Table 3.1-1 of the Draft EIR, the Project would not conflict with Policies COS 10.1 through COS 10.4 of the City's General Plan. Specifically, outdoor lighting at the Project would comply with California Green Building Standard Code, all applicable City requirements, and development standards and design guidelines. As such, light pollution and potential impacts to nighttime skies and astronomical viewing would be minimized.

Further, the Project does not include any components that would include large expanses of reflective materials that would result in the generation of substantial amounts of glare. Moreover, proposed landscaping would screen some potential sources of glare from affecting nearby motorists or residents. Compliance with the Rio Vista Specific Plan development standards and design guidelines related to light and glare would ensure new sources of light and glare are minimized and impact due to light and glare would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impact: Aesthetics.

Finding: The Project would result in a less than cumulatively considerable impact concerning aesthetics.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative development would be required to comply with the overall land use vision, design review regulations, and policies in local and regional planning documents. The Project, as well as any future development in the vicinity of the Project site, would adhere to all City regulations regarding light and glare, by which these potential cumulative impacts would be at less than significant levels. For these reasons, cumulative impacts to aesthetics, State Scenic Highways, or nighttime lighting and daytime glare would be less than significant.

As discussed under Threshold AES-1, impacts to scenic vistas are less than cumulatively considerable. Furthermore, other scenic resources listed in the General Plan, such as ridgelines and floodplains, are not present in the Project site and would, therefore, not be impacted.

As discussed under Threshold AES-2, there are no designated or eligible State Scenic Highways or Scenic Corridors or Roadways surrounding the Project site. Therefore, the Project has no potential to directly impact a scenic resource or to contribute to a cumulatively significant impact on scenic resources within a scenic highway.

As discussed under Threshold AES-3, the Project would not result in direct impacts related to conflicts with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

As discussed under Threshold AES-4, mandatory compliance with the applicable requirements of the City's Municipal Code and the incorporation of the Rio Vista Specific Plan's development standards and PPPs and PDFs would ensure the Project would result in less than significant impacts to light and glare and to daytime and nighttime views. Additionally, there are no cumulative projects in the immediate vicinity that would cumulatively increase light pollution to a substantial level. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than cumulatively considerable impact concerning light/glare impacts to daytime or nighttime views in the Project site.

4.1.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources.

Impact AG-1: Agriculture and Forestry Resources. The proposed project would convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use.

Finding: The Project would not 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 nonagricultural use.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if identified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on General Plan Figure 4-13 Farmland in Jurupa Valley, and the Project will convert such land to nonagricultural use.

According to the FMMP and as shown on General Plan Figure 4-13 Farmland in Jurupa Valley, the land within the project area is considered "Other Land," and there is no land within the project area that is considered Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. While a small portion of land (approximately 55.7 acres) is considered "Farmland of Local Importance" despite not being zoned for agricultural uses, the loss of that potential Farmland of Local Importance on-site would not be significant because the Project site has not been used for farming for nearly 50 years.

Because the Project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, it may be presumed to have a less than significant impact. Thus, the Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the California Resources Agency FMMP to nonagricultural use, and impacts would be less than significant.

Impact AG-2: Agriculture and Forestry Resources. The project would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract.

Finding: The Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the project would have significant effects if located within the A-P (Light Agriculture with Poultry); A-2 (Heavy Agriculture); or A-D (Agriculture-Dairy) zone and if the proposes a use inconsistent with the permitted or conditionally permitted uses in these zones; and/or the Project is under an existing Williamson Act Contract pursuant to the California Land Conservation Act of 1965 and implemented by Riverside County Ordinance No, 509 and a Notice of Cancellation.

According to the General Plan Draft EIR, there are no active Williamson Act Contracts within the City, and the Project site does not contain land that is eligible for or land that is currently under a Williamson Act Contract.

Furthermore, the 2017 General Plan does not propose any agricultural zones. The Project site is currently designated for residential land uses (MDR, MHDR, HDR, VHDR), commercial uses (CR), and open space uses (OS-CH and OS-R), and it is zoned SP Zone. No portion of the Project site is zoned for agricultural uses.

Consistent with the City's Screening Criteria, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract, and there would be no impact.

Impact AG-3: Agriculture and Forestry Resources. The project would 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)).

Finding: The Project would not 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)).

Facts in Support of Finding: There is no land within Jurupa Valley that meets the criteria to be classified "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)). The Project site and surrounding area are currently designated for residential uses (MDR, MHDR, HDR, VHDR), as well as CR and Open Space (OS-CH and OS-R) uses and are zoned SP Zone. The Project would therefore not conflict with existing zoning for forest land or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impact would occur.

Impact AG-4: Agriculture and Forestry Resources. The project would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Finding: The Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. There is no land within Jurupa Valley that meets the criteria to be classified as "forest land." There would be no impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The General Plan Draft EIR states that "there are no areas of forest lands in the City," and therefore no impact would occur due to loss or conversion of forest land. The Project site is vacant, undeveloped, and does not contain forest land. This precludes the possibility that forest lands would be lost or converted to non-forest uses. Therefore, conversion of forest land resulting from implementation of the Project would not occur. There would be no impact.

Impact AG-5: Agriculture and Forestry Resources. The project would involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland to nonagricultural use, or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Finding: The project would not involve changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in significant conversion of Important Farmland to nonagricultural use, or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the project would have significant effects if located on "Farmland of Local Importance" as shown on General Plan Figure 4.13, Farmland in Jurupa Valley (or by the Farmland Maps maintained by the California Department of Conservation) and the project is inconsistent with General Plan Policy COS 4.2 Agricultural Land Conversion which states: "Discourage the conversion of productive agricultural lands to urban uses unless the property owner can demonstrate overarching Community-wide benefits or need for conversion."

With respect to forest land, as discussed above under Impact AG-4, the Project site does not contain forest land and there are no forest lands near the Project site. The Project would therefore have no impact in this regard.

With respect to agricultural uses discussed above under Impact AG-1, the Project site does not contain any Important Farmland (defined as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance). It does contain a small portion that is categorized as Farmland of Local Importance (55.7 acres). However, the loss of potential Farmland of Local Importance on-site would not be significant because the Project site has not been used for farming for nearly 50 years. Potential future use of the site for small-scale agriculture uses would not maximize the potential of the site or provide any of the benefits currently proposed by the Project as it would not meet any of the Project Objectives (see Chapter 2, Project Description), and it would likely not be a financially viable endeavor given the size of the Project site. Lastly, the site is not considered suitable for agricultural uses from a water-usage standpoint given the significant irrigation demand associated with such uses and given that a zone change and General Plan Amendment would be required to allow larger-scale agricultural uses on the site.

Because of the distance between the Project site and the closest Farmland and forest land, as well as the size and scale of intervening development, the Project is not expected to have a significant impact involving changes to the existing environment that would result in the conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or forest land to non-forest use.

Cumulative Impact: Agriculture and Forestry Resources.

Finding: The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact to agriculture and forestry resources.

Facts in Support of Finding: For the Project's cumulative effects to rise to a level of significance, the impact of the Project, together with the impacts of cumulative development, must have the potential to result in a cumulatively significant impact to agriculture and forestry resources, and make significant incremental contributions to cumulative impacts on agriculture and forestry resources.

With respect to agricultural uses, the Project site does not contain Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Unique Farmland. In addition, the site and surrounding areas are not currently under Williamson Act Contracts or used for agricultural purposes and have not been used for such purposes in the past. Consequently, the geographic context for cumulative impacts does not contain any Important Farmland or agricultural land under a Williamson Act Contract and cumulative impacts are less than significant. While the Project site does contain a small area categorized as Farmland of Local Importance (55.57 acres), this area was used for agricultural uses for a brief period of time nearly 50 years ago and it is not currently zoned or

designated by the City for agricultural uses. The Draft EIR prepared for the General Plan states that the "General Plan would result in significant cumulative impact due to its contribution to regional losses of agriculture and farmland," but it does not identify significant cumulative impacts unique to the loss of Farmland of Local Importance. Therefore, the loss of the Farmland of Local Importance area located within the Project site would not represent a considerable contribution. Therefore, the Project, in conjunction with other similar projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact to agriculture or Farmland, including Farmland of Local Importance.

With respect to forest land, there is no Forest or Timber (or similar) land use designation within the City. Neither the project vicinity nor the Project site is zoned as forest land or timberland, and Timberland Production does not occur in the project vicinity. Therefore, there are no cumulative impacts to forestry resources. Additionally, the Project, in conjunction with other similar projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact to or cause the rezoning of forest land, forest resources, or timberland.

4.1.3 Biological Resources

Impact BIO-4: Biological Resources. The project would 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 wildlife nursery sites.

Finding: The Project would not 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 wildlife nursery sites.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it results in a direct or an indirect physical change to the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or to established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impedes the use of native wildlife nursery sites or conflicts with the MBTA.

Construction

The Project site is a large tract of land surrounded by developed lands, except for a small area of undeveloped land adjacent to the north and northwest which includes the Jurupa Hills. Currently, wildlife can move freely throughout the Project site and surrounding undeveloped areas. However, the Project site does not function as a wildlife corridor and there are no adjacent wildlife corridors. The Project site is isolated from other similar habitats by surrounding and forms an "island" with no terrestrial linkages. Therefore, no impacts to wildlife corridors are expected to occur as a result of the construction of the Project.

Operation

Wildlife species are anticipated to continue to use habitat within the avoided and conserved portions of the Project site along with the limited undeveloped areas adjacent to the Project site to the north and northwest. The development of the Project would reduce the overall area of available habitat and may increase competition for resources and leave displaced individuals vulnerable to predation. Those species and individuals that may use the Project site for foraging would have access to habitat in the avoided and conserved areas, and highly mobile species may also utilize adjacent undeveloped habitat and large expanses of relatively undisturbed habitat within the Jurupa Mountains and the Santa Ana River. Habitat in the conserved areas on-site will be further fragmented and isolated. The Project site currently experiences disturbance as a result of human activities. The construction of the Project would likely result in increased disturbances such as noise, lighting, and predation from domestic pets may hinder localized wildlife movement and behaviors within open

space and adjacent habitat. Species that remain would likely be those that are more tolerant of human presence. Management of "edge effects" under the MSHCP Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines would reduce and minimize indirect impacts to wildlife species to the extent possible as required under the MSHCP. Compliance with these guidelines would ensure that potential impacts to wildlife movement following construction would be less than significant and no additional mitigation would be required.

4.1.4 Energy

Impact ENER-1: Energy. The project would result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.

Finding: The Project would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the project may have a significant impact if it: (1) Does not meet State or federal energy standards; (2) Causes wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy during construction or operation; (3) Results in an increase in demand for electricity or natural gas that exceeds available supply or distribution infrastructure capabilities that could result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; (4) Does not utilize source reduction, recycling, and other appropriate measures to reduce the amount of solid waste disposed of in landfills; or (5) Does not include features that encourage advanced energy conservation techniques and the incorporation of energy-efficient design elements for private and public developments, including appropriate site orientation and the use of shade and windbreak trees to reduce fuel consumption for heating and cooling, and offer incentives, as appropriate.

Based on standards for new construction established by the State and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and adherence to the development standards in the City's Municipal Code, activities associated with implementation of the Project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy. Therefore, implementation of the Project will have a less than significant impact under this criterion.

With respect to construction energy usage, limitations on idling of vehicles and equipment and requirements that equipment be properly maintained would result in fuel savings. California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections 2449 and 2485, limit idling from both on-road and off-road diesel-powered equipment and are enforced by the ARB. Additionally, given the cost of fuel, contractors and owners have a strong financial incentive to avoid wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction. Because of the temporary nature of construction and the financial incentives for developers and contractors to use energy-consuming resources in an efficient manner, the construction phase of the Project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy.

Furthermore, new development would be subject to energy conservation requirements in the California Energy Code (CCR Title 24, Part 6–California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings) and California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) (CCR Title 24, Part 11). Project features that reduce the amount of solid waste associated with the project are discussed in Section 3-19, Utilities. Energy efficient Project design features, including the Project's high-density development and alternative transportation infrastructure, such as bicycle and pedestrian paths, would further reduce impacts related to energy. Based on standards for new construction established by the State and the South Coast Air Quality

Management District (SCAQMD) and adherence to the development standards in the City's Municipal Code, activities associated with implementation of the Project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy. Therefore, implementation of the Project will have a less than significant impact under this criterion.

With respect to operational energy usage, future development projects would be designed and constructed in accordance with the City's latest adopted energy efficiency standards, which are based on the California Title 24 energy efficiency standards. Title 24 standards include a broad set of energy conservation requirements that apply to the structural, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems in a building. For example, the Title 24 Lighting Power Density requirements define the maximum wattage of lighting that can be used in a building based on its square footage. Title 24 additionally requires new low-rise residential developments to include rooftop solar systems meeting a minimum system capacity consistent with calculations contained in Title 24, Part 6, Subchapter 8. Title 24 standards, widely regarded as the most advanced energy efficiency standards, would help to reduce the amount of energy required for lighting, water heating, and heating and air conditioning in buildings and promote energy conservation.

The City's General Plan includes energy conservation policies designed to reduce energy demand through improving energy efficiency of homes and businesses, facilitating residential and commercial renewable energy, and promoting recycling and waste management efforts, including Air Quality Element Policies AQ 5.1 and 5.2 and Program AQ 5.1.1. Air Quality policies included in the General Plan also promote increased densities, mixed use, electric vehicles, and improved circulation to reduce VMT and energy consumption. City General Plan Land Use policies encourage the development of renewable energy resources and related infrastructure. Additionally, the City participates in the WRCOG Subregional CAP in support of State GHG-reduction goals, which have corresponding energy conservation benefits. Future development projects envisioned under the Project would be required to comply with stipulations originating from General Plan policies. Compliance with the applicable General Plan policies would help to avoid building energy consumption that would be considered wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary.

Additionally, plans submitted for building permits of development projects in the Project area would be required to include verification demonstrating compliance with the Building and Energy Efficiency Standards in effect at the time building permits are issued. The Project would also be required to adhere to the provisions of CALGreen, which established planning and design standards for sustainable site development, energy efficiency (beyond the California Energy Code requirements), water conservation, material conservation, and internal air contaminants. Furthermore, compliance with recommended mitigation for potential Air Quality and GHG impacts under the EIR would reduce energy usage from the Project by requiring energy efficiency measures that go beyond the Title 24 and CalGreen standards, including the use of energy efficient building design and materials and EV infrastructure. Even though the Project would increase the consumption of electricity and natural gas resources, the Project would not increase demand such that Southern California Edison (SCE) or Southern California Gas (SoCalGas) would need to plan for new regional electricity or natural gas facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Based on the above analysis, the Project would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. The Project would meet or exceed federal energy standards and would not result in an increase in demand for electricity or natural gas that exceeds available supply or distribution infrastructure capabilities. Consistent with the City's General Plan policies, the Project would utilize source reduction and recycling to reduce the amount of solid waste distributed in landfills. Finally, developments consistent with the Project would incorporate energy efficient design elements, consistent with the City's General Plan requirements

and as outlined in PPP 4.6-1. Therefore, the potential energy impacts of the Project would be less than significant.

Impact ENER-2: Energy. The project would conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Finding: The Project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the project may have a significant impact if it: (1) Does not meet the requirements of Title 24, Building Standards Code and California Green Building Standards (CALGreen) Code, and (2) Does not meet the following General Plan Policies (if applicable): COS 5.1–Best Available Practices, COS 5.5–Energy Efficiency and Green Building, or COS 5.8–Reduce "Heat Island" Effect.

With respect to construction impacts, the Project would result in energy consumption through the combustion of fossil fuels in construction vehicles, worker commute vehicles, and construction equipment and the use of electricity for temporary buildings, lighting, and other sources. California Code of Regulations Title 13, Sections 2449 and 2485, limit idling from both on-road and off-road diesel-powered equipment and are enforced by the Air Resources Board. The Project would comply with these regulations.

There are no policies at the local level applicable to energy conservation specific to the construction phase. Thus, it is anticipated that construction of the Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing energy use or increasing the use of renewable energy. Therefore, construction-related energy efficiency and renewable energy standards consistency impacts would be less than significant.

With respect to operational impacts, California's RPS required that 33 percent of electricity retail sales be served by renewable energy sources by 2020. The Project's electricity provider (Southern California Edison) is required to meet the State's 2020 objective of 33 percent and is making progress toward the State's 2024 RPS target of 44 percent. The Project's electricity demands would also be required to meet the State's future objective of 60 percent electricity from renewable energy sources by 2030.

The State's Title 24 energy efficiency standards establish mandatory measures for residential buildings, including material conservation and resource efficiency. The Project would be required to comply with these mandatory measures. In addition, mandatory compliance with the applicable provisions of CALGreen would ensure that the Project uses energy efficiently.

All future development envisioned as a part of the Project would also be required to adhere to the Municipal Code, which contains rules and regulations regarding energy efficiency. In addition, energy conservation measures promoted through the City's General Plan policies and programs include the installation of EV infrastructure, site orientation, shading, windbreak trees, and the establishment of energy incentives. The City's participation in the Western Riverside Council of Governments Subregional Climate Action Plan, which includes local reduction measures such as the establishment of energy action plans, the use of shade trees, the inclusion of bicycle parking, and recommendations for site plan designs, further supports State and local energy conservation goals and plans. These measures represent the best available practices in energy conservation and use, as outlined in General Plan Policy COS-5.1. These energy conservation measures serve to reduce the occurrence of urban heat island effects, as encouraged through General Plan Policy COS-5.8. Future development projects would be required to comply with City-mandated policies through the

development permitting process and, therefore, would implement energy efficiency measures and green building design, as encouraged under General Plan Policy COS-5.5. Other policies that promote energy conservation at the local level are voluntary.

Compliance with the above measures would ensure that future development projects would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing energy use or increasing the use of renewable energy. Furthermore, and as discussed above, the Project would meet the requirements of Title 24 and would meet the requirements of the City's General Plan Policies COS 5.1, 5.5, and 5.8. Therefore, operational energy efficiency and renewable energy standards consistency impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impact: Energy.

Finding: The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact with respect to energy resources.

Facts in Support of Finding: For the Project's cumulative effects to rise to a level of significance, the impact of the Project, together with the impacts of cumulative development, must have the potential to result in a cumulatively significant impacts with respect to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, and make significant incremental contributions to cumulative impacts on agriculture and forestry resources.

With respect to construction energy demand, all projects in the City would be required to comply with City policies that address energy conservation and energy efficiency, such as COS 5.1, Best Available Practices; COS 5.5, Energy Efficiency and Green Building and COS 5.8, Reduce "Heat Island" Effect. Additionally, all projects would be required to comply with the latest California Energy Code as well as other applicable county, State and federal regulations. Accordingly, cumulative impacts would be less than significant. Moreover, the Project's incremental contribution to less than significant cumulative impacts would not be considerable. Based on the preceding analysis, the Project's construction activities would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Construction activities associated with the Project would not be more energy intensive than other similar construction operations throughout the region, and the Project would be subject to applicable regulations designed to reduce energy consumption. Accordingly, the Project's impacts due to construction-related energy consumption would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulative impact.

With respect to operational energy demand, all projects in the City would be required to comply with City policies that address energy conservation and energy efficiency as well as other applicable county, State and federal regulations, including CALGreen. Accordingly, cumulative operational impacts related to energy would be less than significant. Moreover, the Project's incremental contribution to less than significant cumulative impacts would not be considerable. Mandatory compliance with the applicable provisions of CALGreen would ensure that the Project uses energy efficiently. Furthermore, Air Quality mitigation measures included in this document require that the Project go beyond the requirements of CALGreen, as outlined in MM AIR-1h, AIR-1i, and AIR-1j. Energy consumed by the Project is calculated to be comparable to, or less than, energy consumed by other individual residential or commercial uses of similar scale and intensity currently constructed and operating in California. The Project could therefore not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy. The Project would not cause or result in the need for additional energy facilities or energy delivery systems outside of connection to the existing utilities located in the adjacent roadways. The Project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. As such, the Project has no potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts due to a conflict with or obstruction of such plans.

4.1.5 Geology and Soils

Impact GEO-1: Geology and Soils. The project would directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:

i) Ground Rupture?
ii) Strong Seismic Ground Shaking?
iii) Seismic-related Ground Failure, including Liquefaction?
iv) Landslides?

Finding: The project would directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving: (i) Ground Rupture, (ii) Strong Seismic Ground Shaking, (iii) Seismic-related Ground Failure, including Liquefaction, or (iv) Landslides.

Facts in Support of Finding:

i) Ground Rupture

With respect to ground rupture, under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone as shown on General Plan Figure 8-4 -Mapped Fault Zones. According to the Geotechnical Review, there are no known active faults traversing the Project site. Additionally, the Project site does not lie within any Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones. The nearest known active fault is the San Jacinto Fault located approximately 6 miles northeast of the Project site. As such, it is unlikely for ground rupture to occur at the Project site. Thus, the Project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects associated with fault rupture. Therefore, impacts related to fault rupture would be less than significant.

ii) Strong Seismic Ground Shaking

The principal seismic hazard that could affect the Project site is ground shaking resulting from an earthquake occurring along several major active or potentially active faults in Southern California. The Project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone as shown on General Plan Figure 8-4, Mapped Fault Zones, and therefore impacts are less than significant.

The buildings and supporting infrastructure improvements proposed within the Project site would be subject to ground shaking during seismic events along local and regional faults that would occur during the lifetime operation of the Project. Therefore, the project has the potential to expose people or structures to adverse effects associated with seismic events. Based on the location of the Project site in relation to regional faults, it is anticipated that moderate to large seismic events along regional faults would result in strong seismic ground shaking at the Project site. However, the Geotechnical Review states that with proper planning and design, these impacts could be limited. The design and construction of the improvements at the Project site would be subject to the mandatory requirements and standards of the CBC Title 24 (CALGreen) and Title 8 (Buildings and Construction) of the City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, which are designed to attenuate the effects of strong ground shaking. Adherence to the California Building Code requirements, would further ensure impacts would remain less than significant.

iii) Seismic-Related Ground Failure, Including Liquefaction

The Geotechnical Review determined that the potential for liquefaction across the majority of the site is very low due to the presence of dense soil and bedrock and the absence of shallow groundwater. Furthermore, the Project site is not located within an area susceptible to liquefaction as shown on General Plan Figure 8-5, Liquefaction Susceptibility in Jurupa Valley. The majority of the Project site is underlain by granitic bedrock or firm older alluvial soil, and liquefaction and seismically-induced settlement are expected to be minor. Therefore impacts related to liquefaction and seismically-induced settlement would be less than significant.

iv) Landslides

The Geotechnical Review stated that a 2015 review of the Project site found no evidence of deep-seated landslides in the Project site and has concluded that landslides previously mapped did not occur in the proposed Project. Further, large, deep-seated landslides would be very unusual in the Project site's geologic terrain and setting.

According to the Geotechnical Review, the bedrock on the Project site is very hard and capable of supporting tall, steep slopes. Cut slopes excavated at 2:1 and up to 120 feet in height are planned for the development. When underlain by granitic bedrock, these slopes are expected to be grossly stable. Natural slopes surrounding the development are also expected to be grossly stable. Further, design slopes cut into the older alluvial soils are also expected to be grossly stable when constructed at a 2:1 grade. However, portions of the natural hillsides adjacent to the Project are covered with exposed bedrock outcrops and subrounded to rounded boulders. There is a potential for surficial instability and rockfall in these areas. Rockfall can present a hazard to improvements at the base of slopes if not mitigated or considered in the project design. Many of the natural slopes above the development are covered with loose colluvial soils and topsoils that may be prone to soil slumps and debris flow during or immediately following heavy rainfall, resulting in potential adverse effects.

In areas with isolated rock outcrops or loose rocks, it may be possible to remove or break individual rocks and remove the hazard. However, in areas with numerous rocks on steep slopes, removal may not be possible. Accordingly, the Geotechnical Review determined that the recommendations provided in the report would limit impacts. For example, Municipal Code requirements identified in the Geotechnical Review include provision of debris catchment basins where canyons and reentrants descend to the area of the development, as well as construction of debris deflection/impact walls or earthen berms at the base of natural slopes adjacent to the development. The design and construction of the improvements at the Project site would also be subject to the mandatory requirements and standards of the City of Jurupa Valley's building code, which establishes specific site investigation requirements for hillside development to reduce risks from landslides, rock falls, and debris flows. The City also requires geological and geotechnical investigations as part of the environmental and development review process, which applies to any structures whose damage could cause secondary hazards in areas with potential for earthquake-induced liquefaction, landslides, or settlement. Therefore, with adherence to the California Building Code, impacts would be less than significant.

Impact GEO-2: Geology and Soils. The project would result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

Finding: The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if is inconsistent with Municipal Code Chapter 6.05–Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls.

Consistent with Municipal Code Chapter 6.05–Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, the Project would follow all applicable regulations to reduce pollutants in stormwater discharges to the maximum extent practicable. In addition, prior to any development, a Conceptual Grading Plan would be prepared and submitted for the City's Planning Department for review and approval. The Conceptual Grading Plan would provide grading instructions for each individual stage of development, including techniques to prevent erosion and sedimentation as well as eliminate source pollutants during and after the grading process, approximate time frames for grading, identification of areas which may be graded during high probability rain months (January through March), and preliminary pad and roadway elevations.

Additionally, the Project would be required to obtain an NPDES permit for construction activities. As part of the NPDES requirements, preparation of a SWPPP that would address construction fencing, sand bags, and other erosion control features (including wind erosion) that would be implemented during the construction phase to reduce the site's potential for soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would be required. In addition, construction activities associated with the Project would be required to comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403, Fugitive Dust, which would preclude wind-related erosion hazards during construction activities. Mandatory compliance with the Project's NPDES permit and these regulatory requirements of SCAQMD Rule 403 would ensure that water and wind erosion during the Project's construction activities would be minimized. Accordingly, construction-related impacts associated with soil erosion and loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

Following construction, wind and water erosion on the Project site would be minimized as the areas disturbed during construction would be landscaped or covered with impervious surfaces such as building foundations and paved parking areas. With respect to stormwater management, according to the Preliminary Hydrology Report, the proposed storm drain facilities would mitigate post-development flows to meet the as-built capacities of the existing downstream storm drain facilities. The proposed basins would also mitigate water quality impact, and meet County of Riverside's hydromodification criteria by limiting post-project discharge from the proposed site to no more than 110 percent of the pre-project flows for 2-year, 24-hours storm events.

In addition, preparation of a project-specific SWPPP and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) would be required. These would be submitted to the City for review and approval. The SWPPP and WQMP would be required to identify and implement an effective combination of erosion control and sediment control measures (i.e., Best Management Practices [BMPs]) to reduce or eliminate discharge to surface water from stormwater and non-stormwater discharges. Adherence to the requirements noted in the Project's required WQMP and site-specific SWPPP (both included in Appendix G) would ensure that the Project is consistent with Municipal Code Chapter 6.05, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, and potential erosion impacts would be less than significant.

Impact GEO-3: Geology and Soils. The project is 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 off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

Finding: The Project is not 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 off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if located within the following areas: (i) General Plan Figure 8-6: Landslide Susceptibility in Jurupa Valley; (ii) General Plan Figure 8-5: Liquefaction Susceptibility in Jurupa Valley, or (iii) an area susceptible to subsidence as identified in the Parcel Report available on the Riverside County Map My County website.

The Project site is located within a "Moderate" to "Very High" susceptibility to landslides on the General Plan Figure 8-6, Landslide Susceptibility in Jurupa Valley. The Project site is not located within a liquefaction susceptibility area on General Plan Figure 8-5, Liquefaction Susceptibility in Jurupa Valley. Several of the Project site parcels are located in areas susceptible to subsidence as identified in the Parcel Report retrieved from the Riverside County Map My County website.

The Geotechnical Review includes a recommendation for complete removal of undocumented fill and partial removal of alluvial soil in order to reduce the potential for adverse total and differential settlement of the proposed improvements. With adherence to the California Building Code (as stated in PPP 3.7-1 and as required by Municipal Code Section 8.70.070,), which would require compliance with the Geotechnical Review recommendations, impact regarding soil compressibility would be less than significant.

The hard granitic bedrock present in elevated portions of the site is not prone to deep-seated slope failures. The on-site bedrock is very hard and capable of supporting tall, steep slopes. Natural slopes surrounding the Project site are expected to be stable. Design slopes cut into the older alluvial soils are also expected to be stable when constructed at a 2:1 grade.

According to the Geotechnical Review, the potential for liquefaction across the majority of the site is very low due to the presence of dense soil and bedrock and the absence of shallow groundwater. Impacts would be less than significant.

Portions of the natural hillsides adjacent to the development are covered with exposed bedrock outcrops and subrounded to rounded boulders. There is a potential for surficial instability. With adherence to the California Building Code (as stated in PPP 3.7-1 and as required by Municipal Code Section 8.70.070), impacts would be less than significant.

Impact GEO-4: Geology and Soils. The project is located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial or indirect risks to life or property.

Finding: The Project is not located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial or indirect risks to life or property.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if located on soil that has an EI Expansion Potential >91 according to the results of the laboratory testing performed in accordance with ASTM D 4829. The near-surface soils on the Project site consist primarily of sandy silts and silty sands. As reported in the Geotechnical Review, testing conducted in 2006 yielded expansion index of zero. Based on this result and the nature of the soils observed, the Geotechnical Review determined that the near-surface soil is expected to have a low to very low expansion potential. Therefore, impacts associated with expansive soil would be less than significant.

Impact GEO-5: Geology and Soils. The project has 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.

Finding: The Project does not 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.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if the Project's proposed septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal system do not meet the regulatory requirement of the Local Agency Management Program (LAMP) applicable to Jurupa Valley.

The Project site is within the future boundary area of the Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) and the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD), which would provide sewer service for the Project site. However, septic systems would be provided to serve PAs 10 and 11.

According to the Geotechnical Review, two permeameter tests, LB-3 and LB-4 (see Geotechnical Review, Plate 1, Geotechnical Map), were conducted in 2015 in PA 10. Based on the thickness of alluvium encountered and the infiltration rate, septic systems are anticipated to be feasible in PA 10. No boring or testing was conducted at PA 11. This area is either in bedrock or is presumed to be underlain by relatively thin soils and most of that area is not feasible for septic systems, and impacts could be potentially significant. However, prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit for any lot in PA 11, the City's Building Department standards require submittal of successful results of a Soil Percolation Test for any proposed septic system to ensure soil suitability. With adherence to City permitting requirements, impacts would be less than significant as the results would either ensure the ability of each individual lot to support a septic system or a grading and building permit would not be issued.

Furthermore, according to the Riverside County Local Management Program for On-site Wastewater Treatment Systems (LAMP), an On-site Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) Report for Land Divisions is required for all proposed Tract and Parcel Maps (all Planning schedules) that will utilize an OWTS, which include septic tanks, for sewage disposal. The OWTS Reports for Land Divisions would be prepared by approved professionals (Professional Engineer, Professional Geologist, or Registered Environmental Health Specialist). The Report for Land Divisions shall include recommendations related to the installation of the septic tank, including the design rate, location, depth, and any additional special designs as needed. The Project would comply with all requirements in the LAMP. Compliance with all City and Riverside County requirements would ensure impacts would be less than significant.

4.1.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact HAZ-1: Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Finding: The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the project would have significant effects if the Project handles a hazardous material or mixture containing a hazardous material that has a quantity at any one time during the reporting year equal to or greater than the amounts specified by Health and Safety Code Section 25507 *et seq*.

New development or redevelopment in the Project site area would involve the routine management of some hazardous materials that could pose a significant threat to human health or the environment if not properly managed or if accidentally released. Grading and construction activities associated with implementation of the Project may involve the limited transport, storage, usage, or disposal of hazardous materials commonly associated with construction. The handling of hazardous materials would be a temporary activity that would occur during buildout of Project roadways, as well as future buildout of the Project site. The routine handling, transporting, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during construction and operation activities are addressed by applicable federal, State, and local laws, regulations, and programs set forth by various federal, State, and local agencies. Required compliance with applicable hazardous material laws and regulations would ensure that construction-related hazardous material use associated with roadway improvements, land use changes, and new development within the plan area would not result in significant impacts. Therefore, adherence to federal, State, and local regulations regarding potential impacts associated with construction

activities creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment during the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would ensure impact level remain less than significant.

Because of the nature of the Project, hazardous materials used by future development in the plan area may vary but would likely be limited to compressed gas for cooking, and storage of common household cleaning supplies and pesticides for landscaping and maintenance, that could result in potentially significant impacts. However, these materials are transported, stored, and used in accordance with existing federal, State, and local regulations. In addition, hazardous materials associated with future development would not be used, stored, or transported in quantities sufficient enough to create a significant hazard to the public. Furthermore, the quantities of these materials are not expected to be equal to or greater than those identified in the California Health and Safety Code Section 25507. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact HAZ-3: Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The project would emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

Finding: The Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the project would have significant effects if: The Project site is located within ¼ mile of an existing public or private school and the project handles a hazardous material or mixture containing a hazardous material that has a quantity at any one time during the reporting year equal to or greater than the amounts specified by Health and Safety Code Section 25507 et seq.

Currently, the nearest school to the Project site is Mission Middle School, located approximately 1.1 miles to the southwest. In addition, the Project would include the construction of a new public elementary school, serving grades Kindergarten through eighth grade. Construction activities associated with implementation of the Project would be expected to involve the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, such as diesel fuels, aerosols, and paints. The handling, transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials must comply with the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, California Public Resources Code, and other State and local regulations, which further limits the risk of emissions. As such, the Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials within ¼ mile of a school, and impacts would be less than significant.

The Jurupa Unified School District (JUSD) would be responsible for investigating the proposed elementary school site in consultation with the appropriate State and local agencies to ensure site conditions do not pose a health risk to future students, teachers, and workers. This site investigation, as well as potential remediation if needed, would be conducted under DTSC oversight. With compliance with this State regulation, impacts would be less than significant.

Impact HAZ-4: Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The project is 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 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Finding: The Project is not 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 not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

Based on a review of available agency records and a regulatory database search as described in the Phase I ESA, there are no above-ground storage tanks or underground storage tanks located on the Project site.

The closest Leaking Underground Storage Tank listing is located approximately 2,188 feet east of the Project site and at lower elevation relative to the Project site. As of January 2008, this listing is indicated as "Inactive" and the site type is noted as Corrective Action. Because of the distance and topographic relation, the Phase I ESA does not consider it to be an REC in connection with the Project site. The other 4 listings are not considered to be REC either according to the Phase I ESA.

According to the Phase I ESA, one CERCLIS listing was identified within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project site. The listing is described as Riverside Cement Company Crestmore PLT. It is located at 1500 Rubidoux Boulevard, 2,130 feet east of the Project site and at a lower elevation relative to the Project site. The listing's status is "Other Cleanup Activity: State-Lead Cleanup" and in 1995 DTSC issued a No Further Action letter. Because of the status and the No Further Action letter, this site is not considered to be a REC in connection with the Project site.

Potential impacts associated with these two listings would be less than significant.

Impact HAZ-5: Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The project is 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, and would result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area.

Finding: The project is not 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, and would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the project would have significant effects if located within a compatibility zone of the Flabob Airport, Riverside Municipal Airport and does not meet the Compatibility Criteria for Land Use Actions identified in the applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the airport.

The Project would not be located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport. The closest airport, Flabob Field, a privately owned airport, is located approximately 1 mile to the south of the Project site. Riverside Municipal Airport is located approximately 4.5 miles to the southwest of the Project site. Flabob Airport is privately owned but is available for public use. The City's Significance Criteria addresses both airports.

According to Map FL-1 of the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Project site is not located within a Compatibility Zone for Flabob Airport, and according to Map RI-1 of this plan, the Project site is not located within a Compatibility Zone for Riverside Municipal Airport. Because the Project site is located outside of the two Airport Compatibility Zones, no further analysis is required. Therefore, no impacts related to exposure of people to safety hazards or excessive noise in proximity to an airport would occur.

Impact HAZ-6: Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The project would impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Finding: The Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project consists of a master planned residential community. It would include the construction of approximately 19.6 acres of roadways, including a 1.3-mile extension of 20th Street developed as a modified secondary highway (100-foot right-of-way), enhanced with a 30-foot-wide trail easement, Collector roads (74-foot right-of-way), and Local Streets (56-foot right-of-way). There are no changes to existing roads that could potentially impair emergency response or evacuation (lane reductions, narrowing, permanent road closures, etc.).

The Project would include two public access points and three emergency vehicle access points. All road improvements would meet the General Plan and City standards. The Rio Vista Specific Plan further states that "Emergency Vehicle Access roads shall provide all-weather surface, meet minimum width and maximum grade requirements per Fire Department, and built-in accordance with Riverside County Fire Department (CAL FIRE) standards." As such, area-wide emergency vehicle access would be provided by the main roadway network within the Project site.

Furthermore, future development within the Project site would be required to comply with City's congestion management practices to reduce traffic impacts during construction and operation. Consequently, the Project would be required to comply with guidelines necessary for emergency and fire vehicle access. Additionally, future development within the Project site would be included in implementation of the Jurupa Valley LHMP.

Through the construction of new roads as part of its design and connection to existing City roadways, the Project would provide access for emergency vehicles. In addition, the Project would be required to comply with City regulations related to emergency access during construction and operation. The Project would also be required to provide adequate access for emergency vehicles per the California Fire Code. Any short-term impacts on roadways would be temporary and limited to the construction period. Thus, the Project would not impair implementation or physically interfere with the City's ability to implement Riverside County's EOP. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact HAZ-7: Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The project would expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

Finding: The Project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if located within a "High" fire hazard zone per General Plan Figure 8-10: Wildfire Severity Zones in Jurupa Valley.

The Project site is located within a high wildfire severity zone and within a State Responsibility area (SRA) (Section 3.20, Wildfire, Exhibit 3.20-1), and within an area identified by the General Plan Figure 8-10, Wildfire Severity Zones in Jurupa Valley, as having "High" fire risk. However, compliance with applicable State and local plans and regulations would decrease the risk of impacts related to wildland fire hazards. Specifically, General Plan policies incorporate requirements for fire-safe construction into the land use planning and approval process and ensure special fire protection for high-risk land uses and structures. Riverside County also implements an EOP, which addresses responses to emergency incidents within it. Furthermore, all proposed construction in the City is required to meet minimum fire safety standards as defined in the County

Building or Fire Codes, or by Riverside County Zoning, or as dictated by the Building Official of the Transportation Land Management Agency based on building type, design, occupancy, and use. With adherence to all State and local regulations, impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impact: Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Finding: The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.

Facts in Support of Finding: For the Project's cumulative effects to rise to a level of significance, the impact of the Project, together with the impacts of cumulative development, must have the potential to result in a cumulatively significant impacts with respect to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, and make significant incremental contributions to cumulative impacts on agriculture and forestry resources.

Cumulative projects would be subject to the requirements and regulations set forth by the United Stated Department of Transportation (USDOT), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), California Highway Patrol (CHP), CAL FIRE, and Riverside County Fire Department related to transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. Accordingly, cumulative development would not result in physical changes that would result in a significant environmental effect. Cumulative projects will also be required to implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and comply with the California Code of Regulations during construction, site grading, excavation operations, and building demolition to ensure less than significant impacts. For these reasons cumulative projects would have a less than significant effect.

Additionally, the Project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to this less than significant impact related to hazards. The Phase I ESA did not identify any CRECs or HRECs. The Phase I ESA determined that there was one REC in the plan area. While temporary construction activities would result in the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials, compliance with applicable hazardous material laws and regulations would ensure that construction-related hazardous material use would not result in significant impacts. Similar development projects in the area would also be required to comply with such laws and regulations, and there would be no greater risk associated with the transport, use, disposal, or accidental release of these substances than would occur on any other similar construction sites. Therefore, there would not be a cumulative significant impact related to the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. In addition, the Project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site, and the nearest school is more than 0.25 mile from the site. However, the Project would include the construction and operation of a public elementary school. Therefore, the Project in conjunction with other projects would not result in a cumulatively significant impact related to hazardous materials sites or the emission of hazardous materials near a school. Similarly, the Project site is outside of the airport influence area of both Flabob Airport and Riverside Municipal Airport and not located near a private airstrip. Therefore, no cumulative significant impacts associated with airports or private airstrips have been identified.

Cumulative impacts related to emergency response and evacuation plans would be less than significant. Riverside County and local law enforcement and fire departments conduct evacuation exercises annually to prepare for emergency situations. Evacuations in the Project site area are an emergency support function that local law enforcement organizes and coordinates with Riverside County. Larger regional and statewide impacts would be regulated by State agencies to address larger-scale statewide issues. For these reasons, cumulative impacts associated with emergency response and evacuation plans would be less than significant. Moreover, the Project's incremental contribution to these less than significant cumulative impacts would not be significant. The Project would not conflict with or impair an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, because it consists of various roadway improvements and improved circulation and would

not result in any impairment to access roads. In addition, while the Project is located in a high fire severity zone, the Project would be required to comply with minimum fire safety standards as defined in the City Building or Fire Codes, or by City zoning, or as dictated by the Building Official of the Transportation Land Management Agency based on building type, design, occupancy, and use. To ensure a less than significant contribution to cumulative impacts, development consistent with the Rio Vista Specific Plan would be required to implement all applicable policies during the design review process. As the City receives development applications, those applications will be reviewed by the City for compliance with the applicable policies. In addition, a provision will be required to ensure that adequate fire protection service through agreements with Riverside Fire Department, CAL FIRE/Riverside County Fire Department, and local law enforcement and fire departments. The Project would not have a significant cumulative impact related to emergency response plans, emergency evacuation plans, or wildland fire hazards.

4.1.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact HYD-1: Hydrology and Water Quality. The project would violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality.

Finding: The Project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the project would have significant effects if inconsistent with Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Storm Water /Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls.

Surface Waters

Implementation of the Project would result in construction activities that could have the potential to contribute to pollutants in off-site surface waters, potentially impacting the water quality of the Santa Ana Watershed. However, and as required by federal, State, and local regulations, prior to the issuance of grading or construction permits, the project applicant shall prepare a SWPPP conforming to the State Water Board NPDES permit. The SWPPP shall identify BMPs to prevent construction-related pollutants from reaching stormwater and all products of erosion from moving off-site. Therefore, with compliance with federal, State, and local regulations, temporary construction impacts would be less than significant.

Long-term operations of the Project have the potential to increase the potential of stormwater runoff transporting contaminants from roadway surfaces, parking lots, roofs, and other exposed structural and landscape surfaces into the storm drain system. The proposed storm drainage system would collect runoff and direct it to basins where pollutants, trash, and debris would either be collected or sequestered. This drainage system would ensure long-term operational impacts are less than significant.

Water Quality

The Project includes Plan, Policies and Programs (PPPs) to protect water quality in and around the planning area during Project construction. Additionally, PDFs would include water quality basins throughout the Project site to treat storm water prior to discharging to proposed and/or existing off-site storm water facilities. In addition, the Project would be subject to Municipal Code Chapter 6.05, which establishes the Stormwater/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls Ordinance to protect and enhance the water quality of the City. Further compliance with the CWA, mandatory NPDES permit requirements, adherence to the Municipal Code, and implementation of the PPPs, along with the project-specific WQMP, would ensure that impacts related to water quality degradation from construction activities would be less than significant.

The Project includes the Project Design Features (PDFs) to protect water quality in and around the Project site during Project operation. These policies require adherence to Municipal Code Chapter 6.05, Stormwater/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls. Future development under the Project would be required to comply with the CWA and regulations enforced by the RWQCB. Therefore, future operation of the Project would not violate any water quality standards or WDRs or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. As such, implementation of the Project would result in less than significant impacts with respect to water quality degradation from operational activities.

Impact HYD-2: Hydrology and Water Quality. The project would substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.

Finding: The Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it would conflict with an applicable Ground Water Management program as identified in the applicable Urban Water Management Plan.

The Project site would be annexed into the Rubidoux Community Service District (RCSD). Buildout of the Project could lead to an increased demand for water, which could lead to an increased demand for groundwater production.

According to the RCSD 2022 Water Master Plan (WMP), the agency obtains all of its water supply from groundwater pumped from the Riverside County portion of the Riverside-Arlington Basin, which is a subbasin to the Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin. The WMP noted that sufficient water supplies are available from the basin to meet its existing needs and ultimate average day demand needs, which is the buildout scenario for the RCSD. The WMP accounts for the Project. RCSD's groundwater supplies have been proven to be stable and reliable, even in dry seasons. As a result, the WMP concluded that RCSD anticipates having adequate water supplies to meet future demands. Accordingly, the Riverside-Arlington Basin is within its safe yield and is not in a state of overdraft. The WMP does not identify a Groundwater Management Program.

Subsequent development under the Project could result in an increase in impervious surfaces, which could reduce rainwater infiltration. However, upon compliance with the PPPs and the Municipal Code, implementation of the project-specific WQMP to protect groundwater recharge, and meeting stormwater requirements at all regulatory levels, including those for stormwater infiltration, impacts related to groundwater supplies and groundwater management would be less than significant.

Impact HYD-3: Hydrology and Water Quality. The project would 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 which 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.

Finding: The Project would not 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 which would: result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; 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; or impede or redirect flood flows.

Facts in Support of Finding:

Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

Under the City's local significance threshold, the project would have significant effects if: The project is inconsistent with Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls. The Project would be subject to Municipal Code Chapter 6.05, which establishes the Stormwater/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls Ordinance to protect and enhance the water quality of the City, further reducing on- or off-site erosion or siltation. Therefore, impacts related to substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site would be less than significant.

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

Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if its drainage system is not designed to manage runoff from 10- and 100-year storm events. All basins would be developed in accordance with the Riverside County Hydraulic Manual's design standard of detaining a 100-year storm event over a 24-hour period. Therefore, the Project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in on- or off-site flooding. Impacts would be less than significant.

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.

Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if inconsistent with the County of Riverside Master Drainage Plan or Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls. The Project would be subject to Municipal Code Chapter 6.05, which establishes the Stormwater/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls Ordinance to protect and enhance the water quality of the City, further reducing on- or off-site erosion or siltation. Therefore, the Project would not 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impede or redirect flood flows.

Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it would impede or redirect flood flows in a manner that would adversely impact upstream of downstream properties. Stormwater basins on the Project site would be developed in accordance with the Riverside County Hydraulic Manual's design standard of detaining a 100-year storm event over a 24-hour period. In addition, the basins would detain stormwater runoff from the site prior to discharging into the Sunnyslope Channel at four separate locations or into the Market Street Storm Drain at one location. Collectively, these measures would serve to slow, reduce, and meter the volume of runoff leaving the Project site and ensure that downstream

storm drainage facilities are not inundated with Project-related stormwater. Therefore, the Project would have significant effects if it would impede or redirect flood flows in a manner that would adversely impact upstream of downstream properties. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact HYD-4: Hydrology and Water Quality. The project is located in a flood hazard zone, tsunami, or seiche zone, or risk release of pollutants due to project inundation.

Finding: The Project is not located in a flood hazard zone, tsunami, or seiche zone, or risk release of pollutants due to project inundation.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if located in a 100-year flood hazard zone and is inconsistent with Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls.

The Project site is not located in a 100-Year Floodplain Zone delineated by FEMA. There are no enclosed bodies of water on-site or in the Project site vicinity. Further, the Project site is located inland, approximately 38 miles from the Pacific Ocean to the southwest and approximately 80 miles from the Salton Sea to the southeast. While there are slopes within the Project site, potential for mudflow is low given the low annual rainfall.

In addition, the Project would be subject to Municipal Code Chapter 6.05, which establishes the Stormwater/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls Ordinance to protect and enhance the water quality of the City and reduces the potential for release of pollutants due to project inundation.

Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to potential hazards to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No impact would occur.

Impact HYD-5: Hydrology and Water Quality. The project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

Finding: The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if inconsistent with Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Storm Water/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls or Santa Ana Region Basin Plan.

Construction and development of the Project would be required to comply with CWA, General Plan policies and programs, the Municipal Code, and the NPDES permit requirements. The Project would also implement a project-specific WQMP. Therefore, future development under the Project at construction and operation would not violate any water quality standards or WDRs or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality, in compliance with the Santa Ana River Basin Plan.

Further, the Riverside-Arlington Basin is an adjudicated basin; adjudicated basins are exempt from the 2014 Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) because such basins already operate under a court-ordered management plan to ensure the long-term sustainability of the sub-basin. No component of the Project would obstruct with or prevent implementation of the management plan for the Riverside-Arlington Basin.

In addition, the Project would be subject to Municipal Code Chapter 6.05, which establishes the Stormwater/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls Ordinance to protect and enhance the water

quality of the City. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a sustainable groundwater management plan and impacts would be considered less than significant.

Cumulative Impact: Hydrology and Water Quality.

Finding: The Project would have a less than significant cumulative impact related to hydrology and water quality, and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Finding:

The Project would involve short-term construction and long-term operational activities that would have the potential to degrade water quality in downstream water bodies. BMPs proposed in the WQMP would require implementation of various construction and operational water quality control measures that would prevent the release of pollutants into downstream waterways. Other projects that propose new development would be required to implement similar mitigation measures in accordance with adopted regulations. The combined implementation of construction and operation water quality control measures among the other cumulative development projects would be expected to reduce related cumulative impacts.

The various cumulative projects would have the potential to increase the use of groundwater resources. However, the RCSD, which is the water provider for most of Jurupa Valley, indicates in its 2022 WMP that adequate groundwater supplies are available to serve projected demand through the ultimate buildout scenario. These demand figures account for existing water use, plus increased water use in the future from population growth, including that associated with the other projects. All customers within the RCSD, including the Project, would be required to comply with any rationing or demand reduction measures as required to ensure adequate water supplies in time of drought or other emergencies. As such, the Project, in conjunction with other projects, would not deplete groundwater supplies.

The various cumulative projects that are located in the Project site vicinity may have the potential to increase impervious surface coverage and, therefore, may result in increased runoff volumes in downstream waterways. These projects would be required to provide drainage facilities that collect and detain runoff such that off-site releases are controlled and do not create flooding in accordance with State and local regulations. Additionally, all cumulative projects would be subject to local, State and federal permit requirements and would be required to comply with City ordinances and General Plan policies, as well as other water quality regulations that control construction-related and operational discharge of pollutants in stormwater. The water quality regulations implemented by the RWQCB take a basin-wide approach regarding water quality in a regional context. For example, qualifying projects in the cumulative context would be required to adhere to the Construction General Permit which ties receiving water limitations and basin plan objectives to terms and conditions of the permit, and the MS4 Permit works with all municipalities to manage stormwater systems to be collectively protective of water quality. For these reasons, cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant.

Moreover, the Project's incremental contribution to less than significant cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. As noted in this EIR, the Project's impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant or no impact with the implementation of applicable regulations including project design features and General Plan policies and programs. No mitigation is necessary. The Project would install an on-site storm drainage system sized to detain runoff in accordance with the applicable jurisdictions regulations. As discussed in Impact HYD-3 above, the storm drainage system would be able to

reduce peak storm event flows such that they do not inundate downstream drainage facilities. This would ensure that the Project, in conjunction with other projects, would not contribute to downstream flooding conditions during peak storm events.

Therefore, the Project, in conjunction with other planned and approved projects, would not have a cumulatively considerable impact on hydrology and water quality.

4.1.8 Land Use and Planning

Impact LU-1: Land Use and Planning. The project would physically divide an established community.

Finding: The Project would not physically divide an established community.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it involves the construction of a new freeway, highway, or roadway or proposes the construction of any physical feature that would serve to impede the connectivity between parts of a cohesive neighborhood or community.

The Project does not propose the type of large linear construction that would impact mobility within the existing community and surrounding area. The Project site is privately-owned undeveloped land. There are no existing residences or established communities within the Project site boundaries, nor are there developed connecting roadways. Development of the Project would include the construction of approximately 19.6 acres of roadways, including an approximately 1.3-mile extension of 20th Street to be developed as a modified secondary highway, collector roads, and local streets. The extension of 20th Street would not impede the connectivity between parts of a cohesive neighborhood or community; rather it would provide a mobility corridor through the Project site between the existing residential area to the west and the existing industrial/residential areas to the east. An 8-foot-wide decomposed granite soft-surface trail and a 10-foot-wide Class I hard surface bicycle trail would be located within the 30-foot-wide trail easement along 20th Street, forming a central spine of trails through the Project site. Sidewalks would be constructed on all local collectors and local streets in order to provide a pedestrian network. As such, buildout of the Project would not divide an established community but would instead provide connectivity internally and externally. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact LU-2: Land Use and Planning. The project would cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Finding: The project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it conflicts with any land use plan related to an environmental issue under CEQA, and the conflict results in an adverse environmental impact.

Connect SoCal

Tables 3.11-2 and 3.11-3 in Section 3.11 (refer to the Draft EIR) provide an assessment of the Project's relationship to SCAG's Connect SoCal. The analysis concludes that implementation of the Project would not result in an inconsistency with the regional goals contained in Connect SoCal. Accordingly, the Project would have a less than significant impact with respect to a conflict with the SCAG's Connect SoCal.

General Plan

Table 3.11-5 in Section 3.11 (refer to the Draft EIR) provides a detailed analysis of the Project's consistency with the pertinent City of Jurupa Valley General Plan. The analysis concludes that the Project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan goals and policies that are intended to avoid or minimize an environmental effect.

The Project requires a General Plan Amendment to allow the establishment of a mixed-use community, which would include more varied residential and nonresidential uses, as well as additional public uses. When a project itself entails amendments to the general plan designations or zoning, inconsistency with the existing designations or zoning is an element of the project itself, which then necessitates a legislative policy decision by the agency and does not signify a potential environmental effect. Impacts would be less than significant.

Zoning Ordinance

The Project would require a change of zone to allow for adoption of a Zoning Ordinance for the project and modification of the zone from Specific Plan (SP) No. 243 to a new SP Zone, SP No. 16001. The Project would be adopted into the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and serve as zoning for the Project site. The Project's development standards and design guidelines would serve as the regulations for new development. When a project itself entails amendments to the general plan designations or zoning, inconsistency with the existing designations or zoning is an element of the project itself, which then necessitates a legislative policy decision by the agency and does not signify a potential environmental effect. Impacts would be less than significant.

Table 3.11-5 in Section 3.11 (refer to the Draft EIR) provides a detailed analysis of the Project's consistency with the pertinent City of Jurupa Valley General Plan. The analysis concludes that the Project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan goals and policies that are intended to avoid or minimize an environmental effect.

Rubidoux Community Services District

The Riverside County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) informed the applicant that the request to annex the Project into the service area of the Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) is approved, pending completion of several outstanding approvals. Table 3.11-6 in Section 3.11 (refer to the Draft EIR) provides a detailed analysis of the Project's consistency with the LAFCo required document. The majority of the items are pending adoption of the Project (i.e., the new Rio Vista Specific Plan) and certification of the EIR by the City. Table 3.11-6 notes that the documents are expected to be consisted with the required document. Assuming that these two documents would be adopted by the City, the Project would be able to provide the required documents to LAFCo, allowing the annexation to be deemed complete. Impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impact: Land Use and Planning.

Finding: The Project's cumulative impacts relating to land use and planning would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative development is likely to continue occurring in the surrounding vicinity. However, most of this development would take place in urbanized areas as infill development and not require significant land use changes that would create land use conflicts, nor would they divide existing communities. Development projects in the City, the County of Riverside, and the southwestern portion of the County of San Bernardino would be required to demonstrate consistency with all applicable City or County

General Plan and Municipal/Ordinance Code requirements. In addition, development would be required to demonstrate consistency with Connect SoCal and SCAG's RTP/SCS. This would ensure that these future projects comply with applicable planning regulations. For cumulative projects, the applicable lead agency would be required to issue findings demonstrating consistency with the applicable General Plan, Municipal/Ordinance Code requirements and Connect SoCal if they are ultimately approved. For these reasons, cumulative impacts with respect to land use would be less than significant.

The Project's incremental contribution to cumulative land use impacts would also not be significant. With the proposed General Plan Amendment and rezoning, the Project would be consistent with the General Plan and Municipal Code as well as Connect SoCal. New development and redevelopment consistent with the Project would be designed to enhance the character of the City and provide connectivity between existing development and new development within the cumulative analysis area. Further, the Project is designed to encourage connectivity and cohesive development. It does not approve the construction or development of any new roadways, walls, bridges, major infrastructure, or other features that would divide existing neighborhoods within the cumulative analysis areas. Accordingly, the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would also be less than significant and the Project, in conjunction with other existing, planned, and probable future projects, would not have a cumulatively significant impact related to land use.

4.1.9 Mineral Resources

Impact MIN-1: Mineral Resources. The project would 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.

Finding: The Project would not 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. Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if located within MRZ-1 or MRZ-2 as shown on General Plan Figure 4-16-Jurupa Valley Mineral Resources. Because the portion of the Project site within Mineral Resource Zone 2 is not designated as regionally significant resources and is not designated for mineral extraction or held in reserve for future mining activities, 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. As such, impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if located within MRZ-1 or MRZ-2 as shown on General Plan Figure 4-16-Jurupa Valley Mineral Resources.

The majority of the Project site is within "Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3; Areas containing known or inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resource significance)" and partially within "Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2; Areas where available geologic data indicate significant PCC-grade aggregate resources are present)." However, the State Mining and Geology Board (SMGB) does not designate this area as a regionally significant Portland Cement Concrete-grade aggregate resource area. Furthermore, the General Plan does not designate the site as a mineral resource land use designation that allows for mineral extraction on the basis of the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) classification, or an area held in reserve for future mining activities.

Because these PAs are not designated as regionally significant PCC-grade resources and are not designated for mineral extraction or held in reserve for future mining activities, 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. In addition, the MRZ-2 area within the Project site may have been included as an available resource by the State Geologist, but it is not actually available because of the approved Specific Plan. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Impact MIN-2: Mineral Resources. The project would 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.

Finding: The Project would not 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. Under the City's local significance threshold, the project would have significant effects if: The Project site is located on land designated as Open Space, Mineral Resources (OS-MIN) by the General Plan. Neither the General Plan Land Use Map nor the Rio Vista Specific Plan identify any locally important mineral resource recovery sites on the Project site, nor are any mineral resource recovery operations located on-site or in the surrounding area. The City's Zoning Map indicates that the Project site is zoned SP Zone. impacts would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if located on land designated as Open Space, Mineral Resources (OS-MIN) by the General Plan.

Neither the General Plan Land Use Map nor the Rio Vista Specific Plan identify any locally important mineral resource recovery sites on the Project site, nor are any mineral resource recovery operations located on-site or in the surrounding area. The City's Zoning Map indicates that the Project site is zoned SP Zone.

Furthermore, as discussed in Impact MIN-1, the SMGB does not designate this area as a regionally significant PCC-grade aggregate resource area. Similarly, the General Plan does not designate the site as a mineral resource land use designation that allows for mineral extraction on the basis of the SMARA classification, or an area held in reserve for future mining activities. In addition, the MRZ-2 area within the Project site may have been included as an available resource by the State Geologist, but it is not actually available because of the approved Specific Plan. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impact: Mineral Resources.

Finding: The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact with respect to mineral resources.

Facts in Support of Finding: Mineral resource development within the San Bernardino Production-Consumption Region will be conducted in line with SMARA, which requires all cities and counties to incorporate into their General Plans the mapped designations approved by the State Mining Board. Both Riverside County's and the City's General Plan policies require future development to coordinate carefully between proposed mining and existing development, or between existing mining and proposed development. These programmatic goals, policies, and programs would ensure that the cumulative impacts between mining and development within the City would be less than significant. The Project's contribution to less than significant cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable because there are no available resources on the Project site.

4.1.10 Noise

Impact NOI-3: Noise. The project would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels 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.

Finding: The Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels 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.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it generates aircraft noise that exposes people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip or within the Flabob Airport or Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan to noise levels in excess of the noise standards of said plans.

The nearest airport to the Project site is the Flabob Airport, located approximately 1 mile south of the Project site. At this distance, the Project site is located approximately 0.8 mile north of the airport's 55 dBA CNEL noise contours. The Riverside Municipal Airport is located approximately 4.1 miles from the Project boundaries. At this distance, the Project site is located well outside of the airport's 55 dBA CNEL noise contours. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not expose persons residing or working at the Project site to noise levels from airport activity that would be in excess of the noise standards identified in the applicable land use compatibility plans. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Cumulative Impact: Noise.

Finding: The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact with respect to noise.

Facts in Support of Finding:

Construction Noise Impacts

The significance criteria for a cumulative construction noise impact would be a substantial temporary noise increase in areas in the Project vicinity that already experience excessive noise levels from construction activities. While there are industrial, commercial, and residential development projects undergoing construction in the Project vicinity, none of them are located within 500 feet of the Project's development areas and, thus, do not have the potential to create cumulative impacts. Therefore, since there is not an existing cumulative impact and the Project's contribution would be less than significant, the Project would result in a less than significant cumulative impact related to construction noise.

Operational Traffic Noise Impacts

The significance criteria for a cumulative traffic noise impact would be substantial permanent increase in traffic noise levels in the vicinity of the Project along roadway segments that already experience noise levels in excess of normally acceptable standards for adjacent land uses. Traffic noise levels along modeled roadway segments with the highest project-related traffic noise increases would not exceed the City's normally acceptable land use compatibility standards for adjacent land uses. In addition, all other modeled roadway segments would experience less than a 3 dBA increase in traffic noise levels compared to traffic noise levels existing without the Project. Therefore, since there is not an existing cumulative impact, and the Project contribution would also be less than significant, the Project would result in a less than significant cumulative impact related to traffic noise.

Stationary Source Operational Noise Impacts

The significance criteria for a cumulative stationary source operational noise impact would be a substantial temporary noise increase in the Project vicinity that are already exposed to excessive noise levels from stationary source operational noise. While there are industrial, commercial, and residential development

projects in the Project vicinity, none of them are located within 500 feet of the Project's development areas and, thus, do not have the potential to create cumulative impacts. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution of operational stationary noise in the Project vicinity. This impact would be less than significant.

Construction Groundborne Vibration Impacts

The only cumulatively considerable contribution to construction-related groundborne vibration conditions in the Project vicinity would result from introduction of construction activities that would generate groundborne vibration levels within the vicinity of existing construction areas. While there are industrial, commercial, and residential development projects undergoing construction in the Project vicinity, none of them are located within 100 feet of the Project's development areas and, thus, do not have the potential to create cumulative impacts. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant cumulative impact related to construction groundborne vibration impacts.

Operational Groundborne Vibration Impacts

The only cumulatively considerable contribution to groundborne vibration conditions in the Project vicinity would result from introduction of new permanent sources of groundborne vibration to an existing impacted environment. The only major sources of groundborne vibration in the project vicinity is railroad activity along the rail line located approximately 4,000 feet west of the Project's development areas. Implementation of the Project would not introduce any new permanent sources of groundborne vibration to the Project vicinity and would not increase railroad activity. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to vibration conditions in the Project vicinity. This impact would be less than significant.

4.1.11 Population and Housing

Impact POP-1: Population and Housing. The project would induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

Finding: The Project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it is in an area that is currently undeveloped or unserved by major infrastructure, and the Project would introduce unplanned infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in the adopted General Plan.

The Project consists of a master planned residential community that would include up to 1,697 dwelling units (du), 1.27 million square feet of light industrial uses, and 1.43 million square feet of business park uses. As such, it would have the potential to induce direct population growth through the development of new housing and potentially facilitate indirect population growth through the creation of new jobs and expanded infrastructure.

While the Project site is currently undeveloped and is not served by major infrastructure, the Project site is surrounded by developed areas and infrastructure. Connections to infrastructure would be completed, as necessary, when individual projects are developed within the Project site. The Project would include

development of major and minor streets with related infrastructure, including the extension of 20th Street, as planned for in the General Plan. As such, the project would be served by adjacent major infrastructure.

The Project would include extension of roads and infrastructure to serve the proposed residential and nonresidential uses. However, the infrastructure would only serve the Project site. Furthermore, the Project site is surrounded by developed areas already served by roads and infrastructure. Accordingly, buildout of the Project would not remove a physical barrier to growth.

Based on the City of Jurupa Valley's average household size of 3.71 persons per dwelling unit (as shown in Table 3.14-3), the Project could result in a population increase of approximately 6,296 people. This increase of population represents approximately 36 percent of the SCAG's population forecast, which anticipates an increase of 17,700 people between 2016 and 2045 (see Table 3.14-2). Alternatively, the 2014 to 2035 population growth is estimated to be between 37,622 and 53,745 people. The Project's estimated population of 6,296 would be approximately 12 to 17 percent of this growth estimate. Furthermore, the General Plan identifies and includes the Project's area for future residential and open space development as shown on General Plan Figure 2-5, Land Use Plan. Therefore, population increase resulting from buildout of the Project would constitute planned growth in accordance with regional and local projections.

The Project would provide needed housing options in the City to support planned population growth. As shown in Table 3.14-4, the City's RHNA Allocation determined that there is a need for 4,497 housing units in order to meet the City's housing needs. The Project would provide up to 1,697 housing units, which would help to support the housing needs of the City consistent with City's RHNA Allocation. The Housing Element Update projects that by 2029, approximately 60 percent, or 1,081 of the proposed 1,697 housing units would be built. Of these proposed 1,081 housing units, 578 are expected to be in the RHNA "Above Moderate Income" category, and 440 are expected to be in the RHNA "Moderate Income" category. The increase in housing resulting from buildout of the Project would constitute planned growth in accordance with regional and local projections.

As part of SCAG's effort to facilitate regional modeling of land use information from nearly 200 distinct jurisdictions, it developed a simplified series of Land Development Categories (LDCs) to represent the dominant themes taken from the region's many general plans. The three LDCs that SCAG used are Urban, Compact, and Standard. The City is classified within the Standard LDC, and the projected growth described in Section 3.14 of the Draft EIR would not result in the Project site being reclassified to the Urban or Compact LDCs. As such, the Project is consistent with the growth projections in Connect SoCal.

Development of the Project would result in increased employment opportunities associated with the light industrial and business park uses. Using a standard light industrial/business park employment rate of one employee per 1,000 square feet, the Project would create an estimated 2,700 jobs. SCAG anticipates that employment within the City will increase by 4,200 between 2016 and 2045 (see Table 3.14-5). The increase in employment opportunities generated by the Project would be consistent with SCAG's employment forecast for Jurupa Valley.

The Project area was intended for residential and nonresidential uses in 1992, when the County of Riverside approved the Rio Vista Specific Plan No. 243 and certified the associated EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 1988122608). Thus, both local and regional growth projections account for population and employment growth within the Project site. Therefore, buildout of the Project would constitute planned growth in accordance with regional and local projections.

Under the City's thresholds, a project may have a significant impact if it is in an area that is currently underdeveloped or unserved by major infrastructure and the project would introduce unplanned infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in the adopted General Plan. Both conditions must be met to identify a significant impact. Accordingly, while the project would result in the extension of infrastructure into the Project site, the development of the Project site was considered in the General Plan as shown on General Plan Figure 2-5, Land Use Plan. The General Plan identifies and includes the Project's area for future residential and open space development. As such, the extension of infrastructure to the Project site was considered in the General Plan. Overall, the Project's growth has been planned and accounted for, and the Project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact POP-2: Population and Housing. The project would displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Finding: The Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if the Project site contains residential housing which will not be replaced with new residential housing on-site.

The Project site is currently vacant and undeveloped and therefore does not currently provide any housing units, does not support a residential population, and would not result in any impacts to existing housing. Therefore, the Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

The Project would provide needed housing options in the City to support planned population growth. As shown in Table 3.14-4, the City's RHNA Allocation determined that there is a need for 4,497 housing units in order to meet the City's housing needs. The Project would provide up to 1,697 housing units, which would help to support the housing needs of the City. Furthermore, additional housing units are needed to support an ideal jobs-housing ratio in the City. According to the APA, an ideal jobs-housing ratio is generally 1.5, with a recommended range of 1.3 to 1.7. The jobs-housing ratio in the City of Jurupa Valley is anticipated to decrease from 1.07 to 0.98 between 2016 and 2045 due to an increase of employment (Table 3.14-6). Additional housing units provided by the Project would help to support the additional anticipated future housing needs caused by the anticipated increase in employment. Thus, there would be no impact related to displacement of housing or construction of replacement housing.

Cumulative Impact: Population and Housing.

Finding: The Project's cumulative impacts relating to population and housing would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Finding:

Population Growth

With a projection for City population growth of 17,700 people between 2016 and 2045, the contribution of the Project (6,296 people) and cumulative projects (3,372 people) that are located within the City would total 9,668 and would be within this projection. As such, there would not be substantial direct population growth

associated with the Project in conjunction with the cumulative projects. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to population growth, both direct and indirect, would be less than significant.

The Project's incremental contribution to the less than significant impact associated with population growth is not cumulatively considerable. The Project would add 6,296 persons to the City's population, which would represent growth of approximately 6.3 percent of the City's current population and is within the City's planned and anticipated growth. Therefore, the Project would not result in a cumulative considerable impact related to population.

Population/Housing Displacement

Cumulative projects listed in Table 3-1 in conjunction with the Project would add 906 residential units to the City. None of the listed projects substantially displaces housing units or people within the City. In fact, implementation of the cumulative projects would result in a net increase of housing in the City consistent with planned for growth. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with population and housing displacement would be less than significant. Moreover, the Project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to the less than significant cumulative impact as discussed above.

4.1.12 Public Services

Impact PUB-1: Public Services. The project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 fire protection services, police protection services, schools, parks, or other public facilities.

Finding: The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 fire protection services, police protection services, schools, parks, or other public facilities.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it substantially affects Fire-Rescue response times (i.e., increases the existing response times in the project area) to the degree that new or altered fire facilities are required to meet the response times as listed in the County Fire Protection Master Plan or similar performance standard document adopted by the Riverside County Fire Department.

The City General Plan considers the Project as planned growth within the City. The General Plan EIR stated that future development under the General Plan would be required to be designed, constructed, and operated per applicable fire prevention/protection standards established by the City. It further stated that all new development would be required to pay Development Impact Fees (DIF) to the City, concluding that there would be no significant impacts related to fire protection from implementation of the General Plan. Finally, the General Plan identifies the need for expanding public service by establishing Program CSSF 2.2, which would ensure the provision of sufficient public facilities and services prior to, or concurrently with, new development.

The Project would be required 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. In addition, the Project would be required to comply with Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 and pay the City's DIF, which would ensure that the Project provides fair share funds for the provision of additional public services, including equipment and personnel for fire protection services, that the Project would utilize. The addition of equipment to Station 38 could be accommodated within the existing facility and does not require the alteration or construction of new facilities. As such, construction of new or physically altered facilities would not be required, and impacts would be less than significant.

Impact PUB-2: Public Services. The project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 police protection.

Finding: The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 police protection.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it cannot be served by existing Sheriff Department resources and new or altered sheriff facilities are required to serve the Project.

The General Plan considers the Project as planned growth within the City. Furthermore, the General Plan EIR prepared in 2016, stated that new development would increase property tax and DIF revenues to the City which would help fund expanded police services in the future. Therefore, the Final EIR concluded that there would be no significant impacts related to police protection from implementation of the General Plan. Finally, the General Plan identifies the need for expanding public service by establishing Program CSSF 2.2, which would ensure the provision of sufficient public facilities and services prior to, or concurrently with, new development.

The Project would be required to comply with Municipal Code Chapter 3.75 and pay the City's DIF, which would ensure that the Project provides fair share funds for the provision of additional public services, including equipment and personal for police protection services, that the project would utilize. As such, construction of new or physically altered facilities would not be required, and impacts would be less than significant.

Impact PUB-3: Public Services. The project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 schools.

Finding: The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 schools.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it is required under Section 65995 of the Government Code to pay any applicable school district fee

following protocol for impact fee collection required by that district. The payment of school impact fees constitutes complete mitigation under CEQA for project-related impacts to school services.

As part of the Project, JUSD would have an option of purchasing PA 18 for the purpose of constructing a K-8 school. In the event that JUSD elects not to develop a school on the Project site, students residing at the Project would be served by Rustic Lane Elementary School, Mission Middle School, and Rubidoux High School. As of November 1, 2022, the 2022-23 school year Rustic Lane Elementary School enrollment was 542 students, Mission Middle School enrollment was 692 students, and Rubidoux High School enrollment was 1,385 students. These enrollment levels are well within the current (school year 2022-23) school capacities of 900 students for Rustic Lane Elementary School, 1,150 students for Mission Middle School, and 2,400 students for Rubidoux High School, allowing for increased enrollment that could result from development of the Project.

In addition, Riverside Community College District (RCCD) intends to construct and operate the Inland Empire Technical Trade Center (IETTC) in PAs 14 and 18. The IETTC provides career training in the fields of logistics, advanced manufacturing, Cybersecurity/Information Technology (IT), and green technologies.

In accordance with the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (Senate Bill 50) as implemented by California Government Code Section 65995, JUSD is authorized to levy a new construction fee per square foot of construction to fund the reconstruction or construction of new school facilities. Payment of school impact fees constitutes complete mitigation under the Government Code for project-related environmental impacts to school services. Therefore, the payment of school impact fees for residential development would offset the potential impacts of increased student enrollment related to the implementation of the Project. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Impact PUB-4: Public Services. The project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 parks.

Finding: The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 parks.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it will result in creating park deficiencies in the area resulting in the need for new or altered park facilities that are not offset by the payment of DIF or the dedication of parkland.

The Project would include approximately 529.2 acres, or 58 percent, of Open Space and Recreational land uses. In addition, a bike path and soft-surface trail would be provided along 20th Street in the central area of the Project site.

The Project site would contain approximately 510.8 acres of open space, consisting of a combination of natural open space, revegetated manufactured slopes, and regraded and revegetated slopes. Many of the existing informal trails would remain, and no new trails into the open space would be created.

In addition, the Project would provide recreational amenities on 18.4 acres within the Project site, including a 14.3-acre community park and approximately five Neighborhood Parks ranging from approximately 0.75 acre

to 1 acre and located throughout the community. In addition, an integrated system of hard and soft-surface (decomposed granite) trails would provide access from the residential neighborhoods to the school site, community park, and informal dirt trails located in the Open Space.

Trails for equestrians, bicyclists, and pedestrians would form an integrated system of hard and soft-surface (decomposed granite) paths throughout the Project area. The trails would complement and improve access to the existing informal trails traversing the natural open space. The Project would retain the existing unimproved informal trails located within the open space for use by future residents of the Project and the public. Connections from the bike path and soft-surface trail would provide access to these existing informal trails, which would remain unimproved, and would continue to allow public access to the ridges and top of the hills within the proposed community.

The City, JARPD, and RivCo Parks maintain regional and local community parks, trails, and recreational facilities for public use throughout the City. In the absence of a City-approved parks and recreation plan, the City Municipal Code 7.25.020 requires parkland dedication at a rate of 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 persons, or 0.003 acre per person.

The Project would be expected to result in a population increase of 6,296 persons, resulting in the need for 18.89 acres of parkland to support the City's parkland standard. The Project would provide 529.2 acres of open space and recreational facilities, far exceeding the minimum required to maintain the City parkland standard. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Impact PUB-5: Public Services. The project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 other public facilities (including libraries).

Finding: The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 other public facilities (including libraries).

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it will result in creating deficiencies to other public facilities the area that are not offset by the payment of DIF.

Library services are provided to the City by the RCLS. The RCLS facility closest to the Project site is Louis Robidoux Library, located at 5840 Mission Boulevard. This facility is located approximately 0.5 mile south of the Project site (direct distance), approximately 3.4 miles (driving distance) south of the Project site's 20th Street western access point and approximately 3 miles (driving distance) south of the Project site's 20th Street eastern access point.

The General Plan considers the Project as planned growth within the City. Furthermore, at final buildout, the Project is expected to have up to 6,296 residents, accounting for approximately 5 percent of the General Plan's population forecast, which anticipates a City population of 126,000 person by 2035. In addition, the Project's expected population would account for approximately 0.2 percent of the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) 2045 Riverside County population forecast of 3,252,000 persons.

Furthermore, the General Plan EIR prepared in 2016 stated that General Plan policies regarding public services are designed to ensure that the City would have adequate services into the future as the City grows and development and increases in population occur, which would require additional public services. The Final EIR further states that these policies focus on making sure the City has adequate public services in the future, including libraries.

The Project would be required to comply with Municipal Code Chapter 3.75, Development Impact Fee, and pay the City's DIF, which would ensure that the Project provides fair share funds for the provision of additional public services, including library services, that the Project would utilize. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impact: Public Services.

Finding: The Project's cumulative impacts relating to public services would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Finding:

Fire Protection Facilities

To help offset the increased demand, the cumulative projects would be required to pay all applicable fees to the Riverside County Fire Department and CalFire. All developments would also be required to adhere to the California Fire Code, Part 9 of the California Building Standards Code (CBC) in terms of meeting standards for fire safety such as fire flow requirements for buildings, fire hydrant location and distribution criteria, automated sprinkler systems, and fire-resistant building materials.

With adherence to CBC Code sections and payment of applicable fees, cumulative projects would not result in the need for new or altered fire protection or emergency medical facilities. Thus, there would be a less than significant cumulative impact regarding the need for new or altered fire protection and emergency medical facilities. Additionally, as discussed above, the Project's incremental contribution to the less than significant cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

Police Protection Facilities

To help offset the increased demand for police protection facilities, the cumulative projects would be required to pay applicable fees to the Riverside County Sheriff's Department. All developments would also be reviewed for impacts on law enforcement services and would be required to address any potential impacts with mitigation. Because demand for law enforcement services is highly dependent on a number of factors that vary substantially by project (clientele, hours of operation, crime prevention measures, etc.), it is unlikely that there would be substantial overlap in demand that would result in a cumulatively significant impact such that new police protection facilities are necessary.

With payment of applicable fees, cumulative projects would not result in the need for new or altered police protection facilities. Thus, there would be a less than significant cumulative impact regarding the need for new or altered police protection facilities. Additionally, as discussed above, the Project's incremental contribution to the less than significant cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

School Facilities

All cumulative developments would be required to pay DIF to the JUSD. In accordance with the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (Senate Bill 50) as implemented by per California Government Code Section 65995, JUSD is authorized to levy a new construction fee per square foot of construction to fund the reconstruction or construction of new school facilities. Payment of school impact fees constitutes complete mitigation under CEQA for project-related impacts to school services. Under State law, this is the exclusive means of mitigating impacts to school facilities due to increased enrollment. As part of the project entitlement process, the cumulative project applicants would be responsible for paying their fair share of these school facility fees.

With payment of applicable fees, cumulative projects would not result in the need for new or altered school facilities. Thus, there would be a less than significant cumulative impact regarding the need for new or altered school facilities. Additionally, as discussed above, the Project's incremental contribution to the less than significant cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

Parks

With payment of applicable fees by the cumulative projects, there would be a less than significant cumulative impact related to potential increased use and physical deterioration of existing parks and recreational facilities or the need for new or altered parks and recreational facilities. Additionally, as discussed above, the Project would provide 529.2 acres of open space and recreational facilities, far exceeding the minimum required to maintain the City parkland standard. As such the Project would not contribute to the less than significant cumulative impact.

Library Facilities

The geographic scope of the cumulative library facilities analysis is the RCLS. The cumulative projects listed in Chapter 3, Environmental Impact Analysis, Table 3-1, could increase the population and demand for library facilities.

However, with payment of applicable fees by the cumulative projects, there would be a less than significant cumulative impact related to potential increased use and physical deterioration of existing library facilities or the need for new or altered library facilities. Additionally, as discussed above, the Project's incremental contribution to the less than significant cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

4.1.13 Recreation

Impact REC-1: Recreation. The project would 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.

Finding: The Project would not 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.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it proposes a General Plan Amendment which could result in an increase in population over that projected in the adopted General Plan and the Project will result in an increase in 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.

The Project proposes a General Plan Amendment to develop a master planned residential community, including 510.8 acres of natural open space and 18.4 acres of recreational amenities.

The Project would be expected to result in a population increase of 6,296 persons, which is accounted for in the General Plan 2014 to 2035 population growth projection of between 37,622 and 53,745 people (see Section 3.14 Population and Housing). The projected population growth associated with the Project would result in the need for 33.03 acres of parkland to support the City's parkland standard. The Project would provide 529.2 acres of open space and recreational facilities, far exceeding the minimum required to maintain the City parkland standard. Therefore, the Project will not result in an increase in the use of existing parks that would result in a substantial physical deterioration of facilities.

The Project could result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. However, in addition to the ample open space and recreational facilities provided by the Project, compliance with the Municipal Code, paying development impact fees, and adherence to General Plan policies would offset potential significant impacts related to existing parks and recreational facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Impact REC-2: Recreation. The project would include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Finding: The project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the project would have significant effects if it includes recreational facilities or requires the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, significant impacts may occur if any of the Significance Thresholds identified in these Guidelines are exceeded.

The Project would include approximately 529.2 acres of private open space and recreational facilities on the Project site. The environmental impacts associated with construction of the Project, including parks and recreational facilities, are analyzed throughout the Draft EIR. In particular, construction-related impacts discussion of air quality, energy, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and noise-related construction impacts are discussed in Sections 3.3, 3.6, 3.8, and 3.13 respectively, and are summarized as follows:

- Section 3.3, Air Quality: Less than significant impacts related to consistency with an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) (Threshold AQ-1) and odor emissions (Threshold AIR-4) as related to construction and operation of the proposed recreational facilities; and less than significant impact related to potential for air quality standards violation (Threshold AQ-2) and sensitive receptor exposure to pollutant concentrations ((Threshold AIR-3) as related to construction and operation of the proposed recreational facilities.

- Section 3.6, Energy: Less than significant impacts related to construction and operation energy use (Threshold ENER-1) and to energy efficiency and renewable energy standards consistency (Threshold ENER-2) as related to construction and operation of the proposed recreational facilities.

- Section 3.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Less than significant impacts related to generation of GHG emissions (Threshold GHG-1) and to conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted

for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions (Threshold GHG-2) as related to construction and operation of the proposed recreational facilities.

- Section 3.13, Noise: While the Project would result in a significant unavoidable impact related to traffic noise during operations (Threshold NOI-1), this impact would not be generated as a result of construction of the proposed recreational facilities nor their usage.

The Project would result in a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated related to construction noise and applicable standards (Threshold NOI-2). However, this impact would not be generated as a result of construction of the proposed recreational facilities, nor their usage.

Therefore, the Project's construction of parks and recreational facilities on the Project site would result in a less than significant impact.

Cumulative Impact: Recreation.

Finding: The Project's cumulative impacts relating to recreation would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Finding: The cumulative projects listed in Chapter 3, Environmental Impact Analysis, Table 3-1, Cumulative Projects, are mostly commercial and industrial in nature, with only project S, T, U, W, and X being residential. As shown in Table 3-1 and Exhibit 3-1, these cumulative projects are all located within the 3-mile radius of the Project site. All projects in the City would need to comply with the Municipal Code, pay development impact fees, and adhere to General Plan policies, which would offset potential significant impacts related to existing parks and recreational facilities. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Additionally, the Project's contribution to less than significant cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. The Project would include approximately 529.2 acres of private open space and recreational facilities, which would support and exceed the City's parkland standard of 5 acres per new 1,000 residents or 0.005 acre per new resident. Additionally, similar to other development, the Project would comply with all General Plan policies. Therefore, the Project, in conjunction with the five identified cumulative residential projects, would provide full mitigation for potential impacts and would not contribute to an increase in permanent population that could result in an increased cumulative demand for park facilities.

4.1.14 Transportation

Impact TRANS-1: Transportation. The project would conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy of the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

Finding: The Project would not conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy of the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it is inconsistent with the General Plan Mobility Element policies pertaining to the roadway network, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, equestrian and multi-purpose trails network, and public transit. (Note: Level of Service (LOS) is not required to be analyzed under this threshold.)

City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code

Individual projects occurring within the Project site would be required to implement TDM Plans as a condition of approval, as applicable. Furthermore, as described in Section 3.11, Land Use, the Project would not conflict with provisions of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

City of Jurupa Valley Circulation Master Plan for Bicyclists and Pedestrians

Under the City's CEQA Significance Criteria, a project could have a significant impact if it is inconsistent with General Plan Mobility Element policies. Trails for bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians would form an integrated system of hard and soft-surface (decomposed granite) paths throughout the Project site. The trails would complement and improve access to the existing informal trails traversing the natural open space. The Circulation Master Plan does not outline specific plans, ordinances, or policies, but it does include a recommendation for a Class I (multiuse) bike path along the future 20th Street alignment within the Project site. As listed above, the Project would include a Class I trail along 20th Street.

Connect SoCal

SCAG's Connect SoCal is a long-range visioning plan that balances future mobility and housing needs with economic, environmental, and public health goals. Implementation of the Project would be consistent with the goals and policies of Connect SoCal.

City of Jurupa Valley General Plan

The Project would not conflict with any applicable transportation goals or policies of the General Plan. Furthermore, transportation facilities within the Project site would be constructed in accordance with General Plan design standards as a condition of approval.

City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code

Individual projects occurring within the Project site would be required to implement TDM Plans as a condition of approval, as applicable. Furthermore, the Project would not conflict with provisions of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

Transit

Plans, ordinances, and policies regarding the transit system surrounding the Project site are included in SCAG's Connect SoCal, the General Plan, and the Municipal Code. Intermodal connection to the transit system is also supported by the City's Circulation Master Plan for Bicyclists and Pedestrians. As previously indicated, the Project would not conflict with these plans. Furthermore, future projects to be developed within the Project site would be required to coordinate with RTA to identify new bus routes and stops, if warranted. In addition, the paths and sidewalks to be located throughout the Project site as well as proposed bus shelters (subject to approval of RTA) would provide intermodal access to transit services. Therefore, the Project would not impede the implementation of existing or future transit services.

Conclusion

The Project would not conflict with a General Plan Mobility Element policy or any other applicable program plan, ordinance, or policy pertaining to the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Impact TRANS-3: Transportation. The project would substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

Finding: The Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it is inconsistent with the Improvement Standard Drawings for Road Standards maintained by the Public Works Department.

The precise design and alignment of the Project's roadways would be determined with implementation of Tentative Tract Maps and would be reviewed for consistency with applicable Improvement Standard Drawings for Road Standards (maintained by the Public Works Department) at that time. As a part of future individual project approval within the Project site, the City Traffic Engineering Division would conduct a review, ensuring that no hazardous transportation design features would be introduced. Future project compliance with the proposed Rio Vista Specific Plan would ensure hazards would not occur due to incompatible uses. Impacts related to design hazards would be less than significant.

Impact TRANS-4: Transportation. The project would result in inadequate emergency access.

Finding: The Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if: (i) The Project blocks roadways that provide emergency vehicle access during construction; or (ii) The Project does not provide adequate ingress and egress for emergency vehicles from adjacent roadways during operation.

The Project would include two public access points, one at 20th Street at the eastern portion of the Project site, between PAs 13 and 16, and a second at 20th Street at the western portion of the site, near PAs 2, 3, and 4. In addition, there would be three emergency vehicle access points: one at PA 7 in northwest corner of the Project site via Rorimer Drive, a second at PA 10 in northeast corner via Alicante Avenue, and one at PA 1 in southwest area of the Project site via Paramount Drive (access roads are shown in Exhibit 2-6). As such, area-wide emergency vehicle access would be provided by the main roadway network within the Project site. The precise design and alignment of the Project's internal roadways would be determined with implementation of Tentative Tract Maps and would be reviewed for consistency with applicable design standards, including adequate access and roadway widths, at the time of approval. Furthermore, development within the Project site would be required to comply with the City's congestion management practices to reduce traffic impacts during construction and operation. Consequently, any development under the Project would be required to comply with guidelines for emergency and fire vehicle access.

Riverside County Fire Stations No. 18 and No. 38 are nearest to the Project site. Station No. 18, West Riverside Station, is located approximately 2.8 miles (driving distance) west of the Project site's emergency vehicle access on Paramount Drive and approximately 2.2 miles (driving distance) southwest of the 20th Street Project site entrance. Station No. 38, Rubidoux Station, is located approximately 1.1 miles (driving distance) south of the Project site's emergency vehicle access on Paramount Drive. As such, the Project is located within sufficient proximity to fire stations enabling sufficient emergency access. Therefore, impacts related to emergency access would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impact: Transportation.

Finding: The Project's cumulative impacts relating to transportation would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Finding: Past, present, and future development projects contribute to transportation impacts. Regional growth would result in increased traffic volumes on area roadways, VMT, and demand for transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. All cumulative projects would be required to comply with City, County, and other local ordinances as well as the General Plan Mobility Element policies (as applicable to projects in the City) that address potential impacts related to transportation.

In addition, the Project does not increase the VMT for land uses for which the service population metric is applied. Therefore, the cumulative effect on VMT is considered less than significant. For these reasons, cumulative impacts with respect to transportation and traffic would be less than significant.

Moreover, the Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy related to bicycle, pedestrian or transit facilities. The Project would be consistent with the General Plan Mobility Element, Connect SoCal, the Municipal Code, and the Circulation Master Plan. All cumulative projects would be required to comply with applicable local government plans, policies, and ordinances that address potential impacts related to transportation. Therefore, the Project, in conjunction with the construction of other projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to transportation plan, ordinances, or policies of the circulation system.

The Project would not exceed cumulative VMT thresholds for land uses for which the service population metric is applied and therefore would not contribute to a conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b). Other cumulative projects would be required, as applicable, to demonstrate compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b). Therefore, the Project in conjunction with the construction of other projects would not result in a significant cumulative impact in this regard.

The Project would not substantially increase transportation hazards or result in inadequate emergency access. Other cumulative projects would be required to demonstrate appropriate transportation conditions and emergency access. As such, development anticipated under the Specific Plan would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts related to transportation hazard or inadequate emergency access.

As discussed above, there is no identified significant cumulative impact related to traffic or transportation. Moreover, the Project's contribution to cumulative transportation impacts would be less than significant. Both conditions must apply for the Project's cumulative effects to rise to the level of significance. Therefore, the Project, in conjunction with the construction of other projects, would result in a less than significant cumulative transportation impact.

4.1.15 Utilities and Service Systems

Impact UTIL-2: Utilities and Service Systems. The project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years.

Finding: The Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, a significant impact may occur if the Project results in the water purveyor (e.g., JCSD, RCSD, Santa Ana Water Company) not being able to supply sufficient water for the Project during normal, single-dry, and multiple dry years over the next 25 years as described in their respective Urban Water Management Plans.

RCSD's current and future water supply consists of groundwater extracted from the Riverside South Groundwater Basin. RCSD can extract groundwater from the Riverside South Groundwater Basin without restrictions until the combined credit of the Colton, Riverside North, and Riverside South Groundwater Basins are depleted. Once the available credit is depleted, WMWD would be obligated to provide groundwater replenishment. It was anticipated that the cost of the replenishment would be allocated to all groundwater extractors, including RCSD. Based on the latest Watermaster Report (dated August 1, 2020), total extractions from the Colton, Riverside North, and Riverside South Basins have increased from 31,810 AFY in 2015 to 35,817 AFY in 2019, an approximate 3 percent increase per year. Based on the assumption that groundwater extractions for the three groundwater basins would continue to increase at a rate of approximately 3 percent per year, total extraction would increase to approximately 69,217 AFY by 2050. At this rate, it would take nearly 8 years of no river flow to deplete the currently available credit of 544,221 acre-feet.

Even after the available credit is depleted, RCSD can continue to extract groundwater from the Riverside South Groundwater Basin; however, RCSD could be subject to payment of its share of the cost of groundwater replenishment to maintain pumping to meet future water demand. Therefore, as concluded in the WSA, RCSD is guaranteed a sufficient water supply from the Riverside South Groundwater Basin to meet current and future water demands, including the demands of the Project.

The area designated for the Project was identified in RCSD's 2020 UWMP with an annual water demand of approximately 2,000 AFY, which exceeds the Project's currently estimated demand of approximately 963.86 AFY calculated in the WSA. As discussed in the RCSD's 2020 UWMP, reliable water supplies are available to meet demands during normal, single-dry, and multiple dry years through 2045. In addition, as discussed in JCSD's 2020 UWMP, reliable water supplies are available to meet demands during normal, single-dry, and multiple dry years through 2045.

Therefore, the Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project, and impacts would be less than significant.

Impact UTIL-3: Utilities and Service Systems. The project would 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.

Finding: The project would 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.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, a significant impact may occur if the Project results in the RWQCP, which provides wastewater treatment services to the JCSD and the RCSD, to exceed its capacity for wastewater treatment.

The majority of the Project's wastewater would be treated at the RWQCP via RCSD transmission. PA 7's wastewater would be transmitted to RWQCP via JCSD. PA 10 and 11 would be served by septic systems and would not connect to a wastewater treatment provider.

The RCSD Wastewater Master Plan specifically includes future generation of wastewater from the Project. A significant impact may occur if the Project causes the RWQCP to exceed its capacity for wastewater treatment.

Rubidoux Community Service District

RCSD has acquired 3.055 mgd of treatment capacity rights at the RWQCP treatment facility. Average mgd flow from RCSD to the RWQCP between March 2019 and February 2021 was 1.75 mgd. As such, excess capacity is approximately 1.305 mgd. The Project's 453,320 gpd represents 34.7 percent of the excess capacity. The RCSD Wastewater Master Plan specifically includes future generation of wastewater from the Project. The RCSD Wastewater Master Plan identifies capital improvement projects needed to serve the near- and long-term wastewater transmission needs but does not indicate specific deficiency related to Project. The RCSD Wastewater Master Plan identifies an existing water treatment capacity rights shortage of approximately 1.0 for the ultimate buildout scenario (full, future district buildout). However, future projects within the Project area would be required to pay fair-share of Capital Investment Program (CIP) fees and treatment plant costs, based on the average day sewer generation for that project.

Jurupa Valley Community Service District

Based on current purchase agreements, JCSD has a 4.0 mgd allocation limit until 2030, after which the limit increases to 5.0 mgd. Based on 2020 data, the JCSD transmits approximately 2.9 mgd of wastewater to the RWQCP. As such, the JCSD has 1.1 mgd (prior to 2030) to 2.2 mgd (after 2030) of available capacity at the RWQCP.

Riverside Water Quality Control Plant

The Integrated Master Plan for the RWQCP incorporates wastewater flow projections from the RCSD and JCSD, and it is recognized that purchase of additional capacity allocations may be negotiated with individual CSDs. As such, the Integrated Master Plan for the RWQCP considers the Project and its related wastewater treatment needs. The Project's estimated average of 453,320 gpd of wastewater (per the RCSD Wastewater Master Plan) is within the RWQCP assumptions for the Project site used for wastewater treatment planning.

In summary, the flows from RCSD and JCSD have been considered in the RWQCP Integrated Master Plan flow projections and the RWCQP will have sufficient capacity (46mgd) to serve the flows of the Project as well as existing commitments and other future projects. As such, adequate capacity to serve the Project's projected wastewater treatment demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments is available. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact UTIL-4: Utilities and Service Systems. The project would 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.

Finding: The Project would not 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.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, a project may have a significant impact if it does not participate in programs intended to meet waste diversion requirements of the General Plan as stated below:

- CSSF 2.67 Waste Diversion. Achieve at least the minimum construction and demolition waste diversion requirement of 75 percent.
- State legislation (AB 341) mandates businesses and public entities generating 4 cubic yards or more of waste per week and multi-family residential dwellings with five units or more to recycle.

It can be estimated that the Project would generate approximately 246,000 pounds (123 tons) of solid waste per day. This would be equal to approximately 44,895 tons of solid waste per year.

Mid Valley Sanitary Landfill, located approximately 8.45 miles to the north of the Project site(see Table 3.19-1), has a permitted daily throughput of 7,500 tons/day. With a daily generation rate of 123 tons per day, the Project would utilize only up to 1.6 percent of the permitted daily throughput at Mid Valley Sanitary Landfill. The Project is not expected to exceed this capacity. Additionally, Agua Mansa Landfill is located approximately 1.6 miles to the east of the Project site (see Table 3.19-1). The General Plan EIR determined that adequate daily surplus capacity exists at the receiving regional landfills, and that buildout of the General Plan, including the Project, would not significantly affect current operations or the expected lifetime of the landfills in the region.

The Project would achieve at least the minimum construction and demolition waste diversion requirement of 75 percent by demonstrating compliance with SB 1383 regarding the diversion of organic waste as well as General Plan Policy CSSF 2.66, Waste Diversion. The Project is not anticipated to conflict with Riverside County policies and State policies such as AB 341, which requires all businesses that generate four or more cubic yards of garbage per week and multi-family dwellings with five or more units to recycle, and the Project site would be served by a solid waste disposal provider. The Project would also be required to abide by SB 1383. In addition, the Project is not anticipated to conflict with AB 341, which requires all businesses that generate four or more cubic yards of garbage per week and multi-family dwellings with five or more units to recycle. Therefore, the Project would not 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, and impacts would be less than significant.

Impact UTIL-5: Utilities and Service Systems. The project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Finding: The Project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, a project may have a significant impact if it does not participate in individual programs (i.e., solid waste pickup, recycling) identified the CIWMP which was prepared in accordance with the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, Chapter 1095 (AB 939).

AB 939, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, requires that local jurisdictions divert at least 50 percent of all solid waste generated by January 1, 2000. The Riverside CIWMP was prepared in accordance with AB 939 and approved by the California Integrated Waste Management Board in 1996. The City implements the CIWMP through various programs administered by the solid waste providers. The

Project is not anticipated to conflict with Riverside County policies and State policies such as AB 341, which requires all businesses that generate four or more cubic yards of garbage per week and multi-family dwellings with five or more units to recycle, and the Project site would be served by a solid waste disposal provider. The Project would also be required to abide by SB 1383 regarding the diversion of organic waste as well as General Plan Policy CSSF 2.66, Waste Diversion. Thus, the Project would have a less than significant impact.

Cumulative Impact: Utilities and Service Systems.

Finding: The Project's cumulative impacts relating to utilities and service systems would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Finding:

Water

In the course of preparing the UWMP, the RCSD estimated water demand of future development in the service area and forecast the needed facility upgrades. The forecast included supply facility upgrades needed to accommodate growth in the service area. While the JCSD does not directly identify the Project's water needs, only a small portion of the Project (PA 7 only) would be served by JCSD.

Cumulative projects listed in Chapter 3, Environmental Impacts Analysis, Table 3-1 are located within the RCSD and JCSD service areas and would create water supply demand. The RCSD 2021 UWMP determined that RCSD would be able to provide adequate water supplies to its service area, including the Project. The RCSD would have adequate water supplies to serve the cumulative projects during normal and dry years. Similarly, the JCSD's 2020 UWMP concluded that it would have adequate water supplies to its service area. Cumulative projects, listed in Table 3-1, would be required to comply with provisions of the Municipal Code and the California Building Standards Code (CBC) related to water conservation. Therefore, the Project, in conjunction with identified cumulative projects in the RCSD service area, would result in a less than significant cumulative impact related to water supply and water supply facilities. Additionally, the Project's incremental contribution to the less than significant cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

Wastewater

Both the RCSD and JCSD transmit wastewater to the RWQCP. The RWQCP currently has capacity for up to 46 mgd, and as of 2016, the RWQCP was treating 29 mgd, or two-thirds of its capacity, each day. Therefore, the Project, in conjunction with identified cumulative projects in the area, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to wastewater treatment facilities. Additionally, the Project's incremental contribution to the less than significant cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

Storm Drainage

The Project may be required to construct improvements such that the storm drain line is adequate, which would include a drainage line that would extend east of the proposed Business Park and connect to existing facilities in 20th Street. A second off-site drainage line would extend southwest from PA 3 and continue off-site along 20th Street, connecting to existing facilities in 30th Street. A third off-site drainage line would extend from the southwestern corner of the Project site, south of PA 1, and connect to existing facilities. This would ensure that adequate capacity is maintained. Therefore, the Project, in conjunction with identified cumulative projects in the area, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to stormwater

generation and stormwater drainage facilities. Additionally, the Project's incremental contribution to the less than significant cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

Solid Waste

Cumulative projects listed in Table 3-1 consist predominantly of industrial, commercial, and residential uses and would generate solid waste that would increase demand on solid waste facilities to receive, process, and dispose solid waste. Existing solid waste facilities provide sufficient capacity to serve cumulative development. Therefore, the Project, in conjunction with identified cumulative projects in the area, would result in a less than significant cumulative impact related to solid waste generation and landfill capacity. Additionally, the Project's incremental contribution to the less than significant cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

4.1.16 Wildfire

Impact WILD-1: Wildfire. The project would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Finding: The Project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Facts in Support of Finding: Factors such as the number of access points, roadway width, and proximity to fire stations determine whether a project provides sufficient emergency access. The Project would include three public access points and three emergency vehicle access (EVA) points. As such, area-wide EVA would be provided by the main roadway network within the Project site. The precise design and alignment of the Project's internal roadways would be determined with implementation of Tentative Tract Maps and would be reviewed for consistency with applicable design standards, including adequate access and roadway widths, at the time of approval. Furthermore, development within the Project site would be required to comply with the City's congestion management practices to reduce traffic impacts during construction and operation.

An Evacuation Analysis was prepared for the Project by EPD Solutions, Inc. in March 2023 and is included as Appendix L of the Draft EIR. The Evacuation Analysis determined that during construction, vehicle volumes at the Project site would be lower than at operation. Therefore, the Evacuation Analysis did not conduct a separate evaluation of evacuation time during the construction phase and calculated evacuation time only for the operational phase. The Evacuation Analysis concludes that the Project would allow the evacuation of all residents, employees, and students in under 2 hours and 30 minutes. However, the actual timeframes are expected to be significantly lower than stated in the Evacuation Analysis. (See Appendix L of the Draft EIR for further detail.)

The Project would be consistent with the local emergency response plans as well as the Community Safety, Services, and Facilities (CSSF) Element of the General Plan. Any construction activities associated with future buildout of the Project would be required to comply with the California Fire Code's specifications for access and building materials such as tile or other fire-resistant roofing.

The Project would be designed in accordance with City and State standards to accommodate EVA. Furthermore, blockage of an evacuation route would not occur during project operation because the Project would not result in road closures of the streets and roads surrounding and entering the Project site. With adherence to General Plan Policy CSSF 1.23, which would require development and enforcement of construction and design standards that ensure that proposed development incorporates fire prevention

features, the Project would not impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts related to emergency response/evacuation plan consistency would be less than significant.

Impact WILD-2: Wildfire. The project would, 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.

Finding: The project would, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, not exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.

Facts in Support of Finding: Wildfire risk is evaluated in terms of fuel loading, slope, weather, temperature, humidity, and wind speeds. The Project site is surrounded by urbanized uses on relatively flat areas lacking in woodlands or vegetation that could provide fuel load for wildfire or steep slopes that could cause fire to spread more rapidly. The Project site is surrounded by other features that provide fuel breaks in the event of a fire, such as SR-60, Armstrong Road, and Rubidoux Boulevard.

Construction of future individual development projects within the Project site would involve the use of construction materials that can create wildfire hazards, such as petroleum products. However, as described in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, construction of future individual development projects within the Project site would be subject to applicable federal, State, and local laws and regulations regarding the proper use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials.

The Project includes large areas of open space in hilly areas and includes manufactured slopes. However, as described above, FMZs would reduce wildfire risk in steep open spaces areas by utilizing plants similar in nature and character to the surrounding natural landscape and pruning and thinning of vegetation for fuel modification.

Compliance with applicable State and local plans and regulations would decrease the risk of impacts related to wildland fire hazards. This includes CBC regulations for fire protection. When future individual development projects become operational, any hazardous uses would be subject to local and regional restrictions on use or operation during high fire-risk conditions. Future individual development projects would be required to comply with Chapters 7, Fire and Smoke Protection Features; Chapter 7A, Materials and Construction Methods for Exterior Wildfire Exposure; and Chapter 9, Fire Protection Systems, of the CBC, which outline allowable building materials, structural design for fire containment, safety features, and fire sprinkler systems. Landscaping of future individual development projects would be reviewed and approved by the Riverside County Fire Department as a condition of approval. The City also implements an EOP and LHMP. Furthermore, the Project would be required to comply with the California Fire Code regarding emergency access.

In the event of a large wildfire, occupants of future residential development under the Project could be exposed to concentrated pollutants or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire. However, several factors would contribute to reduced fire risk at the Project site: (1) implementation of the regulations listed above, including compliance with the CBC; compliance with the Riverside County Fire Service Fire Prevention Guidelines; and implementation of General Plan policies related to fire prevention design standards, natural vegetation, automatic natural gas shutoff system, and brush clearance; (2) Project-specific PDFs that include FMZs for managing the potential fire hazard at the interface of open space and manufactured slopes; (3) multiple circulation routes throughout the Project as well as in and out of the Project site and three EVA points; and (4) four fire stations located within short driving distance of the Project site, including two within approximately 2 miles of the Project site.

Therefore, impacts related to exposure of Project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of wildfire would be less than significant.

Impact WILD-3: Wildfire. The project would 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.

Finding: The project would not 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.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would include adequate emergency access via existing roads and three EVA points. The Project site is surrounded by an urban area with a network of existing roadways. The open space areas included as part of the Project would also be surrounded by this network of existing and proposed roadways which would act as firebreaks, and the Project would not require the installation of additional firebreaks.

The Project would not require emergency water sources because potable water would be provided by Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) and Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD), which have adequate water supplies available to serve the Project and future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. The Project infrastructure would also provide water to on-site fire hydrants.

New electrical power and natural gas lines on and connecting to the Project site would be installed underground, minimizing potential ignition and related fire risk above ground at the Project site according to the CBC, Uniform Fire Code, and General Plan requirements. Therefore, impacts related to infrastructure that exacerbates fire risk would be less than significant.

Impact WILD-4: Wildfire. The project would 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.

Finding: The Project would not 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.

Facts in Support of Finding: As described under Threshold GEO-1 in Section 3.7 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, the Project site would not be at risk of landslides because all development would be consistent with the Municipal Code requirements identified in the Geotechnical Review. Additionally, according to the Geotechnical Review, it was determined that the bedrock on the Project site is very hard and capable of supporting tall, steep slopes, including the existing and manufactured slopes in the development.

Furthermore, Section 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality Threshold, HYD-3 outlines how stormwater control measures would reduce impacts related to altered drainage patterns to a less than significant level.

Prior to permit issuance, grading and building permit applications within the Project site would require clearance by the Riverside County Fire Department. Each site-specific project design would be modified as needed prior to approval to ensure compliance with Riverside County Fire Department requirements. Further, as described in Section 3.7, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, and Section 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, the Project would be subject to the rules and regulations of the City's Municipal Code and the General Plan regarding development on unstable geologic soils and controlling stormwater runoff during

and after construction. Specific policies described in Section 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, related to the prevention of flooding, landslides, and drainage changes, include Policies CSSF 1.6 through CSSF 1.22. For example, Policy CSSF 1.12, Flood Control Improvements, ensures that direct flood control improvement measures are made to protect existing and planned development, and Policy CSSF 1.14, Ability to Withstand Flooding, requires development to be capable of withstanding flooding and to minimize use of fill. In addition, the Project would implement General Plan Programs COS 3.1.4. Floodway Protection and Enhancement and CSSF 1.1.7. Risk Assessment to minimize risks related to flooding.

Given the stability of the Project site, with implementation of Riverside County's EOP, the City's LHMP, review of architectural and development plans by the Riverside County Fire Department, and adherence to General Plan policies, impacts related to exposure of 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 would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impact: Wildfire.
Finding: The Project's cumulative impacts relating to wildfire risks would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Finding: A combination of federal, State, and local regulations limit or minimize the potential for exposure to wildfires by reducing the amount of development in wildland urban interface areas, ensuring new development is developed according to the CBC and Uniform Fire Code and incorporating requirements for fire-safe construction into the land use planning. Development listed in Table 3-1 consists predominantly of industrial and commercial development. Several of the projects anticipated in Table 3-1 would be located in High or Moderate Fire Hazard Zones. However, these projects, as all the other projects listed in Table 3-1, would be in areas that are already developed and do not contain significant levels of dry fuel susceptible to ignition or significantly high average wind speeds.

The cumulative projects listed in Table 3-1 would result in predominantly infill development and would not significantly increase emergency services beyond the existing service area. Furthermore, all cumulative project construction would adhere to the City Municipal Codes that are designed to minimize the potential for uncontrolled fires. Adherence to City Municipal Codes would ensure that California Fire Code standards are included in development. Once cumulative development is proposed, the City assesses the needs for fire protection services and informs efforts to improve or expand needed facilities. All development would, however, comply with emergency access requirements as a condition of construction. Furthermore, the cumulative projects would not result in permanent road closures, nor impede an established emergency or evacuation access route, such as SR-60, nor interfere with emergency response requirements. As such, there would be a less than significant cumulative impact associated with wildfire hazards and emergency/evacuation response.

The Project's incremental contribution to cumulative wildfire hazard impacts would not be significant. As previously discussed, development and growth in the City would largely occur in already developed areas and would involve infill development and redevelopment. Limited development could result in an incremental increase in exposure of people and structures to wildland fires and associated hazards. However, PDFs such as FMZs and irrigated landscaped areas would reduce impacts. As a result, the degree of wildland fire hazard, including secondary hazards, would not substantially change with adoption of the Project, and current hazards would not significantly increase. Accordingly, the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would also be less than significant.

4.2 Findings Regarding Significant Impacts Mitigated to Less-Than-Significant Levels

The City has determined that, for the following effects, mitigation measures included in the EIR will mitigate the effects of the Project to a less-than-significant level. The following identifies the pertinent mitigation measures by number and summary title.

4.2.1 Air Quality

Impact AIR-4: Air Quality. The project would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure (MM) AIR-4, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce odors caused by construction and operation of the Project to a less-than-significant level. The City finds MM AIR-4 to be feasible. With implementation of MM AIR-4, which requires implementation of an odor management plan, the Project's contribution to this impact would be less than significant.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(1) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it does not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property.

Construction-related Odors

Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include exhaust from diesel construction equipment. However, because of the temporary nature of these emissions, the intermittent nature of construction activities, and the highly diffusive properties of diesel exhaust, nearby receptors would not be affected by diesel exhaust odors associated with Project construction. Odors from these sources would be localized and generally confined to the immediate area surrounding the Project site. The Project would utilize typical construction techniques, and the odors would be typical of most construction sites and temporary in nature. Impacts would be less than significant.

Operational-related Odors

Industrial land uses have the potential to generate objectionable odors. Examples of industrial projects are wastewater treatment plants, compost facilities, landfills, solid waste transfer stations, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), dairy farms, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch manufacturing plants, chemical manufacturing, and food manufacturing facilities. The Project includes industrial land uses, and so there is the potential for land uses typically considered to be associated with odors to be developed in the planning area, which could result in a potentially significant impact.

Residential and other nonresidential (excluding industrial) land uses could result in generation of odors such as vehicle exhaust, landscaping equipment exhaust, laundry cleaning, cooking, and waste disposal. However, unlike industrial land uses, these are not considered potential generators of odor that could affect a

substantial number of people. Additionally, for uses that could generate food odors such as restaurants, coffee roasters, and breweries, these types of uses would be subject to SCAQMD Rule 402 which would minimize and provide a control for odors.

MM AIR-4 requires an analysis of potential odor-emitting land uses through the environmental review process. Therefore, compliance with the applicable policies and programs in the General Plan as well as applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations would minimize odor emissions and prevent them from adversely affecting a substantial number of people within the City. Therefore, impacts from potential odors generated from residential and retail land uses associated with the Project are considered less than significant.

MM AIR-4: Require Implementation of Odor Management Plan

Prior to future discretionary approval for projects that require environmental evaluation under CEQA, the City of Jurupa Valley shall evaluate new development proposals for new industrial land uses that may generate significant operational odor impacts, as determined through a review of South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) odor complaint history for similar facilities and consultation with the SCAQMD, to prepare an odor impact assessment and to implement odor control measures as recommended by the SCAQMD or the City as needed to reduce the impact to a less than significant threshold, as compared to the applicable significance criteria. Prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy, the City shall require project applicants for projects that have the potential to emit nuisance operational odors to prepare an odor management plan that identifies project design features, measures, and control technologies to ensure compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 402 "Nuisance," which prohibits the discharge of air contaminants or other material (including odors) which may cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to the public or to business or property. The City shall verify that all odor control measures have been incorporated into the project design specifications prior to issuing a permit to operate. During operation of the proposed facility, the City shall conduct periodic evaluation of on-site odors per the schedule and reporting requirements outlined in the odor management plan.

Cumulative Impact: Air Quality.

Finding: The Project's cumulative impacts relating to odors would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Finding:

Potential odor sources associated with the Project may result from construction equipment exhaust and the application of asphalt and architectural coatings during construction activities; however, 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. Although it is possible other construction activities could occur in proximity concurrent with construction of the Project, due to the short duration and intermittent nature of construction-related odors, impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable.

For long-term operation, the Project and other cumulative developments would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances, as well as MM AIR-4, which would require potential future odor-generating industrial projects to mitigate potential impacts. Therefore, odors associated with the Project operations would be less than cumulatively considerable.

MM AIR-1a

Implement MM AIR-1a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1b

Implement MM AIR-1b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1c

Implement MM AIR-1c, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1d

Implement MM AIR-1d, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1e

Implement MM AIR-1e, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1f

Implement MM AIR-1f, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1g

Implement MM AIR-1g, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1h

Implement MM AIR-1h, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1i

Implement MM AIR-1i, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-3a

Implement MM AIR-3a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-3.

MM AIR-3b

Implement MM AIR-3b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-3.

MM AIR-3c

Implement MM AIR-3c, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-3.

MM AIR-4

Prior to future discretionary approval for projects that require environmental evaluation under CEQA, the City of Jurupa Valley shall evaluate new development proposals for new industrial land uses that may generate significant operational odor impacts, as determined through a review of South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) odor complaint history for similar facilities and consultation with the SCAQMD, to prepare an odor impact assessment and to implement odor control measures as recommended by the SCAQMD or the City as needed to reduce the impact to a

less than significant threshold, as compared to the applicable significance criteria. Prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy, the City shall require project applicants for projects that have the potential to emit nuisance operational odors to prepare an odor management plan that identifies project design features, measures, and control technologies to ensure compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 402 "Nuisance," which prohibits the discharge of air contaminants or other material (including odors) which may cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to the public or to business or property. The City shall verify that all odor control measures have been incorporated into the project design specifications prior to issuing a permit to operate. During operation of the proposed facility, the City shall conduct periodic evaluation of on-site odors per the schedule and reporting requirements outlined in the odor management plan.

4.2.2 Biological Resources

Impact BIO-1: Biological Resources. The project would have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Finding: Implementation of MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-1c, MM BIO-1d, MM BIO-1e, MM BIO-1f, MM BIO-1g, MM BIO-1h, MM BIO-1i, MM BIO-1j, MM BIO-1k, and MM BIO-1l, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce construction and operational impacts related to special-status plant species, insects, nesting and migratory birds, reptiles, and bats to a less-than-significant level.

The City finds protection for special-status plant species, insects, nesting and migratory birds, reptiles and bats to be feasible. The City hereby determines that any construction or operational impacts related to special-status plants species, insects, nesting and migratory birds, reptiles, and bats after implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1a, BIO-1b, MM BIO-1c, MM BIO-1d, MM BIO-1e, MM BIO-1f, MM BIO-1g, MM BIO-1h, MM BIO-1i, MM BIO-1j MM BIO-1k, and MM BIO-1l would be less than significant.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(1) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it results in a direct or indirect physical change in the environment which is caused by and immediately related to the project that has 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 CDFW or USFWS.

Special-status Plant Species

Listed Plants

The L&L Biological Resources Assessment (BRA) determined all listed plant species shown in Table 12 of the BRA (see Appendix D) to have low or absent potential to occur in the Project site. No State- or federally listed plant species were observed on the project during focused surveys. Additionally, there are no CNDDB recorded occurrences of listed plant species within the Project site. Therefore, implementation of the Project is not expected to result in any impact to listed plant species.

Non-listed Plants

One special-status plant species, Plummer's mariposa lily, was observed in the Project site. This species is covered under the MSHCP and considered Adequately Conserved and no mitigation is proposed. The BRA determined two special-status plant species: Robinson's pepper grass and mesa horkelia, have moderate potential to occur due to the presence of suitable habitat. These species are not covered under the MSHCP.

Robinson's Pepper Grass

With the number and frequency of records within Riverside, San Diego, San Bernardino, and Los Angeles counties, the known locations of the species within MSHCP Conservation Areas, and implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to Robinson's pepper grass (if this species occurs) would be considered adverse, but less than significant.

Mesa Horkelia

Based on the wide distribution and number of locations of this species, and implementation of Project mitigation measures, impacts to mesa horkelia (if this species occurs) would be considered adverse, but not significant.

MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plants

No MSHCP Narrow Endemic plants were observed on the Project site. Based on lack of habitat, poor habitat, geographic range, and/or results of multiple years of field surveys, these species were determined to be absent from the Project site. No impacts are expected to MSHCP Narrow Endemic plant species as a result of the Project.

Direct Impacts to Special-status Plants

If Robinson's pepper grass, mesa horkelia, or other special-status plant species are present on the site, impacts would be avoided and minimized through implementation of MM BIO-1b (Conserve Open Space), MM BIO-1h (Biological Monitoring and Clearance Surveys), and MM BIO-1c (Special-status Plants), which require avoidance or salvage or collection of propagules for use in the Project avoidance area or local restoration projects. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to special-status plants would be less than significant.

Indirect Impacts to Special-status Plants

No special-status plant species are known to occur within the avoided portions of the survey area or immediately adjacent to the survey area; however, if a previously unknown special-status botanical species were present, impacts could potentially occur as a result of chemical emissions, fugitive dust, human presence, and invasive species. Increases of chemical emissions and fugitive dust during clearing would be temporary. Release of chemical emissions from vehicles and machinery would increase during clearing; however, due to the size of the Project site and open area, emissions would disperse. Impacts of chemical emissions after clearing are not expected to increase substantially over current levels.

Fugitive dust rates could increase during clearing as a result of vehicle and machinery use and exposure of soils. Implementation of MM BIO-1d, which limits vehicle speeds on unpaved roads within the project to 15 miles per hour (mph), would help reduce fugitive dust.

Propagules of invasive plant species could be spread or introduced into the area by vehicles or machinery. Implementation of MM BIO-1e reduces the potential for spread of non-native species by utilizing certified weed-free products on the Project site, prohibiting the use of invasive plants in landscaping, washing heavy equipment prior to bringing it on-site, and limiting staging of equipment to the extent possible to areas not infested by invasive plants.

Human and pet encroachment would be reduced by implementation of MM BIO-1f, by requiring compliance with MSHCP Urban and Wildlands Interface guidelines. Measures detailed in MSHCP Section 6.1.4 (Urban Wildland Interface) include incorporation of rear yard fencing and/or steep inaccessible slopes between avoided areas and development in the project design, as well as signage and homeowner education. With incorporation of the mitigation measures outlined above, impacts on listed and special-status plants would be less than significant.

Special-status Wildlife Species

Listed Wildlife

Two listed species were observed on the Project site: Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly (DSF) and Coastal Gnat catcher (CAGN). Crotch's bumble bee was also observed on the Project site. This species is a candidate for State listing (as of October 2023).

Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly

DSF was recorded in 2005 within an approximately 3.73-acre area on the western edge of the Project site. However, a two-year focused survey for DSF was conducted between 2015 and 2016 by L&L and findings were negative both years. The site is not within an MSHCP Criteria Area or a Delhi Sands Conservation Area. DSF is a covered species under the MSHCP and is considered Adequately Conserved.

The Project as designed would impact 4.87 acres (24.4 percent) of the total 19.97 acres of Delhi soils present within the Project site (see L&L BRA Figure 12, included in Appendix D). However, of the 3.73 acres of occupied DSF habitat mapped in 2005, 0.84 acres (22.5 percent) will be impacted by the construction of the Project. With implementation of MM BIO-1b, which would create a deed restriction of any avoided habitat to prevent future impacts, and species-specific conservation goals for DSF under the MSHCP, Project impacts to DSF would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Coastal California Gnatcatcher

Three CAGN were incidentally observed on the Project site in 2017. These observations were likely to have been dispersing juveniles. This species is considered a "Covered Species Adequately Conserved" in the MSHCP and the Project site is not in an MSHCP Criteria Area. Impacts to CAGN, if any, would be covered under the MSHCP and associated incidental take permits.

Development projects within the Plan Area would further avoid and minimize impacts to CAGN through conservation of open space, as required by MM BIO-1b, implementation of nesting bird surveys and avoidance, as required by MM BIO-1g, and biological monitoring and clearance surveys, as required by MM BIO-1h. The implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce any potential impacts to CAGN to less than less than significant levels.

Riparian Birds

The limited riparian vegetation in the survey area does not provide suitable habitat for least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, or western yellow-billed cuckoo. Although willow and cottonwood species are present in small areas, the diversity and density of the vegetation is not adequate to support these species. Therefore, there is no suitable habitat for these species on or adjacent to the Project site and they are considered absent. No impact would occur.

Crotch's Bumble Bee

Large areas of potentially suitable habitat for this species are present in the Project vicinity in and around the Jurupa Mountains and the Santa Ana River. With implementation of MM BIO-1b (Conserve Open Space), approximately 366 acres of sage scrub and approximately 38 acres of non-native grasslands that are potentially suitable habitat for this species would be avoided and conserved on the Project site. As such, the Project has a potential to substantially reduce and adversely modify habitat for Crotch's bumble bee, reduce and potentially impair the viability of populations of Crotch's bumble bee, and reduce the number and range of the species while taking into account the likelihood that special-status species on adjacent and nearby natural lands rely upon the habitat that occurs on the Project site.

MM BIO-1k (Crotch's Bumble Bee) requires the Project proponent to coordinate with CDFW to determine whether an Incidental Take Permit is required. If a permit is required, it would be obtained prior to the start of construction. With implementation of MM BIO-1k and MM BIO-1b (Conserve Open Space), and any additional mitigation required under the Incidental Take Permit (if any), impacts to Crotch's bumble bee would be less than significant.

Other Special-status Wildlife

Burrowing Owl

As stated in in subsection 3.4.3, Environmental Setting, above, previous habitat assessments of the Project site identified habitat suitable for burrowing owl, and determined that burrowing owl could occur in low-lying disturbed and undisturbed brittle bush scrub and non-native grasslands, as well as ground squirrel burrows within the Project site. The findings of the focused burrowing owl survey conducted by L&L in May and June 2014, April through June 2016, and April through June 2018 were negative. No burrowing owl or burrowing owl sign were observed in the survey area or buffer zone.

Implementation of MM BIO-1i would reduce potential impacts to burrowing owl by requiring an updated breeding season protocol survey within one year prior to the start of construction. The RCA typically requires surveys for burrowing owl to be no more than a year old and the requirement for an updated protocol survey was included in MM BIO-1i to address this requirement. Additionally, and in compliance with the MSHCP, a pre-construction burrowing owl clearance survey shall be conducted no more than 30 days before ground or vegetation disturbance. If owls are present, MM BIO-1i includes mitigation as required by the MSHCP. Such measures include the establishment of buffer zones around active burrows (nests) and the installation of burrow exclusion doors during the nesting (February 1-August 31) and non-nesting seasons if occupied burrows are present. The implementation of MM BIO-1i would reduce any potential impacts to burrowing owl to less than significant levels.

Special-status and Nesting Birds

The L&L BRA determined the following special-status bird species, which are not covered by the MSHCP, to have potential to be impacted by the Project: great egret, Lawrence's goldfinch, wrentit, Allen's hummingbird, Brewer's sparrow, black-chinned sparrow, Costa's hummingbird, as well as any other nesting birds protected under the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code.

Development of the Project site could result in the loss of potential foraging and/or nesting habitat for these species. The loss of habitat for special-status and nesting birds would have an adverse impact, but the implementation of MM BIO-1b would avoid and conserve 427 acres of habitat for nesting birds on the Project site. Additionally, the implementation of MM BIO-1f would require the project to minimize edge effects that could impact the conserved habitat and reduce the value of edge habitats to special-status and nesting birds.

If active nests are present within the Project site at the time of construction, there could be impacts to eggs, chicks, and/or dependent juveniles. Impacts to nesting birds, eggs, or dependent juveniles would be avoided and minimized through the implementation of MM BIO-1g, which requires nest surveys to be conducted prior to construction. In addition, the implementation of MM BIO-1h, which requires biological monitoring and pre-construction clearance surveys, would avoid and minimize impacts to nesting birds. With implementation of these measures, impacts to nesting birds would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Special-status Reptiles

The L&L BRA determined the following special-status reptile species to not be covered by the MSHCP and to have potential to be impacted by the Project: Southern California legless lizard, California glossy snake, San Bernardino ringneck snake, and coast patch-nosed snake.

Development of the Project site could result in the loss of potential habitat for these species and potential mortality of individuals or populations. If present in the Plan Area, these species may be killed by the operation of heavy equipment or other disturbances during construction.

Direct and indirect impacts to these species and potential habitat would be avoided and minimized with implementation of MM BIO-1a Flag or Fence Impact Areas, MM BIO-1b (Conserve Open Space), MM BIO-2b (SWPPP), MM BIO-1h (Biological Monitoring and Clearance Surveys), MM BIO-1d (Wildlife Hazards), and MM BIO-1f (Urban/Wildlands Interface), and impacts would be considered adverse but reduced to a less than significant level.

Special-status Bats

The L&L BRA determined that the following special-status bat species are not covered by the MSHCP and have potential to be impacted by the Project: pallid bat, western mastiff bat, and pocketed free-tailed bat.

Development of the Project site could result in the loss of potential foraging and roosting habitat for these species and potential mortality of individuals. If present in the Plan Area, roosting bats may be killed by heavy equipment or other disturbances during construction.

Direct and indirect impacts to special-status bats and their habitat would be avoided and minimized with implementation of MM BIO-1b (Conserve Open Space), MM BIO-2b (SWPPP), MM BIO-1h (Biological Monitoring and Clearance Surveys), MM BIO-1d (Wildlife Hazards), and MM BIO-1f (Urban/Wildlands Interface). MM BIO-1j (Bat Roosts) requires a qualified Biologist to inspect potential roosts and implement

avoidance measures. With these mitigation measures, impacts would be considered adverse but would be reduced to a less than significant level.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1a, BIO-1b, MM BIO-1c, MM BIO-1d, MM BIO-1e, MM BIO-1f, MM BIO-1g, MM BIO-1h, MM BIO-1i, MM BIO-1j , MM BIO-1k, and MM BIO-1l, impacts to sensitive species would be less than significant.

MM BIO-1a: Flag or Fence Impact Areas.

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, or clearing and grubbing, all designated conservation areas within the Project site boundary shall be clearly flagged or fenced prior to grading or vegetation clearing to prevent incursion into sensitive habitats. The approximately 510.8 acres of designated conservation areas are identified as "OS-C" on Exhibit 2-7 of the Draft EIR.

MM BIO-1b: Conserve Open Space.

Prior to recordation of the final map, those areas of the Project site not impacted by the Project footprint, including Riparian/Riverine and Delhi sands, shall be designated as Open Space-Conservation (OS-C). The OS-C areas shall be deed restricted, and ownership shall be transferred to a City-approved conservation entity prior to recordation of the final map.

MM BIO-1c: Special-Status Plants

A pre-construction survey of the proposed development area shall be conducted by a Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP)-qualified Biologist prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The purpose of the survey is to determine whether special-status plant species are present in the development area. If any of the species are observed, impacts shall be avoided and minimized to the extent feasible. If mesa horkelia or Robinson's pepper grass plants are observed within the development footprint, they shall be salvaged or propagules shall be collected for use in the project conservation area or local restoration projects.

If either of these species are found within the development footprint, the applicant shall develop and implement a planting plan to address plant salvage, propagule collection, selection and preparation of a receiver site, propagation and planting methods, maintenance, monitoring, and reporting. At a minimum, the plan shall include the following information:

1. Plant numbers and location on the site.
2. Plant salvage, propagule collection, storage, and growing.
3. A description of the existing conditions of the receiver site(s) characterizing the suitability of the site(s) for the species, and documenting the acreage of the site.
4. A description of how the receiver site will be preserved in perpetuity, e.g., conservation easement, deed restriction, etc., and the name of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)-approved due diligence entity that shall hold the easement/deed restriction, etc.
5. Qualifications of the supervising Biologist. At a minimum the Biologist shall possess a minimum of 5-years' experience conducting habitat restoration projects in Southern California.
6. Receiver site preparation for planting/transplanting.
7. Transplant and propagule installation methods.

8. Schedule and monitoring period.
9. Performance criteria.
10. Maintenance, monitoring, and reporting procedures.

MM BIO-1d: Wildlife Hazards.

The Biological Monitor shall inspect all excavations for trapped wildlife daily. All potential wildlife pitfalls (trenches, bores, and other excavations) shall be backfilled or securely covered at the end of each workday. If backfilling or covering is not feasible, wildlife escape ramps shall be installed, in consultation with the Biological Monitor (as required under MM BIO-1h), sufficient to allow trapped wildlife to escape.

All debris piles, construction pipes, culverts, or other such materials shall be securely covered or capped while stored on the Project site to prevent wildlife access. All such materials shall be inspected for wildlife before being moved, buried, or capped. If wildlife become trapped, the Biological Monitor shall remove the animal (if feasible and safe to do so) and place it in nearby suitable habitat outside of the impact area. If the Biological Monitor is unable to remove the animal, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or other wildlife authority shall be immediately contacted for guidance and/or assistance. Any wildlife encountered on the Project site shall be allowed to leave the area unharmed or moved or encouraged to move out of harm's way by the Biological Monitor, if safe, feasible, and permitted to do so. Vehicles traveling on unpaved roads within the Project site shall be limited to 15 miles per hour (mph). Construction work shall be limited to daylight hours (and in accordance with the Municipal Code, only between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, excluding holidays). If water is applied to the site to control dust, ponding of this water shall be minimized to avoid creating predator subsidies.

MM BIO-1e: Invasive Plants.

Invasive plant species shall not be installed in landscaping. Design guidelines for the Project shall provide the homeowners with a list of native landscaping materials recommended for use within the Project site, and the list shall be included in the project Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) (to be confirmed prior to final map recordation). These materials shall be selected for their compatibility with the unique natural environment in the area. None of the plants listed in the California Invasive Plant Council Inventory (cal-ipc.org) or Section 6.1.4 of the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) shall be utilized in the development design/landscape plans and their use by future homeowners will be discouraged to the extent possible. The MSHCP has identified invasive plants that should be eliminated from open space areas. This list is included in Table 6-2 of the MSHCP. To ensure that invasive plants are not used in landscaping within the Project site, the project proponent shall include a list of plant species to avoid within the (CC&Rs) for the development.

To prevent the spread of invasive plants, all heavy equipment used on-site shall be washed, particularly the wheels, undercarriage, outriggers, and other parts that come in contact with soil and vegetation, prior to bringing it onto the Project site from other construction sites. Care shall be taken to remove soil and debris that may contain seeds or propagules of invasive plants.

Any straw, mulch, or similar products used on the Project site shall be certified weed-free. Any erosion control planting or seeding shall consist of native species, native seed mix, or other ecologically appropriate, non-invasive plants.

Insofar as possible, staging areas shall be placed in areas that have been previously disturbed or have degraded habitat within the project footprint, but that do not show an infestation of non-native species. Staging areas shall be maintained free of invasive species.

MM BIO-1f: Urban/Wildlands Interface.

As the approximately 510.8 acres of open space may be transferred to a City-approved conservation entity, the project shall incorporate design measures to ensure compliance with Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Urban/Wildlands Interface guidelines and requirements. These measures, as listed in Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP, shall address Drainage, Toxics, Lighting, Noise, Barriers, Access, Pets, and Grading/Land Development.

MM BIO-1g: Nesting Birds.

To prevent impacts to nesting birds (including raptors), clearing or other work in native habitats shall be avoided during the nesting season. If work cannot be avoided during this timeframe, a nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified Biologist within 3 days prior to site preparation activities (such as ground disturbance, construction activities, and/or removal of trees and vegetation). The survey results shall be provided to the City's Planning Department and the Project Applicant shall adhere to the following:

1. Applicant shall designate a biologist (Designated Biologist) experienced in: identifying local and migratory bird species of special concern; conducting bird surveys using appropriate survey methodology; nesting surveying techniques, recognizing breeding and nesting behaviors, locating nests and breeding territories, and identifying nesting stages and nest success; determining/establishing appropriate avoidance and minimization measures; and monitoring the efficacy of implemented avoidance and minimization measures.

2. Pre- activity field surveys shall be conducted at the appropriate time of day/night, during appropriate weather conditions, no more than 3 days prior to the initiation of Project activities. Surveys shall encompass all suitable areas including trees, shrubs, bare ground, burrows, cavities, and structures. Survey duration shall take into consideration the size of the Project site; density, and complexity of the habitat; number of survey participants; survey techniques employed; and shall be sufficient to ensure the data collected is complete and accurate.

If no nesting birds are observed during the survey, site preparation and construction activities may begin. If an active nest or nesting birds are present, avoidance buffers shall be implemented as determined by a qualified biologist and approved by the City of Jurupa Valley, based on their best professional judgement and experience in accordance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) regulations and the California Fish and Wildlife Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513. The Designated Biologist shall monitor the nest at the onset of project activities, and at the onset of any changes in such project activities (e.g., increase in number or type of equipment, change in equipment usage, etc.) to determine the efficacy of the buffer. The qualified biologist shall halt all construction activities within proximity to an active nest if it is determined that the activities are harassing the nest and may result in nest abandonment or take.

Active bird nests shall be mapped utilizing a handheld Global Positioning System (GPS), getting as close as possible without disturbing the nest. The buffer shall be of a distance to ensure avoidance of

adverse effects to the nesting bird by accounting for topography, ambient conditions, species, nest location, and activity type. All nests shall be monitored as determined by the qualified biologist until nestlings have fledged and dispersed or it is confirmed that the nest has been unsuccessful or abandoned. Construction shall not be permitted within buffer areas while the nest continues to be active. Once fledging has occurred or the nest otherwise becomes inactive, no further avoidance shall be required. An active nest is defined as a nest that is being built or in use as part of the reproductive process, including a nest with eggs, chicks, or dependent juveniles. The qualified biologist shall also have the authority to require implementation of avoidance measures related to noise, vibration, or light pollution if indirect impacts are resulting in harassment of the nest. Work can resume within these avoidance areas when no other active nests are found. Upon completion of the survey and nesting bird monitoring, a report shall be prepared and submitted to the City for mitigation monitoring compliance record keeping.

The qualified biologist shall also have the authority to require implementation of avoidance measures related to noise, vibration, or light pollution if indirect impacts are resulting in harassment of the nest. Work can resume within these avoidance areas when no other active nests are found. Upon completion of the survey and nesting bird monitoring, a report shall be prepared and submitted to the City for mitigation monitoring compliance record keeping.

MM BIO-1h: Biological Monitoring and Clearance Surveys.

Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a qualified biologist with experience surveying for each of the following species shall be retained: Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), southern California rufous-crowned sparrow (*Aimophila ruficeps canescens*), Lawrence's goldfinch (*Spinus lawrencei*), northern harrier (*Circus hudsonius*), great egret (*Ardea alba*), Costa's hummingbird (*Calypte costae*), red-diamond rattlesnake (*Crotalus ruber*), orange-throated whiptail (*Aspidoscelis hyperythra),* and San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit (*Lepus californicus bennettii*). Prior to commencing any Project-related ground-disturbing activities, the qualified biologist should conduct surveys for where suitable habitat is present. Project related activities include construction, equipment and vehicle access, parking, and staging. Focused surveys should consist of daytime surveys and nighttime surveys no more than one month from the start of any ground-disturbing activities. The surveys should include mapping of current locations of special-status wildlife species for avoidance and relocation efforts and to assist construction monitoring efforts. The survey should be conducted so that 100 percent coverage of the Project site and surrounding areas is achieved. In addition, resumes/and or statements of qualifications shall be provided to the City by the applicant identifying one or more qualified Biological Monitors that will be assigned to the project to monitor construction activities. Monitors shall be responsible for ensuring that impacts to special-status species, native vegetation, wildlife habitat, jurisdictional waters, and sensitive or unique biological resources are avoided to the extent possible.

The City in consultation with a qualified biologist should prepare a Workers Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training prior to implementation of Project ground-disturbing activities. Monitors shall conduct WEAP training to inform construction personnel of applicable mitigation measures and permit conditions, and any potential for infraction and should include effective, specific, enforceable, and feasible actions. The qualified biologist should have prepared maps showing locations where SSC were detected and share this information to workers as part of training. The qualified biologist shall meet with the construction crew at the Project site at the onset of construction to educate the

construction crew on the following: 1) a review of the project boundaries; 2) all special-status species that may be present, their habitat, and proper identification; and 3) the specific mitigation measures that will be incorporated into the construction effort. The qualified biologist should communicate to workers that upon encounter with a SSC, work must stop, a qualified biologist must be notified, and work may only resume once a qualified biologist has determined that it is safe to do so. Any contractor or employee that inadvertently kills or injures a special-status animal, or finds one either dead, injured, or entrapped, should immediately report the incident to the qualified biologist and/or onsite representative identified in the worker training. The biological monitor shall submit a weekly report to the City inspector, and shall promptly identify any concerns or violations, as needed.
A biological monitor shall be present during initial site clearing activities (vegetation clearing, soil preparation, and ground disturbance), during work adjacent to avoided Delhi soils and jurisdictional waters and MSHCP Riparian/Riverine habitat, and at appropriate intervals throughout construction to ensure compliance with mitigation measures and regulatory permit conditions.

In addition, a qualified Biologist shall conduct clearance surveys for special-status plant or wildlife resources within or adjacent to the project disturbance area within three calendar days prior to initial vegetation clearing and ground disturbance, including fence installation. Daily biological monitoring should be conducted during any activities involving vegetation clearing or modification of natural habitat. Surveys for SSC should be conducted prior to the initiation of each day of vegetation removal activities in suitable habitat. Surveys for SSC should be conducted in the areas flagged in earlier surveys before construction and activities may occur in or adjacent to those areas. Work may only occur in these areas after a qualified biologist has determined it is safe to do so. Even so, workers should be advised to work with caution near flagged areas. If SSC is encountered, qualified biologist should safely protect or relocate the animal per relocation and handling protocols.

If any special-status plants or wildlife are found, the Biologist shall take appropriate action as defined in the MSHCP, mitigation measures, permit conditions, and regulations. The qualified biologist should use visible flagging to mark the location where SSC was detected. The qualified biologist should take a photo of each location, map each location, and provide the specific species detected at that location. The qualified biologist should provide a summary report of SSC surveys to the City before any Project-related ground-disturbing activities. The CDFW should be notified and consulted regarding the presence of any special-status wildlife species found on site during surveys. If an Endangered Species Act-listed species is found prior to or during grading of the site, the USFWS should also be notified. If any special-status or listed species are/have been observed on or in proximity to the Project site, Permittee shall submit California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB) forms and maps to the CNDDB within five working days of the sightings. Additional avoidance and minimization measures may need to be developed with CDFW/USFW.

Where applicable, wildlife should be protected, allowed to move away on its own (non-invasive, passive relocation), or relocated to adjacent appropriate habitat within the open space on site or in suitable habitat adjacent to the project area (either way, at least 200 feet from the grading limits). Special status wildlife should be captured only by a qualified biologist. The qualified biologist should prepare a species-specific list (or plan) of proper handling and relocation protocols and a map of suitable and safe relocation areas. The list (or plan) of protocols should be implemented during project construction and activities/biological construction monitoring. The City/qualified biologist may consult with CDFW/USFWS to prepare species-specific protocols for proper handling and

relocation procedures. Only a USFWS approved biologist should be authorized to capture and relocate ESA-listed species. A relocation plan should be submitted to CDFW and USFWS for review and comment prior to implementing Project-related ground-disturbing activities.

If any SSC are harmed during relocation or a dead or injured animal is found, work in the immediate area should stop immediately, the qualified biologist should be notified, and dead or injured wildlife documented immediately. The qualified biologist should contact the USFWS, CDFW, and the City by telephone by the end of the day, or at the beginning of the next working day if the agency office is closed. In addition, a formal report should be sent to the City, CDFW, and USFWS (as appropriate) within three calendar days of the incident or finding. The report should include the date, time of the finding or incident (if known), and location of the carcass or injured animal and circumstances of its death or injury (if known). Work in the immediate area may only resume once the proper notifications have been made and additional mitigation measures have been identified to prevent additional injury or death.

Monitoring and survey activities shall be documented, and~~,~~ summaries shall be submitted on a monthly basis during periods of Project activity until Project completion or monitoring is complete. Monitoring reports of any passively relocated species shall also be included. At the conclusion of project construction activities, a final construction report shall be submitted to CDFW and the City at least two weeks after the Project is fully completed including color photographs of before and after Project-related activities, including the surrounding staging areas. The construction report at a minimum shall contain pre- Project photographs, total amount of area impacted post-Project, post-Project photographs, and biological survey notes (including construction monitoring). All monitoring reports and communications shall be retained in project files to allow review by the lead agency and Wildlife Agencies.

MM BIO-1i: Burrowing Owl.

a) Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Planning Department shall verify that the burrowing owl breeding season protocol survey is not more than one year old. If it is older than one year, an updated breeding season protocol survey for burrowing owl shall be conducted within all suitable burrowing owl habitat on the site and a 150-meter buffer. A copy of the report shall be provided to the Planning Department and to the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) (jointly referred to as the Wildlife Agencies) before grading occurs. If one or more owl-occupied burrows are identified by the breeding season protocol survey, then the Project Applicant shall immediately prepare a Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan (BOPaRP) for review and approval by USFWS and CDFW, without deferring such preparation to a later time, and the 30-day pre-construction burrowing owl survey will no longer be required. The proposed BOPaRP shall be submitted to the two Wildlife Agencies through the City once the City has reviewed the draft BOPaRP.

b) If no burrowing owls are detected in the Project vicinity by the most recent breeding-season burrowing owl protocol survey, then, prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a pre-construction burrowing owl survey in accordance with the March 2006 Burrowing Owl Survey Instructions for the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Area shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days before ground or vegetation disturbance, including grubbing, tree removal, or site watering. The surveys shall be conducted

as close to the actual construction initiation date as possible. In addition, a preconstruction survey for burrowing owl shall be conducted within 3 days prior to initiation of Project activities and reported to CDFW. Additionally, if ground-disturbing activities occur, but the site is subsequently left without further disturbance for more than 30 days, a pre-construction survey shall again be necessary to reconfirm that burrowing owls have not colonized the site since it was last disturbed.

If no burrowing owls are observed during all the surveys, site preparation and construction activities may begin.

If burrowing owls are detected by the pre-construction survey, the Biologist shall notify the Planning Department and consult with local and State agencies, as appropriate, and develop a mitigation plan. A copy of the plan shall be provided to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department, the CDFW, and the USFWS field office in Plam Springs with written notification sent within 48 hours of detecting the burrowing owls. If owl-occupied burrows are identified on an implementing Project site during the pre-construction survey, the Project Applicant shall not commence activities until the City receives CDFW and USFWS approval of a Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan, as described below.

If owl presence is difficult to determine, a qualified biologist shall monitor the burrows with motion-activated trail cameras for at least 24 hours to evaluate burrow occupancy. The onsite qualified biologist will verify the nesting effort has finished according to methods identified in the Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan. A copy of the plan shall be provided to the Planning Department.

The BOPaRP shall be implemented prior to any construction activities that may disturb burrowing owls. Mitigation shall be based on the following goals and requirements in the MSHCP:

1. If the site contains or is part of an area supporting less than 35 acres of suitable habitat or the survey reveals that the site and the surrounding area supports fewer than three pairs of burrowing owls, on-site burrowing owls shall be passively or actively relocated following accepted protocols.

2. If the Project site (including adjacent areas) supports three-or more pairs of burrowing owls, supports greater than 35 acres of suitable habitat, and is noncontiguous with MSHCP Conservation Area lands, at least 90 percent of the area with long-term conservation value and burrowing owl pairs shall be conserved on-site.

The qualified biologist and the Project Applicant shall coordinate with the City, CDFW, and USFWS to develop a Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan to be approved by CDFW and USFWS prior to commencing Project activities. The Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan shall describe the Project's proposed avoidance, relocation, monitoring, minimization, and/or mitigation actions to protect burrowing owls from harm and to maintain their survival and numbers in the MSHCP Plan Area. The Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan shall include the number and location of occupied burrow sites and details on proposed buffers if avoiding the burrowing owls, or information on the adjacent or nearby suitable habitat available

to owls for relocation. If no suitable habitat is available nearby for relocation, details regarding the creation and funding of artificial burrows (numbers, location, and type of burrows) and management activities for relocated owls shall also be included in the Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan. The City will implement the Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan following CDFW and USFWS review and approval.

If burrowing owls are observed within Project Site(s) during Project implementation and construction, the Project Applicant shall notify the Wildlife Agencies immediately in writing within 48 hours of detection. A Burrowing Owl Plan will be submitted to the Wildlife Agencies for review and approval within two weeks of detection and no Project activities will occur within 1,000 feet of the burrowing owls' burrows until the Wildlife Agencies approves the Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan. The City shall be responsible for implementing appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures, including burrow avoidance, passive or active relocation, or other appropriate mitigation measures as identified in the Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan.

A final survey report shall be prepared by a qualified biologist documenting the results of the burrowing owl surveys and detailing avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures. The final report will be submitted to the City and the Wildlife Agencies within 30 days of completion of the survey for mitigation monitoring compliance record keeping.

MM BIO-1j: Bat Roosts.

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, potential roosts for special-status bats (e.g., caves, crevices, mines, hollow trees, palm trees, rock outcrops, buildings, etc.) shall be inspected by a qualified Biologist within 7 days prior to initial ground or vegetation disturbance. If special-status bats are roosting or hibernating, an avoidance buffer shall be implemented where bats are present and a bat exclusion plan shall be prepared and submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley and CDFW for review prior to impacts. If a maternity roost is discovered during the breeding season (March through October), the Biologist shall determine appropriate avoidance measures, including, but not limited to sound walls, buffers, and construction phasing/timing to avoid and minimize disturbance to the roost until all young are weaned and capable of foraging independently.

MM BIO-1k: Crotch's Bumble Bee.

Because of suitable habitat within the Project site, within one year prior to vegetation removal and/or grading, a qualified entomologist familiar with Crotch bumble bee behavior, as approved by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and life history conduct surveys in accordance with any Crotch's bumble bee survey protocol provided by CDFW to determine the presence/absence of Crotch bumble bee. Surveys should be conducted during flying season when the species is most likely to be detected above ground, between March 1 to September 1. Surveys should be conducted within the Project site and areas adjacent to the Project site where suitable habitat exists. If a colony is present, a 100-fot avoidance buffer shall be established. Survey results, including negative findings, should be submitted to CDFW prior to project-related vegetation removal and/or ground-disturbing activities. If a survey finds that a crotch bumble bee ~~colony~~ is present on the Project site or Crotch's bumble bee are observed during Project activities, the project Biologist shall consult with CDFW. The qualified biologist should identify the location of all nests in or adjacent to the Project site. If Project activities may result in disturbance or potential take, the qualified biologist, in coordination with

CDFW, should expand the buffer zone as necessary to prevent disturbance or take. If the Project will impact crotch bumble bee, an incidental take permit from CDFW shall be obtained pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2081 subdivision (b) and/or other mitigation shall be implemented as required by CDFW.

MM BIO-1l: Noise Plan.

Prior to approval of the Final Design, a Noise Plan shall be submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley for review and approval. Proposed The Noise Plan shall identify noise generating land uses that may affecting the MSHCP Conservation Area and shall incorporate setbacks, berms or walls to minimize the effects of noise on MSHCP Conservation Area resources pursuant to applicable rules, regulations and guidelines related to land use noise standards. For planning purposes, wildlife within the MSHCP Conservation Area should not be subject to noise that would exceed residential noise standards. The Noise Plan shall include monitoring during construction and post-project to demonstrate noise levels in the Conservation Area do not exceed residential standards. If noise standards are exceeded, the Project Applicant is responsible for immediate implementation of remedial actions to reduce noise levels to acceptable levels.

Impact BIO-2: Biological Resources. The project would have a substantial adverse effect on a riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

Finding: Implementation of MM BIO-2a and MM BIO-2b, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce construction and operational impacts related to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or United States Fish and Wildlife Service to a less than significant level.

The City finds protection for riparian habitats or any other sensitive natural community, including development and implementation of a habit mitigation and monitoring plan and stormwater prevention plan, to be feasible. The City hereby determines that any construction or operational impacts related to riparian habitats or other sensitive natural community after implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2a and BIO-2b would be less than significant.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(1) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding:

Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it results in a direct or an indirect physical change to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS.

Riparian Habitat

Impacts from earthmoving or other construction activities in or adjacent to drainages or sheet-flow areas could result in discharge of toxic materials, silt, debris, or excessive erosion into Riparian/Riverine Habitat during construction. Impacts to habitat in the immediate Project vicinity could potentially occur as a result of erosion and runoff, fugitive dust, and invasive species. Clearing the site of vegetation will reduce water absorption after rain events and increase runoff. Standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) require watering when necessary to reduce fugitive dust, subject to local water restrictions. MM BIO-2b requires

preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts to drainage features. MM BIO-1d (Wildlife Hazards) restricts vehicles on unpaved roads to 15 mph. The implementation of these measures, as well as any additional measures required by regulatory permits, would reduce potential impacts to Riparian/Riverine habitat to less than significant levels.

Sensitive Natural Communities Implementation of the Project would result in the permanent loss of approximately 477 acres of habitat. The 477 acres of impacted habitat add to the reduction in availability of nest/den sites and foraging habitats for species that utilize shrublands, grasslands, and disturbed habitats. With implementation of MM BIO-1b (Conserve Open Space), approximately 510.5 acres of habitat would be preserved as open space, managed by a City-approved conservation entity, and deed restricted as open space and would be available to support plant and wildlife species that utilize the site. MM BIO-1a (Flag or Fence Impact Areas) and MM BIO-1h (Biological Monitoring and Clearance Surveys) would ensure that construction activities do not encroach on avoidance areas. With implementation of MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, and MM BIO-1h, impacts to common vegetation communities on the Project site would be adverse, but less than significant.

There is one sensitive vegetation community on the site, bush penstemon scrub, and approximately 0.10 acre of this vegetation (about 17 percent of the total on-site) will be permanently impacted by the Project. MM BIO-1b (Conserve Open Space) would conserve the remaining 0.49 acre (83 percent of the total on-site) within open space areas. Bush penstemon scrub is ranked as S3 (vulnerable to extirpation) and the loss of 0.10 acre of this vegetation community, coupled with the conservation of the remaining 0.49 acre, is not expected to significantly impact regional abundance. With implementation of MM BIO-1b, impacts to bush penstemon scrub would be less than significant.

A potential increase in non-native species, which may impact native plant species, may occur along Project margins where newly exposed soils not developed or landscaped could provide fertile ground. Invasive species occur within the impact area and could disperse seed to newly turned soil. Invasive and noxious weed species seeds could be spread or introduced into the area by vehicles or machinery. MM BIO-1e (Invasive Plants) reduces the potential for spread of noxious and non-native species by utilizing certified weed-free products on the site, prohibiting the use of invasive plants in landscaping, washing heavy equipment prior to bringing it on-site, and limiting staging of equipment to areas not occupied by noxious weeds. Human and pet encroachment would be reduced by implementation of MM BIO-1f (Urban/Wildland Interface), which requires compliance with the Urban and Wildlands Interface guidelines. Measures detailed in Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP include the incorporation of rear yard fencing and/or steep inaccessible slopes between the avoided areas and development in the Project design, as well as signage and homeowner education.

MM BIO-2a: MSHCP Riparian/Riverine Habitat.

Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall provide mitigation for the loss of Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Riparian/Riverine areas at no less than a 2:1 basis, or as determined through consultation with the City of Jurupa Valley and wildlife agencies based on a functions and values analysis. Equal or greater value mitigation shall be provided in the form of one or more of the following: off-site acquisition and preservation, participation in an approved mitigation bank, on-site creation, off-site creation and/or enhancement, or reestablishment. If off-site mitigation is incorporated, the preferred choice shall be to find mitigation within or adjacent to the Santa Ana Watershed and within Riverside County.

If on-site mitigation is proposed, a Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (MMRP) shall be developed and provided for review and approval by local and other regional regulatory agencies and shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Recommendations for soil preparation.
- A plant palette to include native species appropriate for the Project site.
- Planting methods.
- Irrigation and maintenance requirements.
- Quantitative success criteria (vegetation cover and species richness).
- A long-term management plan.

MM BIO-2b: Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, , the project applicant shall prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), employing standard Best Management Practices (BMPs), to prevent discharges from entering jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands during construction. BMPs shall include, but not be limited to:

- Use of erosion control or sedimentation prevention methods, such as fiber rolls, sand or gravel bags, rice mats, straw wattles, or similar measures, where appropriate.
- Proper use and disposal of oil, gasoline, diesel fuel, antifreeze, and other toxic substances.

Impact BIO-3: Biological Resources. The project would have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

Finding: Implementation of MM BIO-3a and MM BIO-3b, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce construction and operational impacts on State or federally protected wetlands to a less-than-significant level.

The City finds protection of wetlands, including through potential obtaining of a Waste Discharge Requirement Permit and replacement of State jurisdictional streambeds and wetlands impacted by the Project (as specified by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife), to be feasible. The City hereby determines that any construction or operational impacts related to wetlands after implementation of MM BIO-3a and MM BIO-3b would be less than significant.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(1) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it results in a direct or an indirect physical change to State or federally protected wetlands. As described in the L&L BRA (included in Appendix D), the 2018 L&L jurisdictional delineation determined that the Project would impact 5.98 acres of CDFW jurisdictional streambed and 0.88 acre of State wetland over 27,637 linear feet, for a total of 6.86 acres of State jurisdiction. The USACE issued an Approved Jurisdictional Determination on February 11, 2021, stating that waters of the United States do not occur on the Project site.

MM BIO-3a, which addresses potential impacts to RWQCB jurisdictional areas, and MM BIO-3b, which addresses impacts to CDFW jurisdictional areas, would require mitigation for impacts at no less than a 2:1 ratio. In addition, MM BIO-1a would also ensure jurisdictional resources within the Project site are avoided. Impacts from earthmoving or other construction activities in or adjacent to drainages or sheet-flow areas

could result in discharge of toxic materials, silt, debris, or excessive erosion into jurisdictional waters and wetlands during construction of the Project. Implementation of BMPs described in MM BIO-2b would increase avoidance and minimization of impacts to drainage features. The implementation of these mitigation measures as well as any additional measures required by regulatory permits would reduce potential impacts to protected State wetlands to less than significant levels.

With implementation of MM BIO-3a and MM 3b, impacts to sensitive species would be less than significant.

MM BIO-3a: RWQCB Jurisdictional Areas

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall consult with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to determine the need and if necessary, obtain a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit under the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.

MM BIO-3b: CDFW Jurisdictional Areas

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall enter into an agreement with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) (via issuance and implementation of a Streambed Alteration Agreement, Section 1600) to replace State jurisdictional streambeds and wetlands impacted by the project at no less than a 2:1 ratio, or as specified by the CDFW, through a combination of off-site acquisition and preservation, participation in an approved mitigation bank, and/or on-site or off-site creation, enhancement, or reestablishment of streambed. The exact ratio shall be based on a functions and values assessment.

Impact BIO-5: Biological Resources. The project would conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Finding: Implementation of MM BIO-5, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce impacts related to conflicts with the City's tree ordinances and General Plan policies to a less-than-significant level. The City finds the establishment of a construction buffer zone and establishment of an open-space preserve around the Palmer's Oak to be feasible. The City hereby determines that any impacts on the Palmer's Oak, or conflicts with any of the City's tree ordinances or General Plan policies remaining after implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would be less than significant.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(1) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding:

Under the City's local significance threshold, the project would have significant effects if inconsistent with the following General Plan Policies: (i) COS 1.2–Protection of Significant Trees; and (ii) COS 1.3–Other Significant Vegetation.

The ancient Palmer's oak tree located in the northeast quarter of the Project site would likely qualify for protection under Policy COS 1.2 and 1.3 due to its great age (estimated between 13,000 and 18,000 years old), being possibly the oldest living plant ever documented in California, as well the tree's unique status as being one of the last remnants of its species within all of Southern California.

The Biological Review of Palmer's Oak memorandum (Palmer's Oak memorandum, included in Appendix D) included a ground-penetrating radar (GPR) study which detected planar or basin-shaped depressions in subsurface bedrock to a depth of approximately 2 meters in several location in the study area. These features

appear to confirm the hypothesis that the shape of subsurface bedrock collects and perches water in a manner that provides water to sustain the Jurupa Oak beyond periods of major rainfall.

The Palmer's oak would be avoided in accordance with MM BIO-5, Palmer's Oak. Based on the current design of the Project, the Palmer's oak is located in an area designated as an Open Space Conservation area, approximately 200 feet away from the area designated for development. In addition, based on a vibration prediction study prepared for the area of the Palmer's oak (Appendix D), and as required by MM BIO-5, heavy equipment would not be operating within 259 feet of the tree to prevent potential impact from equipment vibration to the subsurface bedrock that supports the ancient tree.

Detailed location information would be shared as needed with construction personnel; Biological Monitors; State, local, and federal agencies; and the future Homeowner's Association (HOA) to prevent any impacts during construction or operation. With the implementation of MM BIO-5, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy COS 1.2 or COS 1.3 and therefore the development of the Plan Area would have a less than significant impact.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-5, impacts to sensitive species would be less than significant.

> **MM BIO-5: Palmer's Oak.**
>
> Prior to the recordation of the Final Map, a lettered open space lot shall be identified to avoid the Palmer's oak and a minimum of 200 feet beyond its mapped limits, as mapped in the *Revised Updated Biological Resources Assessment, Jurisdictional Delineation, Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Narrow Endemic Plant, Burrowing Owl Breeding Season, and Two-year Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly Focused Surveys for Rio Vista, Specific Plan 16001, Jurupa Valley, Riverside County, California*, prepared by L&L Environmental, Inc. in December 2016 and most recently updated in September 2023. No project-related construction activities may occur within the tree's mapped limit and the 200-foot buffer. This includes, but is not limited to, staging of supplies and equipment, vegetation removal, grading, stockpiling, paving, and any other activity related to development of the Project. A City-approved conservation entity shall be responsible for maintenance of the natural open space areas, which includes the area of the Palmer's oak, and it would monitor the health of this tree. The area surrounding the Palmer's oak would be designated as a preserve with limited public access. In addition, no heavy equipment may operate within 259 feet of the mapped limits of the tree.

Impact BIO-6: Biological Resources. The project would conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan.

Finding: Implementation of MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-1c, MM BIO-1e, MM BIO-1f, MM BIO-1i, MM BIO-2a, and MM BIO-2b, which are adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce direct and indirect impacts to sensitive habitats in compliance with the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) to a less-than-significant level. The City finds adoption of mitigation measures to protect sensitive habitats, including preservation and maintenance of open space areas, preparation of pre-construction surveys and avoidance of identified nests, habitat or special-status plant species, and incorporation of design elements to reduce indirect impacts from development, to be feasible. The City hereby determines that any conflicts with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan,

Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan remaining after implementation of MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-1c, MM BIO-1e, MM BIO-1f, MM BIO-1i, MM BIO-2a, and MM BIO-2b would be less than significant.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(1) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding:

Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if in conflict with the Western Riverside County MSHCP.

Conservation Areas/Reserve Assembly

The Project site is not located within any MSHCP Criteria Areas and it is not located within an MSHCP-designated Core or Linkage and will not impact overall Reserve Assembly goals. The Project site is in the Jurupa Area Plan and is located between but not within Noncontiguous Habitat Block 2 (Jurupa Mountains), a portion of Block 3 (Delhi Soils), and Core A (Santa Ana River). Thus, the Project would not affect either Habitat Block or the Core area. Therefore, the preservation of the affected acreage would not contribute to conservation, habitat, or species protection objectives of the MSHCP and development of the Project site for other appropriate uses would not impact overall Reserve Assembly goals.

The Project site contains Riparian/Riverine and Delhi sands habitat. Impacts to these habitats may require compensatory mitigation under MSHCP requirements. However, with the implementation of MM BIO-1b, which requires the project applicant to set aside portions of the Project site as conservation land, the majority of the Riparian/Riverine and Delhi sands habitat present on-site shall be designated as open space, which would not be impacted by future development. These open space areas shall not be developed, but rather be preserved as open space, managed by a City-approved conservation entity, and placed under a deed with restrictions from future development. The deed restriction would be established prior to issuance of a grading permit, and responsibility for managing this area would be entrusted to a City-approved local conservation entity which shall manage the open space areas and shall restrict future impact and uses of open space areas. With the implementation of these avoidance and preservation measures, the development of the Project site would have a less than significant impact.

Impacts to Riparian/Riverine or Vernal Pools

Streambed/wetland delineation studies of the Project site updated in 2023 identified 5.98 acres of MSHCP Riverine and 0.88 acre of MSHCP Riparian habitat on the Project site. All features identified as MSHCP Riparian/Riverine were also considered a part of State jurisdictional area. No vernal pool habitat was identified in the survey area.

The L&L BRA (see Appendix D) concluded that the development of the Project site would impact an estimated 5.98 acres of MSHCP Riverine area and 0.88 acre of MSHCP Riparian area. On-site and/or off-site mitigation would be provided for impacts to MSHCP Riparian/Riverine habitat as described in MM BIO-2a.

MSHCP Habitat Assessment Requirements

MSHCP Additional Needs Species and Narrow Endemic plant species that required habitat assessments include burrowing owl, San Diego ambrosia, Brand's phacelia, and San Miguel savory.

Burrowing Owl

A habitat assessment for burrowing owl determined that the species could occur in low-lying disturbed and undisturbed brittle bush scrub and non-native grasslands on the Project site. Focused burrowing owl surveys were conducted by L&L in May and June 2014, April through June 2016, and April through June 2018. No burrowing owl or burrowing owl sign were observed in the Project site or buffer zone. However, due to the presence of suitable habitat the potential for burrowing owl to occur on-site cannot be ruled out entirely. As discussed in Impact BIO-1, the implementation of MM BIO-1i, which requires focused burrowing owl surveys to be conducted prior to construction, would reduce potential impacts to burrowing owl to less than significant levels.

Narrow Endemic Plants

A habitat assessment and focused surveys were conducted by L&L between April 2014 and September 2018 for San Diego ambrosia, Brand's phacelia, and San Miguel savory on the Project site. No suitable habitat for San Diego ambrosia was observed in the survey area and the Project site is likely on the margin of its geographic range. The species was not observed during multiple years of surveys. Potentially suitable habitat for Brand's phacelia occurs in the survey area, but it is regularly impacted and heavily disturbed by off-road recreational vehicle use. The habitat is considered poor and the species was not observed during multiple years of surveys.

Potentially suitable habitat for San Miguel savory occurs in the survey area, but the Project site was located north of the known range of the species. The species was not observed during multiple years of surveys. Based on results of the habitat assessment and focused surveys, San Diego ambrosia, Brand's phacelia, and San Miguel savory are considered absent from the site. As discussed under Threshold BIO-1, the implementation of MM BIO-1c, which requires pre-construction surveys and avoidance of any special-status plants if they are present on-site, would reduce potential impacts to narrow endemic plants to less than significant levels.

Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly (DSF)

DSF were found on-site during the 2005 surveys by AMEC and the occupied habitat was mapped as 3.73 acres. A 2-year focused survey was conducted on the Project site in 2015 and 2016 by L&L, but no DSF were observed in the Project site. MSHCP Conservation Objective 1B limits impacts to 25 percent of the Delhi soils on-site if the site is determined to be occupied by DSF. The Project would impact a total of 4.87 acres of suitable DSF habitat, representing 24.4 percent of the suitable habitat on the site and 22.5 percent of the 2005 mapped occupied habitat. As discussed under Impact BIO-1, the implementation of MM BIO-1b, which would create a deed restriction of any avoided habitat to prevent future impacts, would reduce potential impacts to DSF to less than significant levels.

Urban/Wildlands Interface

The Project site lies between two Noncontiguous Habitat Blocks: Block 2 (Jurupa Mountains) and Block 3 (Delhi Soils). The Project site does not adjoin any MSHCP Criteria Areas and is separated from any Conservation Areas by mostly residential and industrial development. Based on the distance and existing development between the Project site and Criteria Areas, indirect impacts to Criteria Areas would not occur. However, indirect impacts may occur to habitat within the Project site that would be avoided by future development, including habitat for DSF. Indirect impacts that result from development, including lighting, urban runoff, toxics, and domestic predators, will be minimized in the Project design in accordance with Urban/Wildlands Interface guidelines and requirements as described in Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP. Additionally, the implementation of MM BIO-1a (Flag or Fence Impact Areas), MM BIO-1b (Conserve Open

Space), MM BIO-1e (Invasive Plants), and MM BIO-1f (Urban/Wildland Interface) throughout the Project site would further reduce any potential impacts to wildlife and their habitats (as described in Impact BIO-1) that may result from edge effects to less than significant levels.

Drainage

The Project would incorporate streets and natural drainage courses, as well as a comprehensive system of underground storm drains, to handle storm runoff from the Project site. Stormwater from the Project site would be directed to storm drains. The design and operation of the drainage channels would be adequate to preclude discharge of water into open space areas that are of lower quality or higher quantity than current conditions.

The proposed development would incorporate measures such as MM BIO-2b, which includes measures required through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements, to ensure that the quantity and quality of runoff discharged to open space area is not altered in an adverse way when compared with existing conditions. These measures would ensure that the discharge of untreated surface runoff from developed and paved areas is prevented from entering into open space areas. Stormwater systems would be designed to prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, invasive plant materials, or other elements that might degrade or harm biological resources or ecosystem processes within open space areas. This would be accomplished using a variety of methods, including natural detention basins, grass swales, or mechanical trapping devices. Regular maintenance shall occur to ensure effective operations of runoff control systems. The implementation of these measures and PDFs would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

Toxics

Future development within the Project site would be designed to utilize natural drainage patterns for the flow of surface water. Water quality BMPs would include education, storm drain stenciling, and street sweeping in compliance with City of Jurupa Valley requirements. These BMPs would be implemented as part of the stormwater pollution prevention measures for the Project, in accordance with all appropriate NPDES requirements.

Development of the Project site would result in additional use of hazardous materials in limited quantities associated with normal residential use, such as cleaning products, solvents, herbicides, and insecticides. However, the implementation of MM BIO-2b and PDFs, as discussed earlier, would reduce potential risk of hazardous material exposure to a level that is less than significant.

Lighting

The Project would comply with applicable requirements and policies of the City of Jurupa Valley. Outdoor lighting of residences within the Project site would be designed so that all direct beams would be confined to dwelling sites. Lighting would not intrude into avoided or adjacent open space areas. Street lighting, parking lot lighting, and other project-related illumination sources would be positioned, directed, and shielded to avoid “light spill” into conserved areas. Through the implementation of these PDFs, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Noise

The Project would incorporate landscape elements, including trees, shrubs, and groundcover, which would assist in noise reduction in native habitats adjacent to the Project site. Noise levels within the Project site

following development are not expected to exceed residential noise standards. Therefore, the Project is in compliance with the MSHCP.

Barriers

In accordance with the Urban/Wildlands guidelines found in the MSHCP Section 6.1.4, the Project would include theme walls along perimeter streets adjacent to public streets and would include walls and fencing located where public view and/or important interfaces are of concern. Future development within the Project site would also incorporate special edge treatments such as native landscaping and fencing to separate development areas from open space areas and minimize unauthorized public access, domestic animal predation, and illegal trespassing and dumping.

Fencing would adhere to MSHCP requirements, would be permanent, and would be maintained in perpetuity. Exclusion fencing would be 5 feet in height at minimum and would be installed and maintained for the purpose of controlling human and domestic animal access into open space areas. Approval of the fencing design will be required by the City of Jurupa Valley prior to initiation of the Project. Through the implementation of these PDFs, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Invasive Vegetation Control

As discussed in Impact BIO-1a, the implementation of MM BIO-1e, which would require invasive plant species control measures, would reduce the potential for spread of non-native species to less than significant levels. Additionally, project design guidelines would be provided to homeowners with a list of allowed native landscaping materials. These materials would be selected for their contribution to the Project theme, adaptability to local climatic and soil conditions, and for their compatibility with the unique natural environment in the Project site vicinity. None of the plants listed in Table 6-2 in Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP will be utilized on the Project site adjacent to open space areas. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Access

Access points between native habitats and the developed areas within the Project site would be posted with signage asking residents to stay on trails and avoid disturbing habitat. The CC&Rs would include a requirement that yard fencing would not have back gates in order to reduce access to native habitats adjacent to any future development within the Project site. Many of the existing informal trails in open space areas would remain for use by residents and the public, but no new trails into the open space would be created. Through the implementation of these PDFs, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Pets

Appropriate signage would be posted requesting that residents leash their pets. Educational pamphlets would be provided to inform homeowners of the potential impacts of uncontrolled pets on native wildlife and request that residents prevent their pets from hunting in the avoidance area. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Grading/Land Development

All manufactured slopes associated with site development would be located within the areas designated for development as shown in Exhibit 2-7 of the Draft Eir. There would be no grading in the areas designated for

conservation. All manufactured slopes that abut natural open space would be retained as open space buffer zones and all manufactured slopes and areas disturbed by construction would be revegetated with buffer species following implementation of the Project in accordance with the Urban/Wildlands guidelines found in Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

With implementation of MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-1c, MM BIO-1e, MM BIO-1f, MM BIO-1i, MM BIO-2a, and MM BIO-2b, conflicts with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan would be less than significant.

MM BIO-1a: Flag or Fence Impact Areas.

Implement MM BIO-1a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1b: Conserve Open Space.

Implement MM BIO-1b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1c: Special-Status Plants.

Implement MM BIO-1c, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1e: Invasive Plants.

Implement MM BIO-1e, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1f: Urban/Wildlands Interface.

Implement MM BIO-1f, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1i: Burrowing Owl.

Implement MM BIO-1i, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-2a: MSHCP Riparian/Riverine Habitat.

Implement MM BIO-2a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-2.

MM BIO-2b: Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.

Implement MM BIO-2b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-2.

Cumulative Impact – Biological Resources. The project would result in a cumulatively considerable impact with regard to biological resources.

Finding: Implementation of MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-1c, MM BIO-1f, MM BIO-1h, MM BIO-1i, MM BIO-2a, and MM BIO-2b, which are adopted and incorporated into the project, would reduce the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts related to biological resources to a less-than-cumulatively considerable level. The City finds implementation of MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-1c, MM BIO-1f, MM BIO-1h, MM BIO-1i, MM BIO-2a, and MM BIO-2b, to be feasible. The City hereby determines that cumulatively considerable impacts related to biological resources after implementation of MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-1c, MM BIO-1f, MM BIO-1h, MM BIO-1i, MM BIO-2a, and MM BIO-2b would be less than significant.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(1) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: The direct and/or indirect impacts of the Project could result in significant cumulative impacts to biological resources within the region of the Project site. While the Project could result in impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species, riparian/riverine habitat, and jurisdictional features, the MSHCP was developed to address the comprehensive regional planning effort and anticipated growth in the City. The Project has been designed and mitigated to remain in compliance with all MSHCP conservation goals and guidelines and therefore, with mitigation implemented, would not result in adverse cumulative impacts. Furthermore, while there are a limited number of isolated pockets of natural habitat in the surrounding areas that could support special-status wildlife and plant species, the built-up nature of the surrounding areas precludes the possible cumulative impacts to biological resources related to special-status wildlife and plant species.

Special-status Species

Listed Species

Listed Plant Species

There are no direct or indirect impacts to State- or federally listed botanical species or to designated or proposed critical habitat on the Project site. No suitable habitat for these species occurs within the Project site and none were identified during multiple years of focused surveys. Implementation of the Project would not add considerably to any cumulative effects to listed plants.

Listed Wildlife Species

The Project would impact 4.87 acres of the 19.97 acres of existing Delhi soils on-site, equivalent to 24.4 percent of Delhi soils suitable to support DSF. Of the 3.73 acres of occupied habitat mapped by AMEC in 2005, 0.84 acres (22.5 percent) would be impacted by the Project. The findings of the 2015 through 2016 2-year survey effort on the Project site were negative. While impacts to 24.4 percent of all Delhi soils habitat and 22.5 percent of the occupied habitat mapped in 2005 could add to cumulative impacts to potentially suitable soils for this species, by meeting the MSHCP requirements for occupied sites, the Project contribution to regional impact would therefore not be cumulatively significant.

Other Special-Status Species

Cumulative habitat loss in the area will affect several special-status species, as loss and degradation of habitat would adversely affect the distribution and abundance of species and would indirectly affect survival of remaining populations through fragmentation and isolation. Impacts to special-status species are likely in the future. However, the implementation of the MSHCP, which focuses conservation in areas of sensitive communities or concentrations of special-status species in proximity to large expanses of open lands or wildlife corridors, will ensure that extensive natural open space is maintained for special-status species in western Riverside County. Upon compliance with MSHCP survey requirements and the implementation of recommended mitigation measures (MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-1c, MM BIO-1f, and MM BIO-1i), potential impacts to MSHCP covered species due to the Project are not expected to be cumulatively significant. Impacts to special-status species not covered under the MSHCP may occur, but the impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels by the implementation of MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1d, MM BIO-1e, MM BIO-1h and MM

BIO-1i. Therefore, the Project is not expected to substantially affect regional populations and would not be cumulatively significant.

Nesting Birds

The implementation of MM BIO-1g would ensure impacts to nesting birds would be avoided and potential nesting habitat would be conserved within open space areas on-site. Additionally, nesting habitat would be preserved within the Project site vicinity as a part of the nearby MSHCP Conservation Areas including Noncontiguous Habitat Block 2 (Jurupa Mountains) and Core A (Santa Ana River). Therefore, the development of the Project would not have significant cumulative impacts to nesting birds.

Sensitive Natural Communities or Riparian Habitat

The development of the Project site would impact 1.96 acres of MSHCP Riverine habitat and 0.78 acre of MSHCP Riparian habitat. These impacts would add to cumulative impacts to MSHCP Riparian/Riverine habitat in the region. However, with the implementation of MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-2a, and MM BIO-2b, the Project's contribution to regional impacts would not be cumulatively significant.

Wetlands and Jurisdictional Features

The Project would impact 27,637 linear feet (6.86 acres) of CDFW jurisdictional areas, composed of 5.98 acres of State streambed and 0.88 acre of State wetlands. These totals would be added to cumulative impacts to jurisdictional features in the region. However, with the implementation of MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-2b, MM BIO-3a, and MM BIO-3b, the Project's contribution to regional impacts would not be cumulatively significant.

Fish and Wildlife Movement Corridors

The Project site does not function as a wildlife corridor. Therefore, the implementation of the Project would not cause or contribute to any cumulative impacts in this regard.

Local Policies or Ordinances

Protected Trees

The ancient Palmer's oak located within the Project site would be avoided in accordance with MM BIO-5. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policies COS 1.2 and COS 1.3.

The development of the Project site would not conflict with any other local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Therefore, the implementation of the Project would not cause or contribute to any cumulative impacts in this regard.

Habitat and Natural Community Conservation Plan Consistency

Western Riverside County MSHCP

During its initial development, the MSHCP considered projects that were already planned and other reasonably foreseeable projects to determine the minimization and mitigation levels required and additional survey needs. The MSHCP provides a process to mitigate for regional cumulative impacts to covered species and their habitats. The MSHCP's habitat-based approach to the protection of covered species focuses on conservation and management of lands essential for their long-term conservation, and therefore addresses potential impacts on environmental resources on a regional scale rather than individually.

Through the implementation of MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-1c, MM BIO-1f, MM BIO-1h, and MM BIO-1i, as well as PDFs, the Project would be consistent with Section 7 of the MSHCP, which ensures cumulative impacts to covered species are mitigated. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not cause or contribute to significant cumulative impacts.

MM BIO-1a: Flag or Fence Impact Areas.

Implement MM BIO-1a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1b: Conserve Open Space.

Implement MM BIO-1b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1c: Special-Status Plants.

Implement MM BIO-1c, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1f: Invasive Plants.

Implement MM BIO-1f, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1h: Urban/Wildlands Interface.

Implement MM BIO-1h, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1i: Burrowing Owl.
Implement MM BIO-1i, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-2a: MSHCP Riparian/Riverine Habitat.

Implement MM BIO-2a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-2.

MM BIO-2b: Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.
Implement MM BIO-2b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-2.

4.2.3 Cultural Resources

Impact CUL-3: Cultural Resources. The project would have the potential to disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Finding: Implementation of MM CUL-3a, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce Project impacts related to the disturbance of human remains to a less-than-significant level. The City finds MM CUL-3a to be feasible. The City hereby determines that any impacts related to the disturbance of human remains, remaining after implementation of MM CUL-3a would be less than significant.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(1) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the project would have significant effects if it disturbs any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

While no cemeteries, informal burial sites, or human remains have been recorded, the size of the Project site and existence of several significant archaeological resources increases the probability that human remains may be located within the Project site. As a result, subsurface construction activities associated with the

Project, such as trenching and grading, could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered human remains. This would constitute a potentially significant impact.

However, in the event of the inadvertent discovery or recognition of any human remains, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, and Public Resources Code Sections 5097.94 and Section 5097.98, must be followed. In the event that human remains are discovered, implementation of MM CUL-3a would reduce impacts related to previously undiscovered human remains to a less than significant level.

> **MM CUL-3a: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains.**
> There is always the possibility that ground-disturbing activities during construction may uncover previously unknown buried human remains. In the event that human or potential human remains are encountered, the following steps shall be taken to reduce potential impacts to inadvertent discoveries of human remains:
>
> In the event of discovery of human bone, potential human bone, or a known or potential human burial or cremation, all ground-disturbing work within 100-feet of the discovery shall halt immediately and the County Coroner and the Lead Agency shall be immediately notified. California State Health and Safety Code 7050.5 dictates that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to CEQA regulations and PRC Section 5097.98. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the NAHC shall be notified within 24 hours and guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in treatment and disposition of the remains.

4.2.4 Geology and Soils

Impact GEO-6: Geology and Soils. The project would directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Finding: Implementation of MM GEO-6a and MM GEO-6b, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce Project impacts related to the destruction of unique paleontological resources or sites, or unique geologic features to a less-than-significant level. The City finds compliance with the Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Plan and monitoring during ground disturbance activities to be feasible. The City hereby determines that any impacts related to paleontological resources or sites, or unique geologic features, remaining after implementation of MM GEO-6a and MM GEO-6b would be less than significant.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(1) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if identified as "HIGH SENSITIVITY (HIGH A)" for paleontological resources in the Parcel Report available on the Riverside County Map My County website.

A Phase I Paleontological Resources Inventory was prepared for the Project by L&L Environmental, Inc. (L&L) on March 20, 2015, and most recently revised on December 21, 2021 (Revised Paleontological Resources Inventory). It concluded that sedimentary rocks present in the northeast corner of the Project site have the most potential to yield significant paleontological resources. While no fossils were observed in surficial

outcrops of this rock unit, paleontological resource monitoring during future grading activities may yield fossil resources.

According to the Revised Paleontological Resources Inventory, the paleontological resources record searches did not identify any previously recorded paleontological localities on or near the Project area. The Project site was surveyed via a meandering pedestrian survey for paleontological resources and no fossil materials were identified. However, the potential for destruction of paleontological resources during surficial earthmoving during construction is high in Quaternary older alluvial fan deposits. Therefore, the Revised Paleontological Resources Inventory determined that there is high potential for locating significant paleontological resources during excavations within the Quaternary older alluvial fan deposits present in several areas around the outer edges of the Project site, resulting in potentially significant impacts related to the destruction of a unique paleontological resource. In addition, the majority of the Project site parcels are located in areas with high paleontological sensitivity as identified in the Parcel Report retrieved from the Riverside County Map My County website. Therefore, impacts to paleontological resources would be potentially significant.

To reduce the potential of destroying paleontological resources, L&L has prepared a PRIMP on March 20, 2015, and revised it most recently on December 21, 2021. The PRIMP states that identifiable fossil remains (particularly of vertebrates), if any, recovered at the Project site would be of high scientific importance if they represent new or rare species, geologic (temporal) and/or geographic range extensions, age-diagnostic taxa, and/or more complete specimens than are now available for their respective taxa. Furthermore, such remains would contribute to a more comprehensive documentation of the diversity of extinct animal life that existed in the Jurupa Valley area during the Quaternary Epoch and to a more accurate reconstruction of the geologic history of the area.

MM GEO-6a would require adherence with the PRIMP, and MM GEO-6b provides further details of the monitoring requirements during ground disturbance activities. With implementation of MM GEO-6a and MM GEO-6b, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

With implementation of MM GEO-6a and MM 6b, impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

MM GEO-6a: Implement Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Plan.
Prior to ground-disturbing activities, the applicant shall implement the Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Plan (PRIMP) prepared by L&L Environmental, Inc. on March 20, 2015, and most recently revised on December 21, 2021, and included in Appendix E of the Draft EIR. The measures identified in the PRIMP are listed below, and detailed requirements for each is provided in the PRIMP.

- Review Geotechnical Report data
- Museum storage agreement
- Discovery clause/treatment plan
- Preconstruction Meeting
- Monitoring of ground-disturbing activities
- Large-specimen evaluation and recovery option
- Small-specimen sample evaluation, recovery, and processing
- Fossil treatment
- Final report

MM GEO-6b: Paleontological monitoring during ground-disturbing activities.
Ground-disturbing activities shall be monitored by a Paleontological Monitor supervised by a qualified paleontologist, as defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) 2010 guidelines (Supervising Paleontologist). Monitoring shall be conducted in areas within the Project site determined by the Supervising Paleontologist to have high potential to yield fossils, specifically within the Quaternary older alluvial fan deposits present in several areas around the outer edges of the Project site. Monitoring shall consist of visually inspecting freshly exposed rock and debris for larger fossil remains and periodically screening a small (25 pound) sample with a 20-mesh box screen for micro vertebrate fossil remains.
Monitors shall be equipped with water, screens, and a 10x magnifying lens so that any sediments encountered that are not clean sands or gravels can be periodically checked for microvertebrate fossils. Monitoring shall be conducted on a full-time basis until the Supervising Paleontologist has determined that additional fossil remains are not likely to be uncovered by earth moving or ground disturbance in specific area(s) underlain by a specific rock unit.
Where warranted, the Supervising Paleontologist may reduce monitoring to half- to quarter-time based on monitoring results. The Supervising Paleontologist may terminate monitoring of rock unit(s) which do not yield fossil resources after 50 percent of the earth has been moved in that rock unit. Alternatively, if sufficient fossil remains are uncovered by earth moving or ground disturbance, and with consultation with the City of Jurupa Valley Community Development Department, monitoring may be increased in areas underlain by the fossil-bearing rock unit, at least in the immediate vicinity of the fossil site.

Cumulative Impact – Geology and Soils. The Project would result in a cumulatively considerable impact with regard to Geology and Soils.

Finding: Implementation of MM GEO-6a, and MM GEO-6b, which are adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts related to geology and soils to a less-than-cumulatively considerable level. The City finds implementation of MM GEO-5a and MM GEO-6b to be feasible. The City hereby determines that cumulatively considerable impacts related to geology and soils after implementation of MM GEO-6a and MM GEO-6b would be less than significant.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(1) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: Adverse effects associated with geology and soils tend to be localized; therefore, an area generally within a 0.25-mile (1320 feet) radius would be the area most affected by activities associated with the Project. The analysis considers the foreseeable development projects listed in Table 3-1 within Chapter 3, Environmental Impact Analysis, in addition to the Project.

Seismic-related Hazards

There are four projects listed in Table 3-1 of the Draft EIR that are located within 0.25 mile of the Project site. Cumulative projects, including the Project, have the potential to experience moderate to strong ground shaking from earthquakes. The projects within 0.25 mile of the Project site, listed in Table 3-1, would be exposed to the same ground shaking hazards and would be subject to the same requirements as the Project. These cumulative projects would adhere to the provisions of the CBC, policies of the General Plan, and the Municipal Code to reduce potential hazards associated with seismic ground shaking and ground failure. As such, the Project, in conjunction with other projects, would not have a cumulatively significant impact associated with seismic-related hazards.

Soil-related Hazards

Soil conditions associated with the Project site, such as expansive soils and soil settlement, are specific to the Project site and generally do not contribute to a cumulative effect. Some or all other cumulative projects may have similar conditions, but they would not contribute to cumulative soil-related hazards. Accordingly, cumulative impacts are less than significant. Moreover, the Project's contribution to less than significant cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. The Project would be subject to the California Building Code (as stated in PPP 3.7-1), General Plan policies, and the Municipal Code to reduce soil-related hazards. Other current and future development/redevelopment projects in the region would similarly be required to adhere to standards and practices that include stringent geologic and soil-related hazard mitigations. As such, the Project, in conjunction with other projects, would not have a cumulatively significant impact associated with soil-related hazards.

Paleontological Resources and Unique Geologic Feature

There are four projects listed in Table 3-1 that are located within 0.25 mile of the Project site. Construction activities associated with development of cumulative projects in the Project vicinity may have the potential to encounter undiscovered geologic resources or paleontological resources. Because the Project site was determined to have potential to yield significant paleontological resources, the possibility of other projects within the 0.25-mile radius would have similar potential and could result in significant cumulative impacts. These cumulative projects would be required to mitigate for impacts through compliance with applicable federal and State laws governing geologic resources and paleontological resources Therefore, cumulative impacts are less than significant. Additionally, the Project's contribution to the less than significant cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. As discussed in Thresholds GEO-1 through GEO-6, development associated with the Project would be consistent with the Municipal Code and the revised PRIMP. Implementation of standard construction practices and MM GEO-6a and MM GEO-6b would ensure that undiscovered geologic resources and paleontological resources are not adversely affected by cumulative project-related construction activities, and potential cumulative impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

MM GEO-6a: Implement Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Plan.

Implement MM GEO-6a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact GEO-6.

MM GEO-6b: Paleontological monitoring during ground disturbance activities.

Implement MM GEO-6b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact GEO-6.

4.2.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact HAZ-2: Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment.

Finding: Implementation of MM HAZ-2a and MM HAZ-2b, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce Project impacts related to significant hazards to the public or the environment related to upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment to a less-than-significant level. The City finds completion of a limited subsurface investigation in areas previously affected by oil debris, and removal and proper disposal of dumped items from the site to be feasible. The City hereby determines that any impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials, remaining after implementation of MM HAZ-2a and MM HAZ-2b would be less than significant.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(1) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the project would have significant effects if: (i) The project handles a hazardous material or mixture containing a hazardous material (as defined in the Health and Safety Code Section 25501(o), see definition above in introduction) that has a quantity at any one time during the reporting year equal to or greater than the amounts specified by Health and Safety Code Section 25507 et seq.; and (ii) The project handles or stores hazardous materials in a quantity equal or greater to the amounts specified by Health and Safety Code Section 25507 and is located within designated 100- or 500-year flood zones.

The Project would involve the handling of material in quantities that are not expected to be equal or greater than the conditions specified in Health and Safety Code Section 25503. The Project is not located within a designated 100- or 500-year flood zone (see Section 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality).

The Phase I ESA determined that there was one REC in the plan area. There were no Historical RECs or Controlled RECs found in the plan area. This REC is located in the vicinity of the roundabout proposed at the center of the Project site, near Planning Area (PA) 8 (residential), PA 12 (light industrial), PA 14 (business park), PA 18 (proposed elementary school), PA 19 (community park), and the proposed 20th Street extension. Impacts associated with this REC could be potentially significant. MM HAZ-2a would require future development in the Project site area where the oily debris and soil was removed to conduct a limited subsurface soil investigation prior to development of PAs 8, 12, 14, 18, and 19 and the 20th Street extension. With implementation of MM HAZ-2a, which requires, prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the completion of a limited subsurface soil investigation in the area of the site where the oily debris and soil was removed and further excavation, if needed, to ensure levels are within adopted thresholds for residential use and a no further action letter is issued by the oversight agency, impacts would be less than significant.

While not identified as a REC in the Phase I ESA, four 15-gallon containers containing vinyl product were dumped into a ravine on the site; two 5-gallon gasoline containers were observed on-site but found empty; and miscellaneous household and construction materials were scattered throughout the site. MM HAZ-2b would require removal and proper disposal of dumped items throughout the site prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit. To address various items dumped at the Project site, the Phase I ESA recommend removal and proper disposal of all dumped items, which would be addressed by MM HAZ-2b.

With implementation of MM HAZ-2a and MM HAZ-2b, construction of the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions related to the release of hazardous materials into the environment, and potential impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The operations associated with development of the Project would comply with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations. Because of the nature of the Project, hazardous materials used on-site may vary but would likely be limited to small quantities of fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides, solvents, cleaning agents, and similar materials used for landscaping and maintenance activities. These types of materials are common for general landscaping and maintenance activities associated with residential and commercial uses and represent a low risk to people and the environment when used as intended.

Hazardous materials may be used in the light industrial uses of the Project, as well as the technical school, proposed to be constructed and operational within the Business Park area of the Project. However, all usage would be in accordance with federal, State, and local regulations, and quantities would not be equal to or

greater than those listed in the California Health and Safety Code Section 25507. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

With implementation of MM GEO-6a and MM 6b, impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials would be less than significant.

MM HAZ-2a: Conduct limited subsurface investigation.
Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit for development of PAs 8, 12, 14, 18 or 19, or the 20th Street extension, whichever occurs first, a limited subsurface soil investigation in the area of the site where the oily debris and soil were removed shall be conducted. If the subsurface investigation results indicate soil concentrations above Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) environmental screening levels, the applicant must obtain regulatory oversight from the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), or the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health under their Site Cleanup Program. A Site Management Plan (SMP), Removal Action Plan (RAP), or equivalent document shall be prepared by a qualified environmental consultant under regulatory oversight and approval that identifies remedial measures and/or soil management practices to ensure construction worker safety and the health of future site occupants or other significant impacts. The plan and evidence of case closure and no further action by the regulatory oversight agency shall be provided to the City of Jurupa Valley before issuance of a grading permit for development in PAs 8, 12, 14, 18, or 19.

MM HAZ-2b: Disposal of potentially hazardous dumped items.
Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit for any development of the site, potentially hazardous dumped items scattered throughout the site(such as gasoline containers and containers containing vinyl product) shall be properly disposed of before commencement of construction in accordance with the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Occupational Safety and Health regulations. Nonhazardous waste and debris (such as miscellaneous household and construction materials) shall be properly disposed in a permitted facility. The completion of the disposal of dumped items or other applicable abatement activities shall be documented by a qualified environmental professional(s) and submitted to the City for review with applications for issuance of construction permits.

4.2.6 Noise

Impact NOI-1: Noise. The project would result in 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 other applicable standards of other agencies.

Finding: Implementation of MM NOI-1a and MM NOI-1b, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce construction and operational impacts related to ambient noise levels to a less-than-significant level. The City finds implementation of noise reduction measures in accordance with a construction noise mitigation plan and stationary source operational noise reduction plan to be feasible. The City hereby determines that any construction and operational impacts related to ambient noise remaining after MM NOI-1a and MM NOI-1b would be less than significant.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(1) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding:

Short-term Construction Noise Impacts

Based on the City's significance criteria, construction noise would result in a significant impact if the project would be inconsistent with General Plan Policy NE 3.5: Construction Noise, and construction noise levels exceed the levels identified in the latest version of the Federal Transit Administration Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual. Both conditions would need to be met to identify a potentially significant impact under the City's thresholds.

The Project must comply with General Plan Policy NE 3.4 Construction Equipment, which requires all construction equipment to utilize noise reduction features (i.e., mufflers and engine shrouds) that are at least as effective as those originally installed by the equipment's manufacturer. Furthermore, the Project must comply with General Plan Policy NE 3.5, Construction Noise, which limits commercial construction activities within 200 feet of residential uses to weekdays, between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., and limits high noise-generating construction activities to between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. To ensure compliance with these requirements, MM NOI-1a requires the construction contractor to designate a "disturbance coordinator" who would be responsible for responding to any complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator would be responsible for responding to complaints and for identifying measures to correct any problem.

Development of the Project is expected to result in construction activities within the planned area. Noise impacts from construction activities associated with the 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.

For future development projects, two types of short-term noise impacts would occur during site preparation and project construction. The first type would result from the increase in traffic flow on local streets, associated with the transport of workers, equipment, and materials to and from the Project site. The transport of workers and construction equipment and materials to a development site would incrementally increase noise levels on access roads leading to the site. Typically, a doubling of the ADT hourly volumes on a roadway segment is required in order to result in an increase of 3 dBA in traffic noise levels, which, as discussed in the characteristics of nose discussion above, is the lowest change that can be perceptible to the human ear in outdoor environments. Individual development project's construction trips would not be expected to double the hourly or daily traffic volumes along roadway segments in the vicinity of a development site. For this reason, short-term intermittent noise from construction trips would not be expected to result in a perceptible increase in hourly or daily average traffic noise levels. Therefore, short-term construction-related noise impacts associated with the transportation of workers and equipment to a development site would be less than significant.

For future development projects, the second type of short-term noise impact is related to noise generated during site preparation, grading, and construction activities. Development projects that could occur with implementation of the of the Project would be expected to require the use of scrapers, bulldozers, water trucks, haul trucks, and pickup trucks. Assuming that each piece of construction equipment operates at some distance from the other equipment, a reasonable worst-case combined noise level during this phase of construction would be 90 dBA L_{max} at a distance of 50 feet from the acoustical center of a construction area. This would result in a reasonable worst-case hourly average of 86 dBA L_{eq}. The acoustical center reference is used because construction equipment must operate at some distance from one another on a Project site and the combined noise level as measured at a point equidistant from multiple sources operating simultaneously would represent the worst-case noise levels.

These reasonable worst-case construction noise levels would only occur during the site preparation phase of development. Such noise levels would attenuate at a rate of 6 dBA for every doubling of the distance from the operating equipment.

There are no site-specific development plans for the Project; however, project development within the Project site could result in a relatively high single-event noise exposure potential, causing a substantial temporary increase that could exceed the City's significance criteria.

Therefore, mitigation is required to reduce this potential impact. Implementation of mitigation limiting construction hours would ensure commercial construction activities would not occur outside the City's time periods for these activities. In addition, implementation of best management noise reduction measures and requiring implementation of temporary sound barriers with Sound Transmission Class (STC) of 35 or greater would ensure construction activities would also not exceed the FTA's threshold of 90 dBA L_{eq} as measured at residential receptors, or 100 dBA L_{eq} as measured at commercial or industrial land use receptors. Therefore, with implementation of MM NOI-1a, the potential short-term construction noise impacts to noise-sensitive receptors in the Project vicinity would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Traffic Operational Noise Impacts

Based on the City's significance criteria, project traffic noise would result in a significant impact if traffic generated by the Project would result in a noticeable increase in roadway noise in areas where exterior noise is already in excess of City standards. A noticeable increase in roadway noise would occur if traffic noise increased by 3 dBA or more.

The FHWA highway traffic noise prediction model (FHWA-RD-77-108) was used to evaluate existing and future project-related traffic noise conditions along modeled roadway segments in the vicinity of the Project site. The highest traffic noise level increase with implementation of the Project would occur along 20th Street, along the segment north of Sierra Avenue, under Existing Plus Specific Plan conditions. The modeling results show that the resulting traffic noise levels would range up to 66.0 dBA Ldn as measured at 50 feet from the centerline of the outermost travel lane along this roadway segment. At this distance and with minimal shielding assumed by the sound wall, these noise levels would attenuate to below 59 dBA Ldn. These noise levels are below the City's normally acceptable land use compatibility standard of 60 dB Ldn for residential land uses. Therefore, traffic noise levels would not exceed the City's standards as measured at adjacent land uses, and this impact would be less than significant.

The second highest traffic noise level increase with implementation of the Project would occur along 20th Street, along the segment from Rubidoux Boulevard to Caterpillar Court, under Existing Plus Specific Plan conditions. The modeling results show that the resulting traffic noise levels would range up to 68.4 dBA Ldn, as measured at 50 feet from the centerline of the outermost travel lane along this roadway segment, under Cumulative Plus Project conditions. Adjacent land uses along this roadway segment are industrial land uses. These noise levels are below the City's normally acceptable land use compatibility standard of 70 dB Ldn for industrial land uses. Therefore, traffic noise levels would not exceed the City's standards as measured at adjacent land uses, and this impact would be less than significant .

The third highest traffic noise level increase with implementation of the Project would occur along Sierra Avenue, along the segment from Armstrong Road to 20th Street, under Existing Plus Specific Plan conditions. The modeling results show that the resulting traffic noise levels would range up to 68.1 dBA Ldn as measured at 50 feet from the centerline of the outermost travel lane along this roadway segment. The nearest existing residences along this roadway segment are located approximately 60 feet from the roadway centerline, with

an existing 6-foot-high sound wall along the entire property line adjacent to the roadway. At this distance and with minimal shielding assumed by the sound wall, these noise levels would attenuate to below 60 dBA Ldn, as measured at the residential receptors along this roadway segment These noise levels are within the City's normally acceptable land use compatibility standard of 60 dB Ldn for residential land uses. Therefore, traffic noise levels would not exceed the City's standards as measured at adjacent land uses, and this impact would be less than significant.

All other modeled roadway segments would experience less than a 3 dBA increase in traffic noise levels compared to traffic noise levels existing without the Project. Therefore, Project-related traffic would not result in a substantial permanent increase in noise levels along any of these modeled roadway segments.

Since no modeled roadway segment would result in an increase of 3 dBA or greater where traffic noise levels already exceed the City's standards, then Project traffic noise impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be needed.

With respect to Operational Noise (Transportation), the Project may have a significant impact if traffic generated by the project would result in a noticeable increase in roadway noise in areas where exterior noise is already in excess of City standards.

Stationary Source Operational Noise Impacts

Based on the City's significance criteria, project operational noise would result in a significant impact if the project would be inconsistent with General Plan Policy NE 1.3 New or Modified Stationary Noise Sources. Noise created by new stationary noise sources, or by existing stationary noise sources that undergo modifications that may increase noise levels, shall be mitigated so as to not exceed the noise level standards of General Plan Figure 7-3 (Table 3.13-5 above). If the existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity (as described in a noise study approved by the City), exceed the noise levels in General Plan Figure 7-3, then any project-related increase would be significant and require mitigation.

Development projects that could occur with implementation of the Project would include new stationary noise sources, such as parking lot activities and mechanical ventilation system equipment. These would be potential point sources of noise that could affect noise-sensitive receptors in the project vicinity.

Parking Lot Activity Noise Impacts

Stationary source operational noise levels at the Project site could exceed the City's thresholds if they were to occur in areas adjacent to sensitive receptor land uses. Therefore, mitigation would be required to reduce this potential impact. Parking activity noise can be mitigated either at the source or at the receiving land use using setbacks, block walls, acoustic-rated windows, or by siting parking areas on sides of buildings opposite sensitive receptors (using buildings as shielding).

With implementation of MM NOI-1b, which requires preparation of a noise study that identifies the Project's design measures which would ensure that these potential parking lot noise level impacts generated by future development projects would be reduced to a less than significant impact.

Truck Loading Activity Noise Impacts

Noise would be also generated by truck loading and unloading activities at the loading docks along future planned commercial land uses. These stationary source operational noise levels could exceed the City's thresholds if they were to occur in areas adjacent to sensitive receptor land uses. Therefore, mitigation would be required to reduce this potential impact. Truck loading activity noises can be mitigated either at the

source or at the receiving land use using setbacks, block walls, or by siting truck loading areas on sides of buildings opposite sensitive receptors (using buildings as shielding).

With implementation of MM NOI-1b, which requires preparation of a noise reduction plan that identifies the Project's design measures, noise levels from truck loading and unloading activities generated by future development projects would be reduced to less than significant.

With implementation of MM NOI-1a and MM NOI-1b, this impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure NOI-1a: Construction Noise Mitigation Plan

Prior to issuance of grading and/or building permits, a note shall be provided on grading and building plans indicating that, during grading and construction, the property owner/developer shall be responsible for requiring contractors to implement the following measures to limit construction-related noise:

- The construction contractor shall limit commercial construction activities adjacent to or within 200 feet of residential uses to weekdays, between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., and limit high-noise-generating construction activities (e.g., grading, demolition, pile driving) near sensitive receptors to weekdays between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.
- The construction contractor shall ensure that all internal combustion engine-driven equipment is equipped with mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- The construction contractor shall locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction project area. In addition, the project contractor shall place such stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the Project site.
- The construction contractor shall prohibit unnecessary idling (no more than 5 minutes) of internal combustion engines.
- The construction contractor shall, to the maximum extent practical, locate on-site equipment staging areas to maximize the distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the Project site during all project construction.
- For construction activity within 50 feet of any noise-sensitive receptors, a temporary noise barrier shall be installed by the applicant/developer. This temporary noise barrier shall be installed prior to the onset of construction activities that would require the use of heavy construction equipment. The barrier shall be located between the construction zone and all adjacent sensitive receptor land uses. The temporary sound barrier shall provide a reduction in noise that shall meet the City's construction noise threshold of 55 dBA L_{max} as measured at the façade of the sensitive receptor land uses. The noise barrier shall be a minimum height of 8 feet and be free of gaps and holes and must achieve a Sound Transmission Class (STC) of 35 or greater. The barrier can be either (a) a 0.75-inch-thick plywood wall or (b) a hanging blanket/curtain with a surface density or at least 2 pounds per square foot. For either configuration, the construction side of the barrier shall have an exterior lining of sound absorption material with a Noise Reduction Coefficient (NRC) rating of 0.7 or higher.
- The construction contractor shall designate a "disturbance coordinator" who would be responsible for responding to any complaints about construction noise. The disturbance

coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., a bad muffler) and shall require that measures be implemented to correct the problem.

- These measures may only be granted an exception if an application for construction-related exception is made to and considered by the Building Official of the City in accordance with Section 11.05.070 of the Municipal Code.

Mitigation Measure NOI-1b: Stationary Source Operational Noise Reduction Plan

Prior to issuance of building permits, the property owner/developer shall be responsible to implement the following measures to limit on-site operational stationary noise source impacts:

- Any proposed large scale, mixed-use, or master-planned developments shall demonstrate compliance with Noise Policy NE 1.9 and NE 1.10 of the City's Noise Element by incorporating acoustic site planning to the satisfaction of the Planning Director that minimizes potential noise impacts to adjacent land uses to meet the City's standards shown in General Plan Figure 7-3. In addition, in compliance with Noise Policy NE 3.1 of the City's Noise Element, such projects shall submit an Operational Noise Reduction Plan to the Planning Director for review and approval. The plan shall identify specific techniques and measures to reduce on-site stationary operational noise to ensure compliance with the noise performance standards of Section 11.05.040 of the Municipal Code. Noise reduction design features may include, but are not limited to, locating stationary noise sources on the site to be shielded by structures (buildings, enclosures, or sound walls) or by using equipment that has a quieter noise rating.

- Any future commercial or industrial development projects that would include stationary noise sources, such as loading, shipping, or parking facilities within 200 feet of a residential parcel, shall demonstrate compliance with Noise Policy NE 3.3 of the City's Noise Element and shall submit an Operational Noise Reduction Plan to the Planning Director for review and approval. The plan shall identify specific techniques and measures to reduce on-site stationary operational noise to ensure compliance with the noise performance standards of Section 11.05.040 of the Municipal Code. Noise reduction design features may include, but are not limited to, locating stationary noise sources on the site to be shielded by structures (buildings, enclosures, or sound walls).

Impact NOI-2: Noise. The project would result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Finding: Implementation of MM NOI-2, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce construction impacts related to exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels to a less-than-significant level. The City finds implementation of groundborne vibration and noise reduction measures in accordance with a construction vibration reduction plan to be feasible. The City hereby determines that any construction and operational impacts related to ambient noise remaining after MM NOI-2 would be less than significant.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(1) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it creates construction or operational vibration in excess of 0.20 PPV inch/second adjacent to or within one-quarter mile of sensitive receptors.

This section analyzes both construction and operational groundborne vibration impacts.

Short-term Construction Vibration Impacts to Off-site Receptors

Construction vibration levels from future development projects could exceed the City's threshold criteria of 0.20 in/sec PPV. Therefore, mitigation would be required to reduce this potential impact. Construction vibration sources can be mitigated to acceptable levels either at the source or on the adjacent property using alternate equipment, adequate setbacks, or by digging temporary trenches between the source and the receptor. For example, at a distance of 100 feet, vibration levels from an impact pile driver would attenuate to 0.19 in/sec PPV, which would be below the City's threshold.

Therefore, implementation of MM NOI-2, which requires preparation of a Construction Vibration Monitoring Plan would ensure that these vibration level impacts generated by future development projects would be reduced to a less than significant impact.

Operational Vibration Impacts

Based on the proposed types of land uses within the Project, future related development projects are not anticipated to include any permanent sources of vibration that would expose persons in the project vicinity to excessive groundborne vibration levels. In addition, there are no existing significant permanent sources of groundborne vibration located within the Project development area to which future development projects would be exposed. Therefore, Project operational groundborne vibration level impacts would be considered less than significant.

With implementation of MM NOI-2, this impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Construction Vibration Reduction Plan

Prior to issuance of grading and/or building permits, a note shall be provided on grading and building plans indicating that, during grading and construction, the property owner/developer shall be responsible for requiring contractors to implement the following measures to limit construction-related vibration impacts:

- For any future development projects that would necessitate the use of pile driving within 100 feet of an off-site structure, shall submit a Construction Vibration Reduction Plan that identifies specific techniques, such as the depth and location of temporary trenching, that would reduce potential vibration impacts to less than significant for the impacted structure.
- For any future development projects that would necessitate the use of large vibratory rollers within 30 feet of an off-site structure, or the use of other heavy construction equipment within 15 feet of an off-site structure, shall submit a Construction Vibration Reduction Plan that identifies specific techniques, such as the depth and location of temporary trenching, that would reduce potential vibration impacts to less than significant for the impacted structure.
- The individual project owner/developer shall submit the Construction Vibration Reduction Plan to the Planning Director for review and approval. Upon approval by the City, the construction vibration reduction measures shall be incorporated into the construction documents.

4.2.7 Utilities

Impact UTIL-1: Utilities and Service Systems. The project would require or result in relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, with the potential to cause significant environmental effects.

Finding: Implementation of MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-1c, MM BIO-1d, MM BIO-1e, MM BIO-1f, MM BIO-1g, MM BIO-1h, MM BIO-1i, MM BIO-1j, MM BIO-1k, MM BIO-2a, MM BIO-2b, MM BIO-3a, MM BIO-3b, MM BIO-5, MM CUL-1a, MM CUL-1b, MM CUL-1c, MM CUL-2a, MM CUL-2b, MM CUL-2d, MM CUL-3, MM GEO-6a, and MM GEO-6b, which are adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce impacts related to utilities facilities to a less-than-significant level. The City finds mitigation of impacts related to utilities facilities to be feasible. The City hereby determines that any impacts related to utilties facilities remaining after implementation of MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-1c, MM BIO-1d, MM BIO-1e, MM BIO-1f, MM BIO-1g, MM BIO-1h, MM BIO-1i, MM BIO-1j, MM BIO-1k, MM BIO-2a, MM BIO-2b, MM BIO-3a, MM BIO-3b, MM BIO-5, MM CUL-1a, MM CUL-1b, MM CUL-1c, MM CUL-2a, MM CUL-2b, MM CUL-2d, MM CUL-3, MM GEO-6a, and MM GEO-6b would be less than significant.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(1) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, a significant impact may occur if the if the installation of water and sewer lines impacts land (either disturbed or undisturbed) to a degree that impacts cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels.

Water Facilities

According to the WSA, the water demand for the Project is estimated to be approximately 963.86 AFY. The area designated for the Project was identified in RCSD's 2020 UWMP with an annual water demand of approximately 2,000 AFY, which exceeds the currently estimated demand of the Project, which is less than 1,000 AFY (as calculated in the WSA). JCSD, which would serve PA 7, indicates in its 2020 UWMP that 100 percent of average water supplies would be available even in the case of multiple dry years. Water demand of the 45 dwelling units in PA 7 would be a maximum of 126.72 AFY, which is only 0.4 percent of JCSD's current water use. Therefore, because there are sufficient water supplies available from both RCSD and JCSD, and because the Project would connect to existing facilities directly adjacent to the Project site, only the construction of on-site water facilities would be required and no new or expanded off-site facilities would be required.

Wastewater Treatment Facilities

The RWQCP currently has capacity for up to 46 mgd. The RWQCP Integrated Master Plan assumed a project-area wastewater production rate of 511,650 gallons per day (gpd). The Project's estimated average of 453,320 gpd of wastewater (per the RCSD Wastewater Master Plan) is within the RWQCP Integrated Master Plan assumptions for the Project site used for wastewater treatment planning. Therefore, the RWQCP has planned for the Project and would have adequate capacity to serve the Project. No additional off-site facilities would need to be constructed.

Stormwater Drainage

Off-site expansion of stormwater facilities would be required but would be limited to the 20th Street right-of-way. Impacts would be less than significant.

Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications.

The Project would not require new off-site power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities because it is located in an urban area that already contains sufficient and adjacent utility infrastructure. Installation of dry utilities on the Project site is considered an inherent component of the construction process, and no significant impacts have been identified throughout this EIR specifically related to their installation.

Summary

The installation of the utility and service system infrastructure improvements described above would result in physical environmental impacts inherent in the Project's construction process; however, these impacts have already been included in the analyses of construction-related effects presented throughout this EIR. In instances where the Project's construction phase would result in specific, significant impacts, feasible mitigation measures are provided. The construction of infrastructure necessary to serve the Project would not result in any significant physical effects on the environment that are not already identified and disclosed elsewhere in this this EIR. Specifically, these include the following mitigation measures that are intended to mitigate impacts related to ground disturbance: MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-1c, MM BIO-1d, MM BIO-1e, MM BIO-1f, MM BIO-1g, MM BIO-1h, MM BIO-1i, MM BIO-1j, MM BIO-1k, MM BIO-2a, MM BIO-2b, MM BIO-3a, MM BIO-3b, MM BIO-5, MM CUL-1a, MM CUL-1b, MM CUL-1c, MM CUL-2a, MM CUL-2b, MM CUL-2d, MM CUL-3, MM GEO-6a, and MM GEO-6b. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant and additional mitigation measures beyond those identified throughout other subsections of this EIR (as listed above) would not be required.

MM BIO-1a: Flag or Fence Impact Areas.

Implement MM BIO-1a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1b: Conserve Open Space.

Implement MM BIO-1b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1c: Special-Status Plants.

Implement MM BIO-1c, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1d: Wildlife Hazards.

Implement MM BIO-1d, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1e: Invasive Plants.

Implement MM BIO-1e, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1f: Urban/Wildlands Interface.

Implement MM BIO-1f, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1g: Nesting Birds.

Implement MM BIO-1g, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1h: Biological Monitoring and Clearance Surveys.

Implement MM BIO-1h, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1i: Burrowing Owl.

Implement MM BIO-1i, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-1k: Crotch's Bumblebee.

Implement MM BIO-1k, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-1.

MM BIO-2a: MSHCP Riparian/Riverine Habitat.

Implement MM BIO-2a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-2.

MM BIO-2b: Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.

Implement MM BIO-2b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-2.

MM BIO-2d: Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan.

Implement MM BIO-2b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-2.

MM BIO-2e: Archaeological Monitoring During Ground Disturbance Plan.

Implement MM BIO-2b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-2.

MM BIO-3a: RWQCB Jurisdictional Areas.

Implement MM BIO-3a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-3.

MM BIO-3b: CDFW Jurisdictional Areas.

Implement MM BIO-3b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact BIO-3.

MM GEO-6a: Implement Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Plan.

Implement MM GEO-6a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact GEO-6.

MM GEO-6b: Archaeological Monitoring During Ground Disturbance Plan.

Implement MM GEO-6b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact GEO-6.

4.3 Findings Regarding Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

The City, based on the Final EIR, determines that the following significant effects cannot be avoided. Feasible mitigation measures included in the Final EIR will lessen these effects but will not result in mitigation of the effects to a less-than-significant level. For these impacts, there are no feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives that would meet the basic project objectives and reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level and the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. The titles/numbers of the effects are the same as those in the Final EIR. The following identifies the pertinent mitigation measures by number and summary title.

4.3.1 Air Quality

Impact AIR-1: Air Quality. The project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Finding: Implementation of MM AIR-1a, MM AIR-1b, MM AIR-1c, MM AIR-1d, MM AIR-1e, MM AIR-1f, MM AIR-1g, MM AIR-1h, and MM AIR-1i, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce the impacts related to conflicts with or obstruction of the applicable air quality plan but not to a less-than-significant level. Although the City finds MM AIR-1a, MM AIR-1b, MM AIR-1c, MM AIR-1d, MM AIR-1e, MM AIR-1f, MM AIR-1g, MM AIR-1h, and MM AIR-1i feasible, special considerations, as set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), make further mitigation measures or alternatives to address conflicts with or obstruction of the applicable air quality plan infeasible. No other feasible, enforceable mitigation is available to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the City hereby determines that any impacts related to conflicts with or obstruction of the applicable air quality plan would be significant and unavoidable.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(3) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it would 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 current SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan and the Project would significantly exceed the growth assumptions used to prepare the current SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan.

To evaluate whether or not a project conflicts with or obstructs the implementation of the applicable air quality plan (2016 AQMP for the SoCAB), the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook states that there are two key indicators:

1. Whether the 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 timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the AQMP.
2. According to Chapter 12 of the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the purpose of the General Plan consistency findings is to determine whether a project is inconsistent with the growth assumptions incorporated into the air quality plan, and thus, whether it would interfere with the region's ability to comply with the NAAQS and CAAQS.

Considering the recommended criteria in the SCAQMD's 1993 Handbook, this analysis uses the following criteria to address this potential impact:

- Step 1: Project's contribution to air quality violations (SCAQMD's first indictor)
- Step 2: Assumptions in the AQMP (SCAQMD's second indictor)
- Step 3: Compliance with applicable emission control measures in the AQMPs

Step 1: Project's Contribution to Air Quality Violations

Step 1 represents an assessment of the overall impacts associated with the Project. The Project would generate regional or localized construction or operational emissions that would exceed SCAQMD's thresholds of significance. The Project would be potentially significant under Criteria 1.

Step 2: Assumptions in AQMP

Step 2 examines the Project's consistency with assumptions made in the AQMP. The AQMP is based on land use patterns and forecasts contained in local general plans and other land use planning documents.

Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that if a project is consistent with the applicable general plan land use designation, and if the general plan was adopted prior to the applicable AQMP, then the growth of VMT and/or population generated by Project would be consistent with the growth in VMT and population assumed within the AQMP.

SCAG is SCAQMD's partner in the preparation of the AQMP, providing the latest economic and demographic forecasts and developing transportation measures. Regional population, housing, and employment projects developed by SCAG are based, in part, on a city's general plan land use designations. These projections form the foundation for the emissions inventory of the AQMP and are incorporated into the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) prepared by SCAG to determine priority transportation projects and VMT in the SCAG region. Because the AQMP strategy is based on projections from local general plans, projects that are consistent with the local general plan are considered consistent with the air quality-related regional plan. Additionally, only large projects have the potential to substantially affect the demographic forecasts in the AQMP.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15206(b) states that a Project is of Statewide, regional, or area-wide significance if the project is a residential development of more than 500 dwelling units or a commercial office building of 250,000 square feet or more or that employs 1,000 or more employees. The Project would introduce a net increase of approximately 2,698,542 square feet of nonresidential building space, 1,697 new dwelling units, a new public elementary school, and 3,786 new employees. It should be noted that Riverside County adopted the existing Rio Vista Specific Plan in 1992, which was incorporated into the 2017 City of Jurupa Valley General Plan after incorporation of the planning area into the City boundaries. The land use assumptions and associated population and employment forecasts that were included in the 1992 Rio Vista Specific Plan were included in the General Plan, as well as in the 2016 AQMP. However, compared to the 1992 Rio Vista Specific Plan, the Project would replace the 1992 Plan and would increase the area of proposed Light Industrial and Business Park uses by approximately 135.3 acres, exceeding the CEQA Guidelines Section 15206(b) threshold of commercial office building space of 250,000 square feet or more. Therefore, the Project is a project of Statewide, regional, or area-wide significance.

Furthermore, analyses in the response to Impact AIR-2 demonstrate that the Project would generate long-term emissions of criteria air pollutants that would exceed SCAQMD's regional operation-phase significance thresholds, which were established to determine whether a project has the potential to cumulatively contribute to the SoCAB's nonattainment designations. Thus, implementation of the Project would result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations; cause or contribute to new violations; or delay timely attainment of the Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS). Therefore, overall, the Project would be considered inconsistent with the AQMP under the second criterion. Additionally, the Project has the potential to significantly alter the demographic and employment projections beyond what is accounted for in the current AQMP. Since the Project would include a General Plan Amendment, the Project would not be consistent with the growth assumptions within the current AQMP. The Project would be potentially significant under Criteria 2.

Step 3: Control Measures

Step 3 is an analysis of the Project's compliance with applicable emission control measures included in the AQMP, which includes SCAQMD rules and regulations that apply to this Project. The City's General Plan also requires compliance with applicable air district rules and control measures. As discussed in the Regulatory Framework section of this document, additional policies included as part of the General Plan, and proposed to be included as a part of the Specific Plan PPPs, would also reduce the impacts of both construction and operational emissions from the Project. The Project would comply with all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations. Therefore, the Project complies with this criterion.

Summary

The Project includes objectives that emphasizes development of mixed-use areas and increased development intensity. These planning areas would allow residences and open spaces, in addition to job opportunities, to be in proximity of each other. In addition to creating and emphasizing mixed-use areas, the Project also outlines improvements to active transportation, such as including bike lanes, soft-surface trails, and a connected pedestrian network in the project area. Development of mixed-use areas and improvement of active travel infrastructure would contribute to reducing vehicle trips and VMT. However, the project would represent a substantial increase in emissions compared to existing conditions. The implementation of the City's General Plan goals and policies, and MM AIR-1a through MM AIR-1i would be required to reduce regional and localized emissions to the extent feasible. However, the estimated construction emissions and long-term emissions generated under full buildout of the Project would exceed the SCAQMD's regional operational significance thresholds (see Table 3.3 11) and would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations in the SoCAB. In addition, implementation of the Project would contribute to exceedances of the current population and employment estimates for the project area. Therefore, the Project would be considered inconsistent with the AQMP, resulting in a significant impact in this regard.

With implementation of, and compliance with, regulatory programs, ordinances, PPPs, and General Plan policies, as well as new MM AIR-1a through MM AIR-1i, air pollution emissions from future developments envisioned under the Project would be reduced, but still would potentially exceed regulatory thresholds for the SoCAB. Given the potential increase in growth and associated increase in criteria air pollutant emissions in the region, the project would continue to be potentially inconsistent with the assumptions in the AQMP, even after the implementation of mitigation. Therefore, Impact AIR-1 would remain significant and unavoidable.

MM AIR-1a

To identify potential implementing development project-specific impacts resulting from construction activities, proposed development projects requiring discretionary approvals or are otherwise subject to CEQA shall have construction-related air quality impacts analyzed using the latest available California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod)—or other analytical method determined in conjunction with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)—and shall be compared with the applicable thresholds of significance in effect as recommended by the SCAQMD or as established by the City of Jurupa Valley as the lead agency. The results of the construction-related air quality impacts analysis shall be included in the development project's CEQA documentation. To address potential localized impacts, the air quality analysis shall incorporate the SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold (LST) analysis or other appropriate analyses as determined in conjunction with SCAQMD. If such analyses identify potentially significant regional or local air quality impacts, the City of Jurupa Valley shall require the incorporation of appropriate mitigation to reduce emissions to the extent feasible, in accordance with mitigation measures recommended by the SCAQMD and the California Air Resources Board (ARB). Proposed mitigation measures to reduce construction-related criteria pollutant emissions may include:

- Extending the construction period as feasible in order to ensure air quality daily thresholds are not exceeded.
- The use of zero-emission or electric construction fleets to reduce emissions from NO_X, $PM_{2.5}$ exhaust, and PM_{10} exhaust.
- Grading activity limitations to reduce fugitive dust or use of construction equipment.
- Construction traffic control plans to reduce sensitive receptor exposure to emissions from NO_X, $PM_{2.5}$ exhaust, and PM_{10} exhaust.

- The analysis shall address pollution levels near sensitive receptors and require mitigation to reduce emissions.

MM AIR-1b

As part of a standard building permit submittal, prior to the issuance of building or grading permits, the project applicant shall provide the City of Jurupa Valley with documentation demonstrating that project construction will use "super-compliant" low-volatile organic compound (VOC) Architectural Coatings, as defined by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), with VOC content of 10 grams per liter (g/L) or less.

MM AIR-1c

Each individual implementing development project shall apply paints using either high volume low pressure (HVLP) spray equipment or other application techniques with a minimum transfer efficiency of at least 65 percent or other application techniques with equivalent or higher transfer efficiency.

MM AIR-1d

As part of a standard grading permit submittal, the project applicant shall submit documentation to the City of Jurupa Valley that demonstrates that all off-road construction equipment in excess of 50 horsepower is equipped with engines meeting the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Tier IV Final off-road engine emission standards or cleaner. The construction contractor shall maintain records concerning its efforts to comply with this requirement during construction, including equipment lists. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include but are not limited to equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, and engine serial number. The project applicant and/or construction contractor shall submit the construction operations plan and records of compliance to the City of Jurupa Valley.

If engines that comply with Tier IV Final off-road emission standards are not commercially available, then the construction contractor shall use the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment (e.g., Tier IV Interim) available. For purposes of this mitigation measure, "commercially available" shall mean the availability of Tier IV Final engines taking into consideration factors such as (i) critical-path timing of construction; and (ii) geographic proximity to the Project site of equipment. The contractor can maintain records for equipment that is not commercially available by providing letters from at least two rental companies for each piece of off-road equipment where the Tier IV Final engine is not available.

MM AIR-1e

To identify potential implementing development project-specific impacts resulting from operational activities, proposed development projects that are subject to CEQA shall have long-term operational-related air quality impacts analyzed using the latest available California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), or other analytical method determined by the City of Jurupa Valley as lead agency in conjunction with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The results of the operational-related air quality impacts analysis shall be included in the development project's CEQA documentation and shall be compared against thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD or the City of Jurupa Valley as the lead agency. To address potential localized impacts, the air quality analysis shall incorporate SCAQMD's Localized Significance Threshold (LST) analysis, carbon monoxide (CO) Hot Spot analysis, or other appropriate analyses as determined by the City of

Jurupa Valley in conjunction with SCAQMD. For industrial uses, such as warehouses and distribution centers, the analysis shall consider mitigation measures included in the 2021 California Department of Justice guidance, "Warehouse Projects: Best Practices and Mitigation Measures to Comply with the California Environmental Quality Act," or the latest appropriate guidance available at the time, as determined by the City in conjunction with SCAQMD. For warehouse or distribution center projects, the CEQA analysis shall specify the amount of cold storage space proposed as part of the project and quantify the air pollutant (including toxic air contaminants [TACs]) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with refrigerant use. If such analyses identify potentially significant regional or local air quality impacts, the City shall require the incorporation of appropriate mitigation documented on applicable site plans or operational plans prior to issuance of grading permits or as part of Conditions of Approval. Mitigation should reduce identified impacts to the maximum extent feasible using, among others, measures identified in the Air Quality Element Policies of the General Plan and the most recent Air Quality Management Plan, as well as mitigation from the most recent CEQA Air Quality Handbook available at the SCAQMD. Example topics include, but are not limited to, energy conservation, reduction of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), overall trip reduction, and reduction of particulate matter emissions. The identified measures shall be included as part of the Project Conditions of Approval and approved by the City of Jurupa Valley Community Development Department.

MM AIR-1f

Industrial projects in the planning area shall place signs that identify the California Air Resources Board (ARB) anti-idling regulations prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for each industrial building. At a minimum, each sign shall include: (1) instructions for truck drivers to shut off engines when not in use; (2) instructions for trucks drivers to restrict idling to no more than 5 minutes once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park," and the parking brake is engaged; and (3) telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and ARB to report violations. Project applicants shall submit plans (1) identifying the location of the signs, (2) required details of the signs that meets this mitigation measure, and (3) dimensions of the sign prior to the issuance of any building permit for each industrial building.

MM AIR-1g

All nonresidential buildings shall be designed to provide infrastructure to support use of electric-powered forklifts and/or other on-site equipment with a charging stations on the interior and a charging station in the yard for outdoor equipment. Additionally, the City of Jurupa Valley shall require use of off-road equipment be zero-emissions, such as forklifts and yard trucks for indoor areas. Outdoor cargo handling equipment (including yard trucks, hostlers, yard goats, pallet jacks, forklifts, and other outdoor on-site equipment) will be powered by compressed natural gas, propane, or electric engines. These requirements shall be noted on all site plans submitted to the City. Installation of the infrastructure to support electric equipment shall be verified by the City of Jurupa Valley prior to issuance of occupancy permits. During operation, the building tenant and/or building owner shall maintain a list of all off-road equipment used on-site. The equipment list shall state the makes, models, and numbers. These records shall be made available to the City of Jurupa Valley upon request.

MM AIR-1h

Prior to issuance of building permits for non-single-family residential and mixed-use residential development projects in the planning area, the project applicant shall indicate on the building plans

that the following features have been incorporated into the design of the building(s). Proper installation of these features shall be verified by the City of Jurupa Valley prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

- Electric vehicle charging shall be provided as specified in Section A4.106.8.2 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) Code.
- Bicycle parking shall be provided as specified in Section A4.106.9 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code.

MM AIR-1i

Prior to the issuance of building permits for nonresidential development projects in the planning area, project applicants shall indicate on the building plans that the following features have been incorporated into the design of the building(s). Proper installation of these features shall be verified by the City of Jurupa Valley prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

- For buildings with more than 10 tenant-occupants, changing/shower facilities shall be provided as specified in Section A5.106.4.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) Code.
- Preferential parking for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles shall be provided as specified in Section A5.106.5.1 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code.
- Facilities shall be installed to support future electric vehicle charging at each nonresidential building with 30 or more parking spaces. Installation shall be consistent with Section A5.106.5.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code.

Impact AIR-2: Air Quality. The project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard.

Finding: Implementation of MM AIR-1a, MM AIR-1b, MM AIR-1c, MM AIR-1d, MM AIR-1e, MM AIR-1f, MM AIR-1g, MM AIR-1h, and MM AIR-1i, which are adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce the impacts related to air quality but not to a less-than-significant level. Although the City finds MM AIR-1a, MM AIR-1b, MM AIR-1c, MM AIR-1d, MM AIR-1e, MM AIR-1f, MM AIR-1g, MM AIR-1h, and MM AIR-1i feasible, special considerations, as set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), make further mitigation measures or alternatives to address air quality infeasible. No other feasible, enforceable mitigation is available to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the City hereby determines that any impacts related to a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant would be significant and unavoidable.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(3) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if its air emissions exceed the applicable regional significance thresholds established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

The nonattainment regional pollutants of concern are ozone, PM10 and PM2.5. The SCAQMD ozone threshold is based on the emissions of the ozone precursors VOC and NOX. This impact section includes analysis of, and significance determinations for, those pollutants. The Project's regional construction and operational emissions, which include both on- and off-site emissions, are evaluated separately below.

Construction Emissions

Construction activities would temporarily increase PM10, PM2.5, VOC, NOX, SOX, and CO regional emissions in the SoCAB. The primary source of NOX, CO, and SOX emissions is the operation of construction equipment. The primary sources of particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) emissions are activities that disturb the soil, such as grading and excavation, road construction, and building demolition and construction. The primary source of VOC emissions is the application of architectural coating and off-gas emissions associated with asphalt paving. A discussion of health impacts associated with air pollutant emissions generated by construction activities is included in Section 3.3.2, Environmental Setting, Air Pollutant Description and Health Effects.

Construction activities associated with buildout of the Project are anticipated to occur sporadically over approximately 10 years or longer. Buildout would consist of multiple smaller projects, each having its own construction timeline and activities. Development of multiple properties could occur at the same time. However, there is no defined development schedule for these future projects at this time. For this analysis, the estimate of maximum daily emissions is based on a very conservative scenario, where multiple construction projects occur at one time, and all construction phases overlap. The amount of construction assumed is consistent with the anticipated 10-year buildout of the Proposed project.

Construction activities associated with development of the project could potentially exceed the SCAQMD regional threshold for VOC, NOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5. As previously discussed, existing General Plan policies, including AQ 3.5 and 3.6, would help minimize construction emissions from projects in the planning area. To further reduce the impacts of future development projects envisioned under the Project, MM AIR-1a through MM AIR-1d are required. Specifically, MM AIR-1a would reduce all air pollutant emissions by requiring future development to include more stringent construction measures, MM AIR-1b and -1c would reduce VOC emissions by requiring “super-compliant” low-volatile organic compound VOC Architectural Coatings and high volume low pressure (HVLP) spray equipment or other application techniques with a minimum transfer efficiency of at least 65 percent, and MM AIR-1d would reduce NOX, PM10, and PM2.5 by requiring all construction equipment with engines greater than 50 HP to use equipment meeting Tier IV Final off-road engine emission standards or cleaner.

MM AIR-1a through MM AIR-1d will reduce emissions of VOCs, NOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5 to the extent feasible; however, due to the size of the Project and the potential for overlapping construction activities, future development could still potentially exceed the SCAQMD regional thresholds, even with the implementation of mitigation. Therefore, project-related construction activities would result in significant regional air quality impacts.

Operation

Buildout of the Project would result in direct and indirect criteria air pollutant emissions from transportation, energy (e.g., natural gas use), and area sources (e.g., aerosols and landscaping equipment). General Plan policies that would help to reduce air quality impacts include Policies AQ 1.1, 1.2, and Program 1.1.1, which promote the City’s participation with agencies to protect air quality, including participating on regional committees and enforcing all regulations. Policies AQ 3.1 through 3.4 include emission reduction measures that promote the use of efficient building materials, prevention of pollution from stationary sources, and requires projects to mitigate emissions that exceed allowable levels to the greatest extent possible. General Plan Policy AQ 4.3 requires “the installation and use of electric service units at truck stops and distribution centers for heating and cooling truck cabs, and particularly for powering refrigeration trucks, in lieu of idling of engines for power,” which would help to reduce operational emissions associated with TRUs at potential future cold storage distribution operations.

The Specific Plan objectives emphasize development of mixed-use areas and improvements to active and public transit facilities that would contribute to reducing vehicle trips and VMT. The City's General Plan also includes Program AQ-4.1.4 that establish incentives for developers to plan for and install electric vehicle charging stations in new development, and research funding sources for installing electric vehicle charging stations in other strategic locations. To further reduce the operational impacts of future development projects envisioned under the Project, MM AIR-1e through MM AIR-1i are recommended, which would allow for project-specific analysis of potential further operational emissions mitigation measures, as well as reducing emissions from future buildings and mobile sources.

Overall, the proposed guiding principles and objectives for land use planning and the proposed land use changes and transportation improvements would contribute to efficient vehicle trips and VMT per service population to the extent feasible. Furthermore, existing General Plan policies and required mitigation measures would further reduce emissions from the operation of future projects in the planning area. However, when compared to the existing vacant land use, implementation of the Project would generate a net increase of approximately 39,775 Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) daily trips.

As shown in this table, due to the magnitude of the proposed growth, operation of the land uses accommodated under the Project at buildout would generate air pollutant emissions that exceed SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds for VOC, NOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5 at full buildout. Emissions of VOC and NOX that exceed the SCAQMD regional threshold would cumulatively contribute to the O3 nonattainment designation of the SoCAB. Emissions of NOX that exceed SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds would cumulatively contribute to the O3 and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. Emissions of CO, PM10, and PM2.5 would contribute to the respective nonattainment designations. Therefore, the Project would result in a potentially significant impact because it would significantly contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB.

Buildout of the Project would occur over approximately 10 years. Construction activities associated with buildout of the Project could generate short-term emissions that exceed the SCAQMD'S significance thresholds during this time and cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. Combined with the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan policies, the implementation of MM AIR-**1a** through MM AIR-**1d** would reduce criteria air pollutant emissions from construction-related activities to the extent feasible. However, specific construction time frames and equipment for individual site-specific projects are not available and there is a potential for multiple developments to be constructed at any one time, resulting in potentially significant cumulative construction-related emissions.

Buildout in accordance with the Project would generate long-term emissions that would exceed SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds and cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. To reduce emissions from the operation of future projects envisioned in the Project, MM AIR-1e through MM AIR-1i are required to reduce emissions to the extent feasible, in combination with the existing General Plan policies and programs that also apply to the Project. However, due to the magnitude of emissions generated by residential, office, institutional, commercial, and industrial land uses proposed as part of the Project, no mitigation measures are available that would reduce cumulative impacts below SCAQMD's thresholds. Therefore, despite adherence to the applicable mitigation measures, Impact AIR-2 would remain significant and unavoidable.

MM AIR-1a

Implement MM AIR-1a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1b

Implement MM AIR-1b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1c

Implement MM AIR-1c, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1d

Implement MM AIR-1d, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1e

Implement MM AIR-1e, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1f

Implement MM AIR-1f, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1g

Implement MM AIR-1g, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1h

Implement MM AIR-1h, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1i

Implement MM AIR-1i, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

Impact AIR-3: Air Quality. The project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard.

Finding: Implementation of MM AIR-1a, MM AIR-1b, MM AIR-1c, MM AIR-1d, MM AIR-1e, MM AIR-1f, MM AIR-1g, MM AIR-1h, MM AIR-1i, MM AIR-3a, MM AIR-3b, and MM AIR-3c, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, would reduce the impacts related to the cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant but not to a less-than-significant level. Although the City finds MM AIR-1a, MM AIR-1b, MM AIR-1c, MM AIR-1d, MM AIR-1e, MM AIR-1f, MM AIR-1g, MM AIR-1h, MM AIR-1i, MM AIR-3a, MM AIR-3b, and MM AIR-3c feasible, special considerations, as set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), make further mitigation measures or alternatives to address cumulatively considerable net increases in criteria pollutants infeasible. No other feasible, enforceable mitigation is available to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the City hereby determines that any impacts related to criteria pollutants would be significant and unavoidable.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(3) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding:

To result in a less than significant impact, the following criteria must be true:

- Criterion 1: Localized Significance Threshold assessment: emissions and air quality impacts during project construction must be below the local significance thresholds.
- Criterion 2: CO hot spot assessment must demonstrate that the project would not result in the development of a CO hot spot that would result in an exceedance of the CO Ambient Air Quality Standards.
- Criterion 3: TAC analysis must demonstrate that the project would not result in significant health risk impacts to sensitive receptors during construction.
- Criterion 4: TAC analysis must demonstrate that TAC emissions from sources external to the project would not result in significant health risk impacts to the new on-site sensitive receptors.

Criterion 1: Construction Phase Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs)

Buildout of the Project would occur over approximately 10 years or longer and would consist of multiple smaller projects with their own construction time frames and equipment. Per the LST methodology, information regarding specific development projects and the locations of receptors would be needed in order to quantify the levels of localized operation and construction-related impacts associated with future development projects. Because the Project is a broad-based policy plan, it is not possible to calculate individual, project-related, operation emissions at this time. The LST analysis can only be conducted at a project level; per SCAQMD methodology, quantification of LSTs is not applicable for this program-level environmental analysis. However, because potential development and redevelopment could occur close to existing sensitive receptors, the Project has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Construction equipment exhaust combined with fugitive particulate matter emissions have the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of criteria air pollutant emissions and result in a significant impact.

Utilizing the construction equipment list and associated acreages per 8-hour day provided in the SCAQMD "Fact Sheet for Applying CalEEMod to Localized Significance Thresholds," the maximum number of acres disturbed in a day would be 4 acres during grading. PM10 and PM2.5 emissions would potentially exceed the local emissions thresholds at the nearest sensitive receptors during site preparation. Therefore, a significant local air quality impact could occur from construction of the Project.

Because of the long-term nature of the buildout of the Project, potential development and redevelopment could occur close to existing sensitive receptors located as close as 24 meters to the west near Loveland Drive and east near Andalusia Avenue or new sensitive receptors within the planning area, potentially exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Construction equipment exhaust combined with fugitive particulate matter emissions have the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of criteria air pollutant emissions and result in a significant impact. Furthermore, the Project would permit commercial and light industrial land uses, which could potentially generate substantial quantities of criteria air pollutants and TACs from land uses such as stationary sources and warehouses once the Project is operational. These emissions could potentially impact nearby sensitive receptors.

Criterion 2: Carbon Monoxide Hot Spot Analysis

Areas of vehicle congestion have the potential to create pockets of CO called hotspots. Under existing and future vehicle emission rates, a project would have to increase traffic volumes at a single intersection by more than 44,000 vehicles per hour—or 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal air does

not mix—in order to generate a significant CO impact. Full buildout of the Project would result in approximately 38,106 average daily trips. With the standard assumption that peak-hour trips represent 10 percent of the average daily trips, implementation of the Project would result in an increase of about 3,811 peak-hour vehicle trips. Furthermore, distributing the total daily vehicle trips in the Project area and region and by peak-hour would result in smaller traffic volumes at the various intersections. Thus, implementation of the Project would not produce the volume of traffic required (i.e., 24,000 to 44,000 peak-hour vehicle trips) to generate a CO hotspot. Therefore, implementation of the Specific Plan would not have the potential to substantially increase CO hotspots at intersections in the vicinity of the Project area, and impacts would be less than significant.

Criterion 3: Construction Toxic Air Pollutants

Known sensitive receptors located within 1 mile of the planning area include numerous residences, child care centers, parks, and public schools. Construction of the Project would be implemented over a period of 10 years. It is anticipated that construction of individual developments accommodated under the plans would likely be spread out incrementally over this period of time, which would limit the exposure of on- and off-site receptors to elevated concentrations of DPM. However, similar to the LST analysis, construction health risk can only be conducted at a project level; therefore, quantification of construction-related health risk is not applicable for this program-level environmental analysis.

General Plan policies would assist in reducing potential impacts of construction emissions to sensitive receptors. Even with these mitigation measures in place, potential development and redevelopment could occur close to existing sensitive receptors. Construction equipment exhaust has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of TACs and result in a significant impact. As the exact location, timing, and level of future development activities arising from the Project is unforeseeable, specific impacts to sensitive receptors cannot be quantified. Therefore, to accurately analyze the potential impacts of potential future development projects, MM AIR-1a is required. Compliance with this mitigation measure will ensure that specific project-level construction impacts are analyzed and further mitigation measures are considered, as appropriate. Even after complying with regulations, existing policies and mitigation measures, as well as new mitigation measures, the impacts cannot be guaranteed to be reduced to below applicable agency thresholds, resulting in a potentially significant impact from construction toxic air pollutants to sensitive receptors.

Criterion 4: Operation Toxic Air Pollutants

The Project would permit residential, office, commercial and industrial land uses. Development of the land uses that are allowed under the Project may result in stationary sources of TAC emissions, including light industrial facilities, warehouses, dry cleaners, restaurants with charbroilers, or buildings with emergency generators and boilers. These types of stationary sources are subject to SCAQMD's new source review through their permitting requirements and would be subject to further study and Health Risk Assessment (HRA) prior to the issuance of any necessary air quality permits under SCAQMD Rule 1401. The permitting process ensures that stationary source emissions would be below the SCAQMD significance thresholds of 10 in a million cancer risk and 1 for acute risk at the maximally exposed individual.

The General Plan Air Quality Element sets forth policies that will further assist in reducing the impact of operational project-related emissions to sensitive receptors, including Policies AQ 2.1 through AQ 2.4. As discussed in the General Plan, these policies require barriers and set-back distances to be implemented between sensitive receptors and emission sources where possible, as well as the use of pollution control

measures such as landscaping and vegetation as buffers. Program AQ 2.1.1 established a program to monitor adherence to best practices in distance and setbacks as recommended by the ARB and SCAQMD as a part of City planning efforts. The General Plan also includes the following policies to reduce emissions from mobile sources and to promote trip reduction: including Policies AQ 7.1 through 8.2, which implement transit incentives, trip reduction programs at workplaces, traffic-flow management efforts, and other measures designed to alleviate traffic congestion and associated air pollution.

These existing policies and programs, combined with existing regulations and proposed mitigation measures, would serve to reduce the potential air quality impacts from future project operations to sensitive receptors. In regard to the industrial land uses proposed to be included in the planning area, the California Department of Justice (DOJ) has provided a document entitled, "Warehouse Projects: Best Practices and Mitigation Measures to Comply with the California Environmental Quality Act," that provides guidance on CEQA analysis for warehouse projects and feasible mitigation measures. This guidance has been reviewed and incorporated into this analysis, as appropriate. However, the document also includes a recommendation to fully analyze the impacts from truck trips as a part of CEQA compliance, stating that, "CEQA requires full public disclosure of a project's anticipated truck trips, which entails calculating truck trip length based on likely truck trip destinations . . . ". While CalEEMod default trip lengths have been utilized for this analysis for most land uses and land uses because the specific types of industrial projects that may be implemented in future buildout of the Project are unknown, there is the possibility that trip lengths for the industrial land uses may be longer than these default values, especially where trucks may be traveling to local ports or to destinations outside of the SoCAB. Therefore, to accurately analyze the potential impacts of potential future development projects that include trucking emissions, MM AIR-1e is recommended.

Furthermore, ARB recommends a minimum separation between new sensitive land receptors and facilities that may emit TACs, such as dry cleaners, gas stations, auto body shops, warehouses, research and development facilities, manufacturers, public facilities such as wastewater treatment plants, truck stops, and busy roadways. These types of facilities would potentially be developed as a part of the land uses envisioned as a part of the Project. The health effects of DPM are of particular concern, as well as benzene, as discussed in earlier sections. To analyze and potentially reduce the potential exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs that could be emitted from the operation of these types of facilities, MM AIR-3a is required.

Furthermore, benzene may be emitted from the operation of gasoline service stations or other land uses with gasoline fueling pumps. To ensure that sensitive receptors are not going to be adversely affected by the exposure to benzene, it is recommended that the lead agency evaluate, quantify, and perform an HRA for the Project in the CEQA document for future Projects that include the operation of gasoline fueling pumps. To address this recommendation, MM AIR-3c is included.

In addition to operational emissions from new stationary sources of emissions and vehicle trips to and within the planning area, the Project would locate new sensitive receptors (residents) that could be subject to existing sources of TACs within the project boundary. The California Supreme Court in California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District concluded that agencies generally subject to CEQA are not required to analyze the impact of existing environmental conditions on a project's future users or residents. However, various types of mitigation are potentially available to reduce potential impacts to new sensitive receptors in the planning area. These methods include enhanced air filtration systems, sound walls, and vegetation. General Plan Air Quality Element policies that promote these methods include AQ 2.1 through AQ 2.4. Policy AQ 2.2 encourages, "the use of pollution control measures such as landscaping, vegetation and other materials that trap particulate matter or control pollution." Both the SCAQMD and the

ARB have discussed the merits and effectiveness of these types of measures designed to reduce near-roadway pollutant levels. The use of landscaping and vegetative barriers, as described in General Plan Policy AQ 2.2, would assist in reducing potential air quality impacts to sensitive receptors.

In order to demonstrate a reduction in the risk of future residents, the use of air filters have been considered, as required under Title 24, Part 6, Subchapter 7, Section 150.0(m)12.C. Title 24 of the California Building Code requires that residential air filters meet a MERV of 13. MERV 13 filters would trap particles at an efficiency rate of 60 percent; however, the use of air filters is only effective when residents keep windows closed and use air passed through the filtration system. The Project has no direct control over the resident's operation of windows. Therefore, MM AIR-3b has been included to relay this information to the residents in order for them to make their own informed decisions.

Mobile Source Operational Health Risk Assessment

Because the lifetime cancer risk for the Project exceeds 10 in a million in the worst-case scenario analysis, it is concluded that the Project site would be impacted by TAC emissions generated by mobile source emissions due to the operation of the proposed industrial uses and existing mobile source emissions in the area. The implementation of MM AIR-3a, MM AIR-3b, and MM AIR-3c will assist in reducing potential health risks to sensitive receptors.

The criterion for significance is a Hazard Index increase of 1.0 or greater. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact due to the non-cancer risk from diesel emissions from mobile sources during operation of the Project.

Compliance with existing regulatory programs, existing General Plan policies and mitigation measures, and MM AIR-1a through MM AIR-1i and MM AIR-3a through MM AIR-3c will serve to reduce the impacts of the Project to the extent feasible. However, the Project would result in the future development of numerous projects, each contributing incrementally to air emissions affecting sensitive receptors. Thus, it is possible that the Project would result in cumulatively significant impacts to sensitive receptors, even if individual projects were each less than significant. This is particularly likely since none of the measures herein would prevent multiple development projects from being constructed concurrently within close proximity to sensitive receptors in such a manner as to cause substantial concentrations within the area. Further, neither the amount of construction occurring nor the exact location within the county is foreseeable and, as such, it cannot be determined whether the resultant construction emissions could be adequately controlled or reduced to below regulatory thresholds. Without such information, it is not possible to conclude that air pollutant emissions resulting from construction activities would be adequately reduced to the point that sensitive receptors are not exposed to substantial concentrations of air pollutants, and thus a significant and unavoidable impact may result.

Existing regulations and ordinances would reduce operation-related impacts by reducing air pollutant emissions from stationary and mobile sources. Even with the implementation of new project-specific mitigation measures, cumulative operational emissions resulting from future development would likely exceed SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, the potential impacts from the Project to sensitive receptors would be significant and unavoidable.

MM AIR-1a

Implement MM AIR-1a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1b

Implement MM AIR-1b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1c

Implement MM AIR-1c, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1d

Implement MM AIR-1d, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1e

Implement MM AIR-1e, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1f

Implement MM AIR-1f, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1g

Implement MM AIR-1g, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1h

Implement MM AIR-1h, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1i

Implement MM AIR-1i, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-3a

The City of Jurupa Valley shall require minimum distances between potentially incompatible land uses, as described below, unless a project-specific evaluation of human health risks defines, quantifies and reduces the potential incremental health risks through site design or the implementation of additional reduction measures to levels below applicable standards (e.g., standards recommended or required by the California Air Resources Board [ARB] or South Coast Air Quality Management District [SCAQMD]). The Health Risk Assessment (HRA) shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the most current California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the SCAQMD. At a minimum, the project-specific health risk analysis shall include emissions from sources including project trips, evaluated using appropriate emission factors and assumptions; stationary sources; area sources; on-site off-road equipment; Transport Refrigeration Units (TRUs); etc.

a. Proposed dry cleaners and film processing services that use perchloroethylene shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing sensitive land uses including residential, schools, day care facilities, congregate care facilities, hospitals, or other places of long-term residency for people.

b. Proposed auto body repair services shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing sensitive land uses.

c. Proposed gasoline dispensing stations with an annual throughout of less than 3.6 million gallons shall be sited at least 50 feet from existing sensitive land uses. Proposed gasoline dispensing stations with an annual throughput at or above 3.6 million gallons shall be sited at least 300 feet from existing sensitive land uses.

d. Other proposed sources of toxic air contaminants (TACs) including furniture manufacturing and repair services that use methylene chloride or other solvents identified as a TAC shall be sited at least 300 feet from existing sensitive land uses.

e. Avoid siting distribution centers or other industrial land uses that accommodate more than 100 truck trips per day (or more than 40 truck trips operating TRUs per day, or where TRUs operate more than 300 hours per week) within 1,000 feet of existing sensitive land uses.

f. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing freeways, major urban roadways with 100,000 vehicles per day or more and major rural roadways with 50,000 vehicles per day or more.

g. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing dry cleaners and film processing services that use perchloroethylene.

h. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing auto body repair services.

i. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 50 feet from existing gasoline dispensing stations with an annual throughput of less than 3.6 million gallons and 300 feet from existing gasoline dispensing stations with an annual throughput at or above 3.6 million gallons.

j. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 300 feet from existing land uses that use methylene chloride or other solvents identified as a TAC.

k. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 1,000 feet from existing distribution centers that accommodate more than 100 trucks per day, accommodate more than 40 trucks per day with transportation refrigeration units, or where transportation refrigeration units operate more than 300 hours per week.

MM AIR-3b

All future residents of the planning area shall be provided with information that describes the potential health risks from localized and regional air pollution and that the incorporation of an advanced air filtration system has been provided in their housing unit to reduce that risk. The information shall also indicate that the residents have the option to open windows for circulation, however that by opening windows, they reduce or eliminate the effectiveness of the air filtration system within their unit for as long as the unit is open to unfiltered air.

MM AIR-3c

Prior to future discretionary approval for projects that require environmental evaluation under CEQA, the City of Jurupa Valley shall evaluate new development proposals for new commercial land uses that include gasoline fueling pumps. Such projects shall submit a Health Risk Assessment (HRA)

to the appropriate City department. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the most current California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). If the HRA shows that the incremental health risks exceed their respective thresholds, as established by the SCAQMD at the time a project is considered, the applicant shall be required to identify and demonstrate that best available control technologies for toxics (T-BACTs), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms to reduce risks to an acceptable level.

Cumulative Impact: Air Quality. The project would result in a cumulatively considerable impact with regard to air quality.

Finding: Implementation of MM AIR-1a, MM AIR-1b, MM AIR-1c, MM AIR-1d, MM AIR-1e, MM AIR-1f, MM AIR-1g, MM AIR-1h, MM AIR-1i, MM AIR-3a, and MM AIR-4. which are adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts related to air quality. Although the City finds MM AIR-1a, MM AIR-1b, MM AIR-1c, MM AIR-1d, MM AIR-1e, MM AIR-1f, MM AIR-1g, MM AIR-1h, MM AIR-1i, MM AIR-3a, and MM AIR-4 feasible, special considerations, as set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), make further mitigation measures or alternatives to address cumulatively considerable impactes related to air quality infeasible. No other feasible, enforceable mitigation is available to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the City hereby determines that any impacts related to criteria pollutants and sensitive receptors would be significant and unavoidable.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(3) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding:

Criteria Pollutants

The Project's construction and operational-related emissions would exceed the SCAQMD regional thresholds for criteria pollutants, including for NOX, VOCs, CO, PM10, and PM2.5. As such, the Project would conflict with AQMP Consistency Criterion No. 1, and would, therefore, conflict with the SCAQMD 2016 AQMP. Other projects within the SoCAB also have the potential to conflict with the AQMP; therefore, the Project's impacts due to a conflict with the AQMP would be cumulatively considerable.

Sensitive Receptors

The Project could result in exposure of sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the Project (i.e., residences to the east and west of the Project) to potential TAC emissions from diesel trucks from future industrial land uses and existing local freeways, exceeding a cancer risk of 10 per million for long-term exposures. Additionally, emissions of DPM generated at the Project site from construction and operation of the Project could expose sensitive receptors to TAC emissions at levels that would potentially exceed SCAQMD and OEHHA health-protective recommendations. However, as noted above, consistent with SCAQMD guidance an SLT should be applied at a project level, and identification of the applicable threshold is not applicable for this specific plan-level environmental analysis.

Mitigation measures have been recommended to further analyze and potentially reduce the potential health risks from exposure to TACs generated by the construction and operation of future developments envisioned as a part of the Project. However, the potential cumulative impact to sensitive receptors from exposure to

TACs remains potentially significant and should be further evaluated at a project level for future developments.

MM AIR-1a

Implement MM AIR-1a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1b

Implement MM AIR-1b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1c

Implement MM AIR-1c, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1d

Implement MM AIR-1d, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1e

Implement MM AIR-1e, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1f

Implement MM AIR-1f, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1g

Implement MM AIR-1g, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1h

Implement MM AIR-1h, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1i

Implement MM AIR-1i, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-3a

Implement MM AIR-3a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-3.

MM AIR-4

Implement MM AIR-4, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-4.

4.3.2 Cultural Resources

Impact CUL-1: Cultural Resources. The project would have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, or potential disturbance to undiscovered archaeological resources, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

Finding: Implementation of MM CUL-1a, MM CUL-1b, MM CUL-1c, and MM CUL-1d, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, would reduce the impacts related to adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, or potential disturbance to undiscovered archaeological resources

but not to a less-than-significant level. Although the City finds MM CUL-1a, MM CUL-1b, MM CUL-1c, and MM CUL-1d feasible, special considerations, as set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), make further mitigation measures or alternatives to address adverse changes in the significance of an archaeological resource, or potential disturbance to undiscovered archaeological resources infeasible. No other feasible, enforceable mitigation is available to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the City hereby determines that any impacts related to adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, or potential disturbance to undiscovered archaeological resources would be significant and unavoidable.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(3) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it causes a substantial adverse change or materially alters a resource as described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b). The Project causes a substantial adverse change or materially alters a resource as identified in General Plan Table 4.1: Designated Historic Structures in Jurupa Valley as amended from time to time.

A substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is defined at Section 15064.5(b)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines as the "physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired."

Thirteen cultural resources within the Project's direct impact area are eligible for the CRHR individually and/or as contributors to the significance of a district and are considered historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. These include two historically significant areas, Hurunga Oak and Rattlesnake Mountain (*Junā'av*). Development under the Project would result in additional residential and industrial development throughout the Project site that would likely result in the alteration of these resources, which would constitute a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5. It is likely that these impacts may not be mitigated or reduced to a level less than significant. In order to reduce these impacts to the greatest extent feasible, the Project shall implement Mitigation Measure (MM) MM CUL-1a, MM CUL-1b, MM CUL-1c, and MM CUL-1d.

As the City receives development applications for subsequent development under the Project, those applications will be reviewed by the City for compliance with policies and programs in the General Plan and the Rio Vista Specific Plan related to the protection of historical resources. The City's Municipal Code, which implements the City's General Plan, would be reviewed when development applications are received, and projects would be planned to reduce impacts to the greatest extent feasible. However, even with implementation of the mitigation measures listed below, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

MM CUL-1a - Protection of the Hurunga Oak

The Hurunga Oak, also known as the Palmer's oak (*Quercus palmeri*), is both a historic resource and a historic tribal cultural resource, as defined by Public Resources Code section 21074 (a) (1) (A). It is called the "Hurunga Oak" by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation. Direct or indirect impacts to the Hurunga Oak, located within a portion of the Native American sacred area (MRN 45), resulting from the proposed Project that may lead to its decay or death would constitute a significant impact on the environment. To ensure the continued existence of the Hurunga Oak, the following steps shall be taken in accordance with City of Jurupa Valley General Plan Policy COS 7.1:

The project proponent shall design the project to avoid direct impacts to the Hurunga Oak in coordination with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation. Additionally, because the Hurunga Oak (aka Palmer Oak) is also a sensitive biological resource, the avoidance area shall include the area identified in Mitigation Measure MM BIO-5.

MM CUL-1b - Rattlesnake Mountain (Junā'av) Park Site

The following measures/conditions will be required to reduce the project's potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impact on Rattlesnake Mountain (*Junā'av*) Ethnographic Area in accordance with the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan Policies COS 7.1, COS 7.2, COS 7.5, COS 7.7, COS 7.8, COS 7.9, and Program COS 7.1.4.

- The project proponent shall name one of its dedicated open space parks *Junā'av* Park and commission the production of an informational kiosk that will be installed in the park. Installation shall occur prior to the approval/sign off of the landscape and irrigation systems within the park. The kiosk shall include photos and/or illustrations and a narrative description of the Rattlesnake Mountain (*Junā'av*) Ethnographic Area and its contribution to the cultural heritage of the local indigenous population. The information presented on the kiosk shall be developed in coordination with the City and the consulting Native American tribes.

MM CUL-1c

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project proponent shall hire a qualified Archaeologist identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archaeologist), to provide evidence that a California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523D District Record Form for *Junā'av* Ethnographic Area has been completed that identifies contributing and noncontributing resources, describes its historic function or use, and includes a narrative description and narrative statement of significance in accordance with pertinent guidelines. This measure shall be done in conjunction with MM CUL-2b.

MM CUL-1d

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project proponent shall hire a qualified Archaeologist identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archaeologist), to conduct archival research and prepare an educational booklet for the public that describes Jurupa (*Hurúpa*/ *Hurú'ŋa*/ *Húutsuvaxpa'*/*Haránka*) and its various ethnographic areas (e.g., Rattlesnake Mountain [*Junā'av*], Jurupa Hills [*Sokáva*], etc.) that contribute to the cultural heritage of indigenous population(s) and Jurupa's local history. The project proponent shall circulate the booklet to the Native American Tribes who participated in the AB 52 consultation process for review and comment prior to publication if requested. The project proponent shall make the booklet available to the City of Jurupa Valley, and provide the local public libraries, government buildings, etc., with copies and potentially on the City's website.

Impact CUL-2: Cultural Resources. The project would have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

Finding: Implementation of MM CUL-2a, MM CUL-2b, MM CUL-2d, MM CUL-2e, MM CUL-2f, MM CUL-2g, and MM CUL-2h, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce construction impacts related to archaeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

Although the City finds MM CUL-2a, MM CUL-2b, MM CUL-2d, MM CUL-2e, MM CUL-2f, MM CUL-2g, and MM CUL-2h feasible, special considerations, as set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), make further mitigation measures or alternatives to address adverse changes in the significance of an archaeological resources infeasible. No other feasible, enforceable mitigation is available to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the City hereby determines that any impacts related to changes in the significance of an archaeological resources would be significant and unavoidable.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(3) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it causes a substantial adverse change or materially alters a "historic" or "unique" archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.S(c).

Thirteen cultural resources within the Project's direct impact area are eligible for the CRHR individually and/or as contributors to the significance of a district and are considered historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. These include 10 prehistoric archaeological sites, one prehistoric component of a mixed component site, and two historically significant areas, Hurunga Oak and Rattlesnake Mountain (Junā'av), of which archaeological resources are contributing elements. Development under the Project would result in additional residential and industrial development throughout the Project site that would likely result in the demolition or alteration of these resources, which would constitute a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5. It is likely that these impacts may not be mitigated or reduced to a level less than significant. In order to reduce these impacts to the greatest extent feasible, the Project shall implement MM CUL-1a, MM CUL-1b, MM CUL-1c, MM CUL-1d, MM CUL-2a, MM CUL-2b, MM CUL-2d, MM CUL-2e, MM CUL-2f, MM CUL-2g, and MM CUL-2h.

As the City receives development applications for subsequent development under the Specific Plan, those applications will be reviewed by the City of Jurupa Valley for compliance with policies and programs in the Specific Plan and General Plan related to the protection of historical resources. The City's Municipal Code, which implements the City's General Plan, would be reviewed when development applications are received, and projects will be planned to reduce impacts to the greatest extent feasible. However, even with implementation of the mitigation measures listed below, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

MM CUL-1a

Implement MM CUL-1a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-1.

MM CUL-1b

Implement MM CUL-1b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-1.

MM CUL-1c

Implement MM CUL-1c, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-1.

MM CUL-1d

Implement MM CUL-1d, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-1.

MM CUL-2a: Photogrammetric Documentation and Viewshed Analysis

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project proponent shall hire a qualified Archaeologist identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archaeologist), to provide evidence that a close range photogrammetric documentation and viewshed analysis (i.e., direct line of sight and 180-degree viewsheds) of all prehistoric sites within the project's direct impact area through the completion of field work. The results of the analysis, including all photos and figures, shall be presented in a technical report attached to the data recovery report. Final reports must be submitted by the project Archaeologist to the City, project proponent, consulting Native American Tribe, the Eastern Information Center (EIC) located on the campus of the University of California, Riverside, and the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) located on the campus of California State University, Fullerton prior to final building inspection and approval (See Below MM CUL–2f). The reports shall be transmitted by U.S. Mail, return receipt requested.

MM CUL-2b: **Archaeological Phase II Testing and Data Recovery**

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project proponent shall hire a qualified Archaeologist identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archaeologist), to conduct Phase II testing and a data recovery program, if avoidance is not feasible, through the completion of field work to City of Jurupa Valley standards. Based on the current project design, the testing and data recovery (as needed) will apply to 13 impacted archaeological resources within the project's direct impact area, and any additional resources within 100 feet of the project impact limits. In addition, surface collection of the four prehistoric isolates that fall within the project's direct impact area (33-024196 [MRN 33], 33-024772 [MRN 36], 33-024774 [MRN 38], and 33-024775 [MRN 39]) shall be included in the data recovery plan. If the project design changes the sites that are impacted may correspondingly change (See MM CUL-2h).

The Phase II testing and data recovery program shall include preparation of a testing and data recovery plan, completion of testing and data recovery field work, archival research, lab analysis of artifacts recovered, preparation of a data recovery report, and curation of archaeological materials in a local museum or repository or an agreement that artifacts/materials shall be buried within a designated conservation area within the project area limits. The data recovery plan must include an archaeological research design for prehistoric archaeological resources that presents specific research domains/themes of interest, offer questions that shall be investigated through archaeological research and analysis, and identify data requirements necessary to address those questions. The plan shall also include, at a minimum, the following: site descriptions, background contexts, field methods, lab methods, reporting requirements, and a curation agreement with a local repository or a repatriation agreement with consulting Native American tribes. The plan shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist and circulated for review and comment to the consulting Native American tribe and the City prior to implementation.

MM CUL-2d: Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP)

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project proponent shall hire a qualified Archaeologist identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archeologist), to prepare, in consultation with the consulting Native American tribes, the contractor, and the City, a Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP), to address the details, timing and responsibility of all archaeological and tribal cultural activities that will occur on the Project site. A consulting Native American tribe is defined as a tribe that initiated the AB 52 tribal consultation process for the Project, has not opted out of the AB52 consultation process, and is engaged in or has completed AB 52 consultation with the City as provided for in Cal Pub Res Code Section 21080.3.2(b)(1) of AB52. Details in the CRMP shall include: a brief description of the cultural resources present, standards and specifications for ESA and the avoided archaeological sites (14 sites currently lie outside of the project design impact area), as well as any resources that fall within 100 feet of the project impact limits. CRIMP shall include:

a) Project description and location;
b) Project grading and development scheduling;
c) Roles and responsibilities of individuals on the Project;
d) The pre-grading meeting and Cultural Resources Worker Sensitivity Training details;
e) The protocols and stipulations that the contractor, City, consulting Native American Tribe(s) and Project Archaeologist shall follow in the event of inadvertent cultural resources discoveries, human remains/cremations, sacred and ceremonial items, including any newly discovered cultural resource deposits that shall be subject to a cultural resources evaluation.
f) The type of recordation needed for inadvertent finds and the stipulations of recordation of sacred items.
g) Contact information of relevant individuals for the Project.

MM CUL-2e: Archaeological Monitoring During Ground Disturbance

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit or any permit authorizing ground disturbance, the Project Proponent shall provide a copy an engagement letter with a A qualified Archaeologist, identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archeologist), to oversee archaeological and Native American monitoring (per MM TCR-1a and MM TCR-1b) on a full-time basis for all grading and ground-disturbing activities until the Project Archaeologist in coordination with the consulting Tribe(s) and the City determines that resources are not likely to be encountered. Should any cultural resources be discovered during ground disturbance, the Monitor(s) shall be authorized to temporarily halt all construction-related activities within a 100-foot radius of the discovery while the resource is recorded onto appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 Forms and evaluated for significance per the CRMP.

MM CUL-2f: Final Archaeological Reports

Prior to final building inspection and approval, the project proponent shall provide the City of Jurupa Valley with a draft Phase II testing and data recovery report, draft archaeological monitoring report, draft California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523D District Record Form for the *Junā'av* Ethnographic Area including the photogrammetric documentation and viewshed analysis, draft educational booklet for Jurupa (*Hurúpa*/ *Hurú'ŋa*/ *Húutsuvaxpa'*/*Haránka*), and one or more of the following, (1) a receipt of payment to a local museum or repository for the curation of archaeological materials generated during implementation of the data recovery program and/or monitoring

program, (2) an agreement that artifacts/materials will be buried within a designated conservation area within the project area limits or (3) a tribal repatriation agreement. The Phase II testing, data recovery report and archaeological monitoring report should follow Archaeological Resource Management Report (ARMR) format and content guidelines developed by the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). They shall, at a minimum, present the results of field work, lab analysis, archival research, special studies, and identify the final disposition of artifacts. The project proponent shall provide a final testing, data recovery and monitoring reports. Reports shall address comments from the City, project proponent, and/or consulting Native American tribe(s). Final reports shall be submitted to the City, project proponent, consulting Native American tribe(s), the Eastern Information Center (EIC) located on the campus of the University of California, Riverside, and the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) located on the campus of California State University, Fullerton. The reports shall be transmitted by the project proponent or their designee via U.S. Mail return receipt requested.

MM CUL-2g: Resurvey of Site 33-003494 (MRN 3) and Site 33-003497 (MRN 6)

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project proponent shall hire a qualified Archaeologist identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archaeologist), to resurvey sites 33-003494 (MRN 3) and 33-003497(MRN 6). These previously recorded archaeological resources were not found during the current study and may have been obscured. These resources fall within the current direct impact area. Should the previously recorded resources be found, they would be subject to the same treatment measures placed on other prehistoric archaeological sites to reduce potentially significant impacts resulting from the project. The results of this survey shall be reported by the Project Archaeologist in a letter report and provided to the City by the project proponent at or before grading permit issuance.

MM CUL-2h: Project Design Modifications

The following steps shall be taken to reduce potential impacts to historic and archaeological resources resulting from project design modifications:

If at any time, the Rio Vista Specific Plan development footprint is modified, project impacts to cultural resources shall be reviewed by an Archaeologist identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archaeologist) to determine whether additional studies may be required prior to issuance of the grading permit, or prior to any project related disturbances. The Project Archaeologist in coordination with the City of Jurupa Valley, shall determine whether an update of existing literature searches, consultation, or coordination with the NAHC and the consulting Native American tribes, survey work, Phase II testing, data recovery and/or other work is necessary based upon the nature of the Project and resultant impacts to cultural resources or Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs).

Project modifications may include, but are not limited to, an increase in development impact acreage beyond what is addressed in this EIR, or within 100 feet of any resources, and/or the addition of recreational trails, trailheads utilizing existing dirt paths, or any other development that may increase public accessibility and the potential for vandalism or disturbance to cultural resources in areas proposed as open space.

Cumulative Impact: Cultural Resources.

Finding: Implementation of MM CUL-1a, MM CUL-1b, MM CUL-1c, MM CUL-1d, MM CUL-2a, MM CUL-2b, MM CUL-2d, MM CUL-2e, MM CUL-2f, MM CUL-2g, MM CUL-2h, and MM CUL-3a, which are adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts related to cultural resources. Although the City finds MM CUL-1a, MM CUL-1b, MM CUL-1c, MM CUL-1d, MM CUL-2a, MM CUL-2b, MM CUL-2d, MM CUL-2e, MM CUL-2f, MM CUL-2g, MM CUL-2h, and MM CUL-3a feasible, special considerations, as set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), make further mitigation measures or alternatives to address cumulatively considerable impacts to cultural resources infeasible. No other feasible, enforceable mitigation is available to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the City hereby determines that any impacts related to cultural resources would be significant and unavoidable.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(3) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding:

Historic Resources

Of the 26 cultural resources verified within the direct impact area, 13 resources are recommended eligible for the CRHR individually and/or as contributors to the significance of a district and are considered historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. Two of these resources are historical resources that are individually eligible for the CRHR: The *Hurunga* Oak Native American sacred area and Rattlesnake Mountain (*Junā'av*) Ethnographic Area. As project implementation has the potential to significantly alter these resources, this could also constitute a significant cumulative impact to historic resources in the surrounding area.

Archaeological Resources

Of the 26 cultural resources verified within the direct impact area, 13 resources are recommended eligible for the CRHR individually and/or as contributors to the significance of a district and are considered historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. These include 10 prehistoric archaeological sites, one prehistoric component of a mixed component site, and two historically significant areas, *Hurunga* Oak and Rattlesnake Mountain (*Junā'av*), of which archaeological resources are contributing elements. As project implementation has the potential to destroy or significantly alter these resources, this could also constitute a significant cumulative impact to archaeological resources in the surrounding area.

Human Remains

Potential impacts associated with the disturbance of human remains are highly localized and unlikely to result in cumulative impacts. In the event that human remains are discovered, implementation of MM CUL-3 would reduce impacts to previously undiscovered human remains to a less than significant level.

Overall

As Project implementation has the potential to significantly alter or destroy historic and archaeological resources, this could also constitute a significant cumulative impact to historic and archaeological resources within the City of Jurupa and surrounding areas. Mitigation may not reduce impacts to a less than significant level but will be required to reduce impacts to the greatest extent feasible.

MM CUL-1a

Implement MM CUL-1a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-1.

MM CUL-1b

Implement MM CUL-1b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-1.

MM CUL-1c

Implement MM CUL-1c, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-1.

MM CUL-1d

Implement MM CUL-1d, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-1.

MM CUL-2a

Implement MM CUL-2a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2b

Implement MM CUL-2a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2d

Implement MM CUL-2a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2e

Implement MM CUL-2a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2f

Implement MM CUL-2a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2g

Implement MM CUL-2a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2h

Implement MM CUL-2a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-3a

Implement MM CUL-3a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-3.

4.3.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact GHG-1: The project would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Finding: Implementation of MM AIR-1a, MM AIR-1b, MM AIR-1c, MM AIR-1d, MM AIR-1e, MM AIR-1f, MM AIR-1g, MM AIR-1h, MM AIR-1i, MM GHG-1a, MM GHG-1b, and MM GHG-1c, which are adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce the Project's contribution to the generation of GHG emissions. Although the City finds MM AIR-1a, MM AIR-1b, MM AIR-1c, MM AIR-1d, MM AIR-1e, MM AIR-1f, MM AIR-1g, MM AIR-1h, MM AIR-1i, MM GHG-1a, MM GHG-1b, and MM GHG-1c feasible, special considerations, as set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), make further mitigation measures or alternatives to address generation of GHG emissions infeasible. No other feasible, enforceable mitigation is available to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the City hereby determines that any impacts related to the generation of GHG emissions would be significant and unavoidable.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(3) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it exceeds the thresholds per the General Plan Policy AQ 9.5 (GHG Thresholds) - Utilize the SCAQMD Draft GHG thresholds to evaluate development proposals until the City adopts a Climate Action Plan (CAP).

Implementation of the Project would contribute to global climate change through direct emissions of GHG from on-site area sources and vehicle trips generated by the Project and indirectly through off-site energy production required for on-site activities, water use, and waste disposal. The emissions associated with the Project includes emissions associated with the new facilities, with the overall growth in the service population (e.g., mobile source emissions), and with the existing facilities.

Construction

Construction activities associated with future development under the Project would generate temporary short-term GHG emissions from heavy-duty construction equipment, worker trips, and material delivery and hauling. On-site activities would consist of the operation of off-road construction equipment as well as on-site truck travel (e.g., haul trucks, dump trucks, and concrete trucks). Off-site sources would include emissions from construction vehicles used for hauling materials and worker vehicle trips. The SCAQMD has not established thresholds of significance for GHG emissions resulting from construction activities at the plan level. Rather, the SCAQMD Rule 403 encourages the incorporation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce GHG emissions during construction. New development facilitated by the General Plan would include the SCAQMD BMPs for reducing construction emissions of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5.}$ The provisions that limit idling set forth in the SCAQMD BMPs would also reduce GHG emissions during construction.

Future development under the Project would comply with the requirements of the City's General Plan policies and programs related to GHG emissions as well as applicable SCAQMD regulations. Therefore, future development under the Project at construction would not result in significant adverse effects related to GHG emissions. As such, the construction of the Project would result in a less than significant impact relative to this topic.

Operation

Operation of the Project would result in a net increase of GHG emissions by 90,620.26 MT CO_2e per year compared to the existing conditions in the Project area. This net increase would exceed SCAQMD's bright-line threshold of 3,000 MT CO_2e per year; therefore, emissions are compared to the efficiency metric, which is based on achieving a trajectory toward the State's long-term climate stabilizations goals under Executive Order S-03-05.

While implementation of the Project would generate a substantial increase in GHG emissions and would result in per service population emissions that exceed the efficiency target, its guiding principles, design guidelines, and proposed land use designations for the plan area would contribute to minimizing emissions to the extent feasible. Guiding principles and objectives of the Project include providing for a balanced mix of uses, boosting the economy, and promoting sustainable development. Additionally, objectives of the Project include removing barriers to infill development, reusing underutilized properties, encouraging a balanced mix of uses, and promoting development that reduces VMT and encourages active transit.

General Plan Policy AQ 4.3 requires, "the installation and use of electric service units at truck stops and distribution centers for heating and cooling truck cabs, and particularly for powering refrigeration trucks, in lieu of idling of engines for power." Other General Plan policies support the installation of electric infrastructure to support electric vehicles at residential, commercial, and industrial land uses. Future developments envisioned as a part of the Project would be subject to State regulations that will reduce emissions from Project construction and operation, including Title 24 and CALGreen standards and the California Code of Regulations. Furthermore, the City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code adopts these standards.

Under full buildout conditions, the forecast year 2035 threshold of 4.1 MT CO_2e per service population per year would be exceeded in the Project site The increases in overall emissions would be attributable to the additional nonresidential and residential land uses proposed. In addition, an increase in service population would contribute to an increase in wastewater generation, water demand, and vehicle trips. New buildings would be more energy-efficient, but there would be an overall increase in energy usage due to the magnitude of new building space that would be constructed. Overall, the Project's cumulative contribution to the long-term GHG emissions in the State would be considered potentially significant.

Even with the implementation of MM GHG-1 through MM GHG-3, due to the size of the proposed development and potential emissions of GHGs from project construction and operation, the impacts of the Project are significant and unavoidable.

MM AIR-1a

Implement MM AIR-1a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1d

Implement MM AIR-1d, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1e

Implement MM AIR-1e, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1f

Implement MM AIR-1f, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1g

Implement MM AIR-1g, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1h

Implement MM AIR-1h, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1i

Implement MM AIR-1i, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM GHG-1a

To identify potential implementing development project impacts, project applicants for proposed development projects that are subject to CEQA shall analyze, or shall have analyzed by a qualified air quality consultant, the construction and operational-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emission impacts of the proposed development project using the latest available CalEEMod model or other analytical method determined by the City of Jurupa Valley as lead agency in conjunction with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The results of this GHG impact analysis shall be included in the development project's CEQA documentation. If such analysis identifies that emissions would exceed the latest recommended SCAQMD significance thresholds for GHG emissions, the City shall require the incorporation of appropriate mitigation. Mitigation should reduce identified impacts to the maximum extent feasible using, among others, measures identified in the Air Quality Element Policies of the General Plan and the most recent Air Quality Management Plan, as well as mitigation from the most recent CEQA Air Quality Handbook available at the SCAQMD, and the latest version of the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) Handbook for Analyzing Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions, Assessing Climate Vulnerabilities, and Advancing Health and Equity. Example topics include, but are not limited to, energy conservation and efficiency measures, use of renewable energy, reduction of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), use of zero and near-Zero-Emission Vehicles (ZEVs), waste reduction measures, and water conservation. For new nonresidential land uses, the following mitigation shall be considered, where feasible:

- The project shall install solar photovoltaic (PV) panels or other source of renewable energy generation on-site, or otherwise acquire energy from the local utility that has been generated by renewable sources, which would provide 100 percent of the expected building load. The buildings shall include an electrical system and other infrastructure sufficiently sized to accommodate the PV arrays. The electrical system and infrastructure must be clearly labeled with noticeable and permanent signage.
- Only electric-powered off-road equipment (e.g., yard trucks/hostlers, forklifts, indoor material handling equipment, etc.) shall be utilized on-site for daily warehouse and business operations. The project developer/facility owner shall disclose this requirement to all tenants/business entities prior to the signing of any lease agreement. In addition, the limitation to use only electric-powered off-road equipment shall be included in all leasing agreements.

MM GHG-1b

Buildings in the project area will be designed to provide CALGreen Standards with Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED®) features for potential certification and will employ energy and water conservation measures in accordance with such standards. This includes design considerations related to the building envelope, and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC), lighting, and power systems. Additionally, the architectural expression such as roofs and windows in the buildings will relate to conserving energy. Compliance with this mitigation measure shall be verified by the City of Jurupa Valley prior to the issuance of a building permit.

MM GHG-1c

Prior to the issuance of building permits for new development projects in the project area, the project applicant shall show on the building plans that all major appliances (dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers) to be provided/installed are Energy Star-certified appliances or appliances of equivalent energy efficiency. Installation of Energy Star or equivalent appliances shall be verified by the City of Jurupa Valley prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

Impact GHG-2: The project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Finding: Implementation of MM GHG-1a, MM GHG-1b, MM GHG-1c, MM TRANS-2a, MM TRANS-2c, and MM TRANS-2d, which are adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts related to criteria pollutants and sensitive receptors. Although the City finds MM GHG-1a, MM GHG-1b, MM GHG-1c, MM TRANS-2a, MM TRANS-2c, and MM TRANS-2d feasible, special considerations, as set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), make further mitigation measures or alternatives to address conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases infeasible. No other feasible, enforceable mitigation is available to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the City hereby determines that any impacts related to conflicts with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases would be significant and unavoidable.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(3) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding:

Under the City's local significance threshold, the project would have significant effects if the Project is inconsistent with the following: (i) The Climate Change Scoping Plan first approved by the California Air Resources Board (ARB) in 2008 and updated every 5 years, or (ii) the Western Riverside County Council of Governments Subregional Action Plan (WRCOG Subregional CAP).

Applicable plans adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions include the City's General Plan, ARB's Scoping Plan, and SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. A consistency analysis with these plans is presented below.

City of Jurupa Valley General Plan and Municipal Code

The analysis under Impact GHG-1 demonstrates consistency with AQ 9.5 GHG Thresholds because it utilizes the SCAQMD GHG Thresholds in the absence of a qualified CAP. The Project would be consistent with policies LUE 2.2 and 2.5 because it would provide residential, recreational, and school land uses connected by a network of multiuse trails designed for pedestrian, bicycles, and equestrian use. Additionally, the Project would be consistent with policies LUE 3.4, 3.10 and 3.11, because the Project would integrate commercial and residential land uses near transit facilities and planned multiuse paths. Moreover, the Project would not conflict with policies LUE 3.15 and 7.4 because industrial and business park land uses would be sited near the southern and eastern boundaries near a major transportation corridor, State Route 60, existing light industrial uses, and would be served by existing transit. Also, PPP 3.8-1 and 3.8-2 would ensure proposed development would be consistent with Municipal Code Chapter 8.05 and 9.283 as well as any new updates associated with the California Building Standards Code (CBC), CALGreen, and water efficient landscape

requirements as they are released. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan or Municipal Code policies and programs aimed at reducing GHG emissions.

ARB Scoping Plan

Development projects accommodated under the Project are required to adhere to the programs and regulations identified by the Scoping Plan and implemented by State, regional, and local agencies to achieve the Statewide GHG reduction goals of AB 32. These future individual development projects would comply with these Statewide GHG emissions reduction measures. For example, new buildings under the Project would meet the current CALGreen and Building Energy Efficiency standards. The California Energy Commission (CEC) anticipates that new residential buildings will be required to achieve zero net energy (ZNE) by 2020 and that new nonresidential buildings will be required to achieve ZNE by 2030. Estimated Project GHG emissions include reductions associated with Statewide strategies that have been adopted since AB 32. However, because the Project exceeds the applicable numeric screening threshold identified by the SCAQMD under GHG Impact-1, the Project has the potential to impede the State's ability to achieve GHG reduction targets.

2022 Scoping Plan Update

The 2022 Scoping Plan reaffirms and clarifies the role of local governments in achieving the State's climate goals, particularly as it concerns the approval of new land use development projects and their environmental review under CEQA. It outlines three distinct approaches that lead agencies may consider for evaluating the consistency of proposed plans and residential and mixed-use development projects with the State's climate goals. However, it notes that these approaches are recommendations only and that they do not supplant lead agencies' discretion to develop their own evidence-based approaches for determining whether a project would result in a potentially significant impact on GHG emissions.

The first approach involves consistency with a GHG reduction plan, such as a CEQA-qualified CAP. However, the City of Jurupa Valley has not developed such a CAP. Therefore, this approach is not applicable to the Project.

The second approach involves determining whether a project would result in net-zero GHG emissions. However, the 2022 Scoping Plan acknowledges that this approach may not be appropriate or even feasible for every project.

The third approach involves assessing a project's consistency with key project attributes that have been demonstrated to reduce operational GHG emissions while advancing fair housing. Table 3.8-4 of the Draft EIR presents these attributes and a discussion of the Project's consistency with them. The Project would be consistent with some measures while other measures contained in the 2022 Scoping Plan would not directly apply to the Project. However, due to the Project's VMT impacts, the Project would result in a significant impact related to consistency with the Measure Deploy ZEVs and reduce driving demand. Despite implementation of PDFs and MM TRANS-2a, MM TRANS-2c, and MM TRANS-2d, the Project would still exceed the respective reduction in VMT required to meet this measure and contribute toward meeting the State's goal of achieving carbon neutrality by 2045. Therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Scoping Plan Appendix D, Local Actions

Appendix D of the 2022 Scoping Plan includes a section on evaluating plan-level and project-level alignment with the State's Climate Goals in CEQA GHG analyses and identifies several recommendations and strategies

that should be considered for new development in order to determine consistency with the 2022 Scoping Plan.

Appendix D notes that Projects that have all of the key project attributes should accommodate growth in a manner consistent with State GHG reduction goals. While the Project does not include all-electric design that is a key component to demonstrating clear consistency with the 2022 Scoping Plan, the following comparison to the three aforementioned key project attributes is provided for information purposes:

Transportation electrification

MM AIR-1h would require electric vehicle charging to be provided as specified in Section A4.106.8.2 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code. MM AIR-1f would require the construction of all buildings to facilitate sufficient electric charging for trucks to plug in, in anticipation of future technology that allows trucks to operate partially or completely on electricity.

VMT reduction

As stated previously, the Project would include multiple PDFs that include: high density development and alternative transportation infrastructure, such as bicycle and pedestrian paths, that would reduce VMT. Further, MM TRANS-2a which would require a transportation demand management program to reduce VMT, MM TRANS-2b, which would require a school car pool program, and MM TRANS-2c and MM TRANS-2d, which would require street and transit access improvements.

Building decarbonization

As described above, the General Plan and Municipal Code include policies and regulations that aim to reduce GHG emissions or would indirectly reduce GHG emissions. PPP 3.8-1 requires that the City's Building and Safety Department ensure that the Project is designed, constructed, and operated to meet or exceed the incumbent CCR Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards and Title 24 CalGreen Standards, which will serve to reduce GHG emissions from the Project. Further, MM GHG-1 requires future residential development to shall install solar PV panels or other source of renewable energy generation on-site, or otherwise acquire energy from the local utility that has been generated by renewable sources, that would provide 100 percent of the expected building load.

SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

Project-generated Production Attraction (PA) Home-Based (HB) VMT per capita exceeds the City's VMT per capita impact threshold by 22.4 percent in the baseline condition and 26.2 percent in the cumulative condition and is considered potentially significant. Despite the implementation of PDFs, such as providing pedestrian and bicycle network improvements, MM TRANS-2a which would require a transportation demand management program to reduce VMT, MM TRANS-2b, which would require a school car pool program, and MM TRANS-2c and MM TRANS-2d, which would require street and transit access improvements, the Project VMT impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the Project would conflict with the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS.

Table 3.8-5 of the Draft EIR provides an evaluation of the Project in comparison to the three primary transportation-land-use strategies in the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. As shown in the table, the Project would be consistent with the applicable 2020-2045 RTP/SCS land use strategies. Implementation of MM TRANS-2a, MM TRANS-2c, and MM TRANS-2d would reduce Project VMT, however, project VMT impacts would still

exceed the City of Jurupa Valley baseline VMT threshold and impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

WRCOG Subregional CAP Consistency

In 2014, the City of Jurupa Valley was one of 12 cities that collaborated with the WRCOG on a Subregional CAP that includes 36 measures to guide GHG reduction efforts through 2020. However, the City of Jurupa Valley has not adopted the Subregional CAP because it did not go through formal CEQA review by WRCOG, which intended it to be a framework for cities to implement AB 32 and for cities to develop their own CAPs. Therefore, since the City has not adopted a CAP no impact determination can be made.

Summary

The Project is consistent with many applicable Scoping Plan goals and policies as evaluated herein, but would be inconsistent with the 2022 Scoping Plan measure to reduce VMT. Additionally, the Project incorporates a number of PDFs that go beyond the Scoping Plan requirements that would further minimize GHG emissions. The Project promotes the goals of the Scoping Plan through implementation of the design measures that reduce energy consumption and water consumption. In addition, the Project is required to comply with the regulations described in this section that have been adopted to implement the Scoping Plan and to achieve the AB 32 2020 target and the SB 32 2030 target. However, the Project does conflict with the 2022 Scoping Plan and SCAG 2020/2045 RTP/SCS due to the VMT impacts. Although MM GHG-1a, GHG-1b, GHG-1c, and TRANS-2a, MM TRANS-2c, and MM TRANS-2d would reduce GHG emissions and VMT, the reduction in emissions and VMT from these mitigation measures would not reduce impacts below the applicable thresholds. Therefore, because the Project exceeds the SCAQMD GHG numeric threshold and results in a cumulatively considerable impact with respect to GHG emissions, a significant and unavoidable finding with respect to this criterion is also identified.

MM GHG-1a

Implement MM GHG-1a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact GHG-1.

MM GHG-1b

Implement MM GHG-1b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact GHG-1.

MM GHG-1c

Implement MM GHG-1c, the full text of which is provided above for Impact GHG-1.

MM TRANS-2a

Implement MM TRANS-2a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact TRANS-2.

MM TRANS-2c

Implement MM TRANS-2c, the full text of which is provided above for Impact TRANS-2.

MM TRANS-2d

Implement MM TRANS-2d, the full text of which is provided above for Impact TRANS-2.

Cumulative Impact – Greenhouse Gases: The project would result in a cumulatively considerable impact with regard to GHG emissions during operations.

Finding: Implementation of MM AIR-1a, MM AIR-1d, MM AIR-1e, MM AIR-1f, MM AIR-1g, MM AIR-1h, MM AIR-1i, MM GHG-1a, MM GHG-1b, and MM GHG-1c, which are adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts related to criteria pollutants and sensitive receptors. Although the City finds MM AIR-1a, MM AIR-1d, MM AIR-1e, MM AIR-1f, MM AIR-1g, MM AIR-1h, MM AIR-1i, MM GHG-1a, MM GHG-1b, and MM GHG-1c feasible, special considerations, as set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), make further mitigation measures or alternatives to address cumulatively impacts with regard to GHG emissions during operations infeasible. No other feasible, enforceable mitigation is available to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the City hereby determines that any impacts related to GHG emissions during operations would be significant and unavoidable.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(3) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: No single land use project could generate enough GHG emissions to noticeably change the global average temperature. Cumulative GHG emissions, however, contribute to global climate change and its significant adverse environmental impacts. The Project would generate a net increase in GHG emissions and would exceed the SCAQMD Working Group's bright-line threshold of 3,000 MT CO2e for all land use types.

Compliance with MM AIR-1a and MM AIR-1d would assist in reducing emissions from construction equipment associated with the buildout of the Project. Implementation of MM AIR-1e through MM AIR-1i, as well as MM GHG-1a, MM GHG-1b, and MM GHG-1c, will help to reduce cumulative GHG impacts from future project operations to the extent feasible. However, even with the implementation of applicable mitigation measures, the Project impacts are cumulatively considerable.

MM AIR-1a

Implement MM AIR-1a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1d

Implement MM AIR-1d, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1e

Implement MM AIR-1e, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1f

Implement MM AIR-1f, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1g

Implement MM AIR-1g, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1h

Implement MM AIR-1h, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM AIR-1i

Implement MM AIR-1i, the full text of which is provided above for Impact AIR-1.

MM GHG-1a

Implement MM GHG-1a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact GHG-1.

MM GHG-1b

Implement MM GHG-1b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact GHG-1.

MM GHG-1c

Implement MM GHG-1c, the full text of which is provided above for Impact GHG-1.

4.3.4 Tribal Cultural Resources

Impact TCR-1: Tribal Cultural Resources. The project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource (TCR) that is 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).

Impact TCR-2: Tribal Cultural Resources. The project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural 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

Finding: Implementation of MM CUL-1a, MM CUL-1b, MM CUL-1c, MM CUL-1d, MM CUL-2a, MM CUL-2b, MM CUL-2d, MM CUL-2e, MM CUL-2f, MM CUL-2g, MM CUL-2h, MM CUL-3a, MM TCR-1, MM TCR-3, MM TCR-4, MM TCR-5, and MM TCR-13, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, would reduce the impacts related to tribal cultural resources, but not to a less-than-significant level. Although the City finds MM CUL-1a, MM CUL-1b, MM CUL-1c, MM CUL-1d, MM CUL-2a, MM CUL-2b, MM CUL-2d, MM CUL-2e, MM CUL-2f, MM CUL-2g, MM CUL-2h, MM CUL-3a, MM TCR-1, MM TCR-3, MM TCR-4, MM TCR-5, and MM TCR-13 feasible, special considerations, as set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), make further mitigation measures or alternatives to address tribal cultural resources infeasible. No other feasible, enforceable mitigation is available to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the City hereby determines that the project would conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b), and such impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(3) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effects.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under the City's local significance threshold, the Project would have significant effects if it causes a substantial adverse change or materially alters sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following: (1) Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR; (2) Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1; (3) A cultural landscape that meets the criteria of subdivision (a) is a tribal cultural resource to the extent that the landscape is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape; (4) A historical resource described in Section 21084.1, a unique

archaeological resource as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 21083.2, or a "nonunique archaeological resource" as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 21083.2 may also be a tribal cultural resource if it conforms with the criteria of subdivision (a).

Development under the Project would result in additional residential and industrial development throughout the Project site that would likely result in the alteration and destruction of these resources, which would constitute a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR pursuant to Section 15064.5. While specific site plans are not available at this time, the 13 resources would be adversely impacted by the Project. In order to reduce these impacts to the greatest extent feasible, the Project shall implement MM CUL-1a, MM CUL-1b, MM CUL-1c, MM CUL-1d, MM CUL-2a, MM CUL-2b, MM CUL-2d, MM CUL-2e, MM CUL-2f, MM CUL-2g, MM CUL-2h, and MM CUL-3a. However, even with implementation of the proposed mitigation, impacts to these resources would remain significant and unavoidable.

There are 13 sites within the Project site that are associated with tribes and may be considered eligible TCRs pursuant to CEQA, and some of them may be impacted by the Project, resulting in potentially significant impact. However, even with implementation of MM TCR-1a through MM TCR-13, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

MM CUL-1a

Implement MM CUL-1a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-1.

MM CUL-1b

Implement MM CUL-1b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-1.

MM CUL-1c

Implement MM CUL-1c, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-1.

MM CUL-2a

Implement MM CUL-2a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2b

Implement MM CUL-2b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2d

Implement MM CUL-2d, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2e

Implement MM CUL-2e, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2f

Implement MM CUL-2f, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2g

Implement MM CUL-2g, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2h

Implement MM CUL-2h, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-3a

Implement MM CUL-3a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-3.

MM TCR-1a: Tribal Resources Component of the Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP)

Prior to issuance of grading permit, or excavation, trenching, cleaning, grubbing, tree removals, grading and trenching, a qualified Archaeologist identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archeologist), in consultation with the consulting Native American tribes, the contractor, and the City, shall include in the CRMP required by MM CUL-2d, the following components regarding Native American tribal cultural resources as provided for in Public Resources Code Section 21084.3:

a) Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, including, but not limited to, planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context, or planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.

b) Treating the resources with culturally appropriate dignity taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:

1) Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resources.

2) Protecting the traditional use of the resource.

3) Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.

c) Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places.

d) Protecting the resource.

If the Developer/Permit Applicant and the consulting tribe(s) are unable to reach an agreement, the mitigation measure shall be considered satisfied if the Developer/Permit Applicant provides sufficient documented evidence that they have made a reasonably good faith effort to reach an agreement, as determined by the City, with the consulting tribes with regards to items a-d, as listed above.

If, after conducting consultations in good faith and within the spirit of the definition, the tribe or local government cannot reach agreement on preservation or mitigation of any impact to a California Native American cultural place, neither party is required to take any action.

MM TCR-1b: Native American Component of the Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP)

Consistent with the provisions of Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) which recognizes that California Native American tribes may have expertise with regard to their tribal history and practices, which concern the tribal cultural resources with which they are traditionally and culturally affiliated, tribal

knowledge about the land and tribal cultural resources at issue shall be considered for inclusion in the CRMP as requested by the consulting tribes.

MM TCR-2: Avoidance and Preservation of Significant Resources and Locations

Prior to the issuance of grading permits, efforts shall be devised in consultation with the consulting Native American tribes, to avoid specific locations based on substantial evidence provided by a consulting Native American tribe so as to protect the cultural and natural context of the resource through Project re-design, and the designation of open space where significant resources are located.

MM TCR-3: Conservation Areas

Permanent conservation easements or restrictive covenants shall be required and created in consultation with the Project applicant, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department, and the consulting Native American tribes for all open space avoidance areas based on substantial evidence provided by a consulting Native American tribe. Any and all conservation easements will be transferred, managed, or maintained only by a Third-Party entity as approved by the City.

MM TCR-4: Long-Term Management Plan for Tribal Cultural Resources

A Tribal Cultural Resources Long Term Management Plan (TCR TLMP) shall be created in consultation with the Project applicant, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department, and the consulting Native American tribes, for significant locations based on substantial evidence provided by a consulting Native American tribe which are avoided in open space areas. The TCR TLMP shall address periodic maintenance, such as any necessary fuels modification, natural deterrents for unauthorized access, etc., in a manner that is culturally appropriate management criteria for the purpose of preserving or utilizing the resources or places, as described in PRC § 21084.3(b).

MM TCR-5: Documentation and Relocation of Significant Tangible Elements

For significant locations based on substantial evidence provided by a consulting Native American tribes the Project Archaeologist shall submit photo documentation of contributing elements (cultural and natural) of any tribal cultural resources that cannot be avoided. The resources shall be photo documented using high resolution (at least 300 pixels per inch [dpi]). Bedrock Milling Features (BRMs) that cannot be avoided shall be captured in three-dimensional (3D) images for the creation of 3D models and shall be relocated to mutually agreed upon areas within the 917.3-acre Specific Planning Area. These areas must be placed in a conservation easement so they are preserved in perpetuity.

MM TCR-13: Unanticipated Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resource Objects (Non-Funerary/Non-Ceremonial)

Upon discovery of any Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs), all construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall cease (i.e., not less than the surrounding 50 feet) and shall not resume until the discovered TCR has been fully assessed by the Kizh Monitor and/or Kizh Archaeologist. The Kizh will coordinate with the landowner or the relevant governmental agency (as applicable) regarding treatment and curation of these resources

Cumulative Impact – Tribal Cultural Resources: The project would result in a cumulatively considerable impact with regard to tribal cultural resources during operations.

Finding: Implementation of MM CUL-1a, MM CUL-1b, MM CUL-1c, MM CUL-1d, MM CUL-2a, MM CUL-2b, MM CUL-2d, MM CUL-2e, MM CUL-2f, MM CUL-2g, MM CUL-2h, MM CUL-3a, MM TCR-1, MM TCR-3, MM TCR-4, MM TCR-5, and MM TCR-13, which are adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts related to tribal cultural resources. Although the City finds MM CUL-1a, MM CUL-1b, MM CUL-1c, MM CUL-1d, MM CUL-2a, MM CUL-2b, MM CUL-2d, MM CUL-2e, MM CUL-2f, MM CUL-2g, MM CUL-2h, MM CUL-3a, MM TCR-1, MM TCR-3, MM TCR-4, MM TCR-5, and MM TCR-13 feasible, special considerations, as set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), make further mitigation measures or alternatives to address cumulatively considerable impacts to tribal cultural resources infeasible. No other feasible, enforceable mitigation is available to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the City hereby determines that any impacts related to cultural resources would be significant and unavoidable.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(3) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding:

Development within the cumulative geographic scope would be required to comply with federal, State, and local laws and policies that protect cultural and TCRs, including the provisions of SB 18 and AB 52, Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, and Sections 5024.1 and 5097 of the Public Resources Code. Compliance with these policies may also require development projects to prepare site-specific project-level analysis to fulfill CEQA requirements, which also would include additional consultation that could lead to the identification of potential site-specific mitigation that would further reduce impacts.

As noted in Section 3.18.5, Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures, above, there are known TCRs in the cumulative geographic scope that may contribute to the significance of the cultural landscape and/or sites that are associated with tribes and may be considered eligible TCRs. Additionally, there is a potential for yet unidentified TCRs on the surface or subsurface within the geographic scope. Past, present, and foreseeable projects have resulted in or could result in the demolition or material alteration to some aspects of TCRs or the tribal cultural landscape that convey its significance. Implementation of existing regulations and site-specific mitigation, as discussed above, would be required and would reduce impacts. However, since avoidance and preservation in place of such resources cannot be guaranteed, impacts to TCRs in the geographic scope are considered significant and unavoidable. When taken together, past, present, and foreseeable projects within the geographic scope could result in a significant cumulative impact to TCRs.

With respect to the project's contribution, although MM CUL-1a through MM CUL-1d, MM CUL-2a through MM CUL-2h, MM CUL-3a, and MM TCR-1a through MM TCR-13 would lessen the Project's impact to TCRs, the Project's incremental contribution to the significant cumulative impact remains considerable due to the project's location and the size and scope of the Project. Moreover, even with implementation of these measures, the destruction or material alteration of a resource that contributes to the cultural landscape would constitute a substantial adverse change since it would no longer be present on the landscape. No feasible mitigation is available to reduce the Project's contribution to below a level of significance. Accordingly, the Project would have a significant and unavoidable cumulatively considerable impact with respect to TCRs.

MM CUL-1a

Implement MM CUL-1a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-1.

MM CUL-1b

Implement MM CUL-1b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-1.

MM CUL-1c

Implement MM CUL-1c, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-1.

MM CUL-2a

Implement MM CUL-2a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2b

Implement MM CUL-2b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2d

Implement MM CUL-2d, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2e

Implement MM CUL-2e, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2f

Implement MM CUL-2f, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2g

Implement MM CUL-2g, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-2h

Implement MM CUL-2h, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-2.

MM CUL-3a

Implement MM CUL-3a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact CUL-3.

MM TCR-1a: Tribal Resources Component of the Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP)

Implement MM TCR-1a, the full text of which is provided above for Impact TCR-1.

MM TCR-1b: Native American Component of the Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP)

Implement MM TCR-1b, the full text of which is provided above for Impact TCR-1.

MM TCR-2: Avoidance and Preservation of Significant Resources and Locations

Implement MM TCR-2, the full text of which is provided above for Impact TCR-2.

MM TCR-3: Conservation Areas

Implement MM TCR-3, the full text of which is provided above for Impact TCR-3.

MM TCR-4: Long-Term Management Plan for Tribal Cultural Resources

Implement MM TCR-4, the full text of which is provided above for Impact TCR-4.

MM TCR-5: Documentation and Relocation of Significant Tangible Elements

Implement MM TCR-5, the full text of which is provided above for Impact TCR-5.

MM TCR-13: Unanticipated Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resource Objects (Non-Funerary/Non-Ceremonial)

Implement MM TCR-13, the full text of which is provided above for Impact TCR-13.

4.3.5 Transportation

Impact TRA-2: Transportation. The project would conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

Finding: Implementation of MM TRA-2a, MM TRA-2b, MM TRA-2c, and MM TRA-2d. which are adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce the Project's contribution to conflicts related to conflicts with State CEQA Guidelines related to transportation. Although the City finds MM AIR-1a, MM AIR-1b, MM AIR-1c, MM AIR-1d, MM AIR-1e, MM AIR-1f, MM AIR-1g, MM AIR-1h, MM AIR-1i, MM GHG-1a, MM GHG-1b, and MM GHG-1c feasible, special considerations, as set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), make further mitigation measures or alternatives to address conflicts with State CEQA Guidelines related to transportation infeasible. No other feasible, enforceable mitigation is available to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the City hereby determines that any impacts related to conflicts with State CEQA Guidelines related to transportation would be significant and unavoidable.

The City hereby makes finding (a)(3) (described above), as required by Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 and stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, with respect to the above identified effect.

Facts in Support of Finding: Projects that cannot be screened out through the steps outlined in the City of Jurupa Valley Traffic Impact Guidelines will require additional analysis in order to determine whether a project exceeds the following thresholds of significance. Under the City's local significance threshold, the project would have significant effects if:

1. Project VMT Impacts: A project would result in a significant project-generated VMT impact if, in the Existing Plus Project scenario, its net VMT per capita (for residential projects) or per employee (for office and industrial projects) exceeds the City's average VMT. The City's average VMT per service population shall be the metric that is in effect at the time the Notice of Preparation is published, or if no Notice of Preparation is required, at the time the environmental analysis is commenced.

2. Cumulative VMT Impacts: If a project is consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), then the cumulative impacts shall be considered less than significant subject to consideration of other substantial evidence. If it is not consistent with the RTP/SCS, a project would result in a significant VMT if:

a) For residential projects, its net VMT per capita exceeds the average VMT per capita for Jurupa Valley in the RTP/SCS horizon year.

b) For office and industrial projects its net VMT per employee exceeds the average VMT per employee for Jurupa Valley in the RTP/SCS horizon year.

c) For all other land development project types, a net increase in VMT in the RTP/SCS horizon year would be considered a significant impact.

d) Transportation projects that reduce, or have no impact on, vehicle miles traveled should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. For roadway capacity projects, agencies have discretion to determine the appropriate measure of transportation impacts consistent with CEQA and ither applicable requirements. To the extent that such impacts have already been adequately addressed at a programmatic level, such as in a regional transportation plan EIR, a lead agency may be tier from that analysis as is provided in Section 15152.

City of Jurupa Valley VMT Thresholds

The Project could result in a significant project-generated VMT impact if a net increase in total VMT within the City would occur. For cumulative impacts, if a Project is consistent with the regional RTP/SCS, then the cumulative impacts would be considered less than significant, subject to consideration of other substantial evidence. If it is not consistent with the RTP/SCS, a Project would result in a significant VMT impact if a net increase in total VMT in the Cumulative Plus Project scenario versus the RTP/SCS Without Project would occur.

The 2021 Home Based (HB) VMT per capita within the City increases from 21.9 to 26.8 with the Project, a 22.4 percent increase. The 2045 HB VMT per capita increases from 22.5 to 28.4 with the Project, a 26.2 percent increase with the Project. Based on the City's threshold of significance (a net increase in total VMT within the City by any component of the project), the Project could have a significant impact on VMT.

Project generated Production/Attraction Method HB VMT per capita exceeds the City's VMT per capita impact threshold by 22.4 percent in the baseline condition and 26.2 percent in the cumulative condition and is considered potentially significant. Project generated Production/Attraction Method HBW VMT per employee is below the City's VMT per employee impact threshold by 20.2 percent in the baseline condition and 2.3 percent in the cumulative condition and is considered less than significant. As any component of the Project exceeds the City's adopted impact threshold, the Project in its entirety is considered potentially significant.

The Project would exceed the City HB VMT per capita threshold by 22.4 percent in the baseline condition and by 26.2 percent in the cumulative condition. As such, to achieve an HB VMT below the City's threshold, the Project would require a minimum 37,152 reduction in VMT or a 20.8 percent reduction to the Project's HB VMT.

The Project includes several design features that promote reduction in Project generated VMT. In addition, Mitigation Measure (MM) MM TRANS-2a, which would require preparation of a TDM plan; MM TRANS-2b, which would encourage implementation of school pool program; MM TRANS-2c, which would support implementation of transit access improvements; and MM TRANS-2d, which would require improvements to street connectivity, would further reduce VMT impacts.

As future project-specific development plans are submitted to the City, the effectiveness of the above design features and mitigation measures would be evaluated and confirmed by the City in addition. Once a VMT mitigation fee program is available for the City or Riverside County, future development projects can contribute to this fee program to further reduce their project VMT impacts.

The Project consists of long-term plans that will guide future development within the Specific Plan Area over the buildout horizon consistent with the General Plan. No specific development projects are proposed as part of the Project. Given the programmatic nature of this analysis, it is not possible to fully account for the effect of specific design principles, policies, and improvements that will reduce a specific activity's VMT as part of this analysis.

In sum, the Project was evaluated against City screening criteria. The Project was not found to meet any available screening criteria, and a VMT analysis was performed. Project generated HB VMT per capita was determined to exceed the City's VMT per capita impact threshold by 22.4 percent in the baseline condition and 26.2 percent in the cumulative condition. Project design features that would contribute to a 10.32 percent reduction in VMT are incorporated as well as additional features that would also contribute to further reductions, but these would not reduce VMT to a less than significant level and impacts would remain significant and unavoidable at the programmatic level.

Based on the above analysis as set forth in the VMT Analysis memorandum, the Project is anticipated to have a significant and unavoidable impact related to VMT. Implementation of MM TRANS-2a, MM TRANS-2b, MM TRANS-2c, and MM TRANS-2d would reduce VMT impacts. However, it would not reduce these impacts to meet the City threshold, resulting in significant unavoidable impacts.

MM TRANS-2a: Transportation Demand Management Program

> Prior to recordation of the Final Map, the Property Owner shall provide assurances that the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures described below, will be perpetually implemented, regardless of property ownership, and a mechanism for informing subsequent property owners of the transportation demand management plan requirements. These requirements may be accomplished through recordation of covenants, conditions and restrictions and/or the formation of a transportation management association which assumes responsibility for implementation and monitoring of the Transportation Demand Management measures or other measures deemed acceptable by the City. TDM Requirements for Nonresidential Uses include:
>
> - Prior to the issuance of a building permit for any phase, the Project Applicant shall consult with the Riverside Transit Authority (RTA) on the need to provide infrastructure to connect the Project with transit services and to relocate the existing bus stop on northbound Rubidoux Boulevard at Frontage Road southward to the intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard and proposed A Street. The Project Applicant shall fund such relocation. The Project Applicant shall fund a study on behalf of RTA to determine whether adding bus service along proposed A Street in the Project site would be warranted by potential ridership and be practicable for RTA. Evidence of compliance with this requirement may include correspondence from the local transit provider(s) regarding the potential need for installing bus turnouts, shelters, or bus stops at the site.
> - Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit for any commercial use, future tenants in employment-generating land uses developed pursuant to the Project shall implement measures including, but not be limited to, the following: ride-matching assistance; preferential carpool parking; flexible work schedules for carpools; transportation coordinators; providing a web site

or message board for coordinating rides; designating adequate passenger loading and unloading and waiting areas for ride sharing vehicles; and including bicycle end of trip facilities including bike parking, bike lockers, showers, and personal lockers. The measures chosen must achieve a total estimated VMT reduction not less than 8.3 percent. This list may be updated as new methods become available. TDM Requirements for Residential Units:

- Owner-Occupied Units. Upon a residential dwelling being sold or offered for sale, the Project Applicant shall notify and offer to the buyer or prospective buyer, as soon as it may be done, materials describing public transit, ride sharing, and nonmotorized commuting opportunities available in the vicinity of the Project. Such information shall be transmitted no later than the close of escrow. This information shall be submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division for review and approval prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy.
- Rental Units. Upon a residential dwelling being rented or offered for rent, the Project Applicant shall notify and offer to the tenant or prospective tenant, materials describing public transit, ride sharing, and nonmotorized commuting opportunities in the vicinity of the development. The materials shall be approved by the City of Jurupa Valley. The materials shall be provided no later than the time the rental agreement is executed. This information shall be submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division for review and approval, prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy.

MM TRANS-2b: Implement a School Pool Program

If the Jurupa Valley Unified School District purchases the school site in Planning Area 18 by the buildout of the 800th residential unit and constructs a school, then the City of Jurupa Valley shall encourage the District to implement a ride sharing program for school children.

MM TRANS-2c: Implement Transit Access Improvements

If the Riverside Transit Agency (RTA) or successor, proposes the installation or construction of bus shelters and/or turnouts within the public right-of-way within the boundaries of the Rio Vista Specific Plan, the City shall consult with RTA to issue encroachment permits for up to four bus shelters and/or turnouts. The City Engineer may allow modification of the roadway cross-sections identified in Figures II-4A and 4B, Roadway Cross Sections, of the Rio Vista Specific Plan to accommodate bus turnouts and/or shelters.

MM TRANS-2d: Improve Street Connectivity

Before the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for Phase 1, the Project Applicant shall install a signal fiber interconnect along 20th Street between Sierra Avenue and Rubidoux Boulevard. If deemed infeasible by the City, the Project Applicant shall pay cash-in-lieu in the amount to be determined by the City to install an equivalent length of signal interconnect elsewhere Citywide.

5 Findings Regarding Alternatives

As noted above, these Findings address whether the various alternatives substantially lessen or avoid any of the significant impacts associated with the Project and then consider the feasibility of each alternative. Under CEQA, as noted earlier, "[f]easible means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a

reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors." (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15364.) The concept of feasibility permits agency decisionmakers to consider the extent to which an alternative can meet some or all of a project's objectives. In addition, the definition of feasibility encompasses "merit" to the extent that an agency's determination of infeasibility represents a reasonable balancing of competing economic, environmental, social and technological factors supported by substantial evidence. As such, these Findings consider the extent to which the alternatives can meet the project objectives, as described in the EIR and in Section 2.2, above.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires an EIR to evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the project that would feasibly attain most of the project's basic objectives, but that would avoid or substantially lessen any identified significant environmental impacts of the project, as well as the No Project Alternative. Alternatives determined to be infeasible, to not avoid or substantially reduce one or more significant impacts of the Project, or to not meet most of the Project's basic objectives were dismissed from further analysis.

5.1 No-Project Alternative

Description of Alternative: CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires EIRs to evaluate a "No Project" alternative, which is defined as the "circumstance under which the project does not proceed." Under the No Project, No Build Alternative, the elements of the proposed Rio Vista Specific Plan would not be constructed on the Project site and no other development would be approved. In this scenario, the existing 17 vacant parcels would remain vacant, and the proposed roads and additional infrastructure such as water and sewer improvements would not be developed, all existing vegetation and riparian/riverine habitat would remain on-site, no public facilities such as a new elementary school and water tanks would be constructed, and grading would not take place. Under this alternative, all current General Plan land use designations would remain unchanged and no residential, Light Industrial, Business Park, Public Facilities, and Open Space-Recreation land use activities would occur.

Comparison to Proposed Project: The No Project, No Build Alternative would avoid all the Project's less than significant impacts, less than significant impacts with mitigation, and significant and unavoidable impacts, as well as avoid the need to implement any mitigation measures. The No Project, No Build Alternative would result in greater impacts than the Project associated with hazards and hazardous materials; however, this impact would remain less than significant.

As shown in Table 5-2 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, is considered the overall environmentally superior alternative because the significant impacts associated with implementation of the Project would not occur with the No Project Alternative. However, if the No Project Alternative is found to be the environmentally superior alternative, CEQA requires selection of an "environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project Alternative" from among the other alternatives.

The No Project, No Build Alternative would not meet 11 of the Project's 12 objectives because the Project site would not be developed with residential, light industrial, business park, public facilities, recreational land uses; roads and additional infrastructure such as water and sewer improvements would not be developed; and no public facilities, such as a new elementary school and water tanks, would be constructed. Instead, the Project site would remain vacant and in an undeveloped condition.

As such, the No Project, No Build Alternative would not meet the objectives of providing a long-range comprehensive planning approach to guide the development of the Project site; assisting the City in meeting

its housing goals and reflecting anticipated market needs and public demand by providing a diverse range of home types; anticipating market demand by providing for a mixture of residential, light industrial, and business park land uses, provide economic growth and employment opportunities with the City; adopting a Specific Plan that allows for a range of industrial uses, research and development uses, business park and other nonresidential uses that would encourage private capital investment; providing for the establishment of a mixed-use master planned community that is sensitive to the environment and is aesthetically pleasing; creating a community design that complements the land's topography by respecting and preserving the geology, rock formations, and basic landforms; providing a potential Jurupa Unified School District (JUSD) school site to serve the needs of future residents of the Project and the surrounding area; providing a community park and neighborhood parks to meet the needs of future residents of the Project and surrounding neighborhoods; establishing a cohesive trail system that promotes active recreational uses and provides pedestrian links between the school site, parks, residential neighborhoods, and open space; providing guidelines for architecture, landscaping, entry treatments, walls, fencing, parks, and trails that reinforce this community's identity and its relationship to the City. in addition, this alternative would not advance the approved 1992 Rio Vista Specific Plan nor the current General Plan, and it would be inconsistent with the City's established and proposed vision for the future. This alternative would only meet the objective of protecting valuable scenic resources within large expanses of open space, thereby preserving Rio Vista's character and identity and the surrounding region. However, this open space would not be managed or available for public use. Therefore, this alternative would be environmentally inferior to the Proposed project.

Findings: The Council finds the No Project Alternative fails to meet Project objectives, and is less desirable than the Project. The Council this Alternative for the following "[s]pecific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations": the Project benefits such as assisting the City in meeting its housing goals, providing for the establishment of a mixed-use master planned community that is sensitive to the environment and is aesthetically pleasing, providing a potential Jurupa Unified School District (JUSD) school site, and establishing a cohesive trail system that promotes active recreational uses and provides pedestrian links between the school site, parks, residential neighborhoods, and open space, and other benefits of the Project "make infeasible the project alternatives identified in the [F]inal EIR." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091(a)(3).) The No Project Alternative also would not achieve any of the objectives for the Project which are identified above. For these reasons, the Council rejects the No Project Alternatives as infeasible within the meaning of CEQA. The Council further finds that each of these reasons, separately and independently, justifies rejection of this Alternative.

5.2 Alternative 2: No Project, Develop the Approved Specific Plan

Description of Alternative: Under the No Project, Develop the Approved Specific Plan Alternative, the Project site would be developed in accordance with the existing Rio Vista Specific Plan No. 243 that was approved by the County of Riverside on April 14, 1992 (1992 Specific Plan). Under this scenario, up to 1,697 homes, a 5-acre commercial site, two elementary schools, three neighborhood parks, and a 14-acre equestrian center would be developed. An area of natural open space, encompassing 405 acres would be included as well.

Under the No Project, Develop the Approved Specific Plan Alternative, the majority of the current General Plan land use designations would remain unchanged. However, land use in an area in the western portion of

the Project site would change from the current Medium Density Residential (MDR) to a low density residential land use (Low Residential and Single-Family Residential), and the land use in the northwestern corner would change from the current MHDR to a recreational land use (Equestrian). Under this scenario, a small, 5-acre area would be developed as a commercial area, and no Light Industrial or Business Park uses would be developed. Residential land uses would include Low Density, High Density, and Very High Density, and would not include the Very Low Density Residential (VLDR), Medium High Density Residential (MHDR), High Density Residential (HDR), and Very High Density Residential (VHDR) included in the Project.

Comparison to Proposed Project: This alternative would have similar impacts to the Project's no impact or less than significant impacts associated with aesthetics; agricultural and forestry resources; energy; hydrology and water quality; land use and planning; minerals; population and housing; public services; recreation; and wildfire. This alternative would require similar mitigation measures and could be mitigated to a less than significant level, similar to the Project's impacts on biological resources; geology and soils; hazards and hazardous materials; noise; and utilities and service systems. This alternative would have similar impacts to the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts associated with air quality; cultural resources; greenhouse gas emissions; VMT; and TCRs.

The No Project, Develop the Approved Specific Plan Alternative would not meet all of the Project objectives because it does not include the mixed-use light industrial business park uses. Therefore, this alternative would not meet the objectives of providing for a mixture of residential, light industrial, and business park land uses that are marketable and financially feasible within the City's evolving economic profile; providing economic growth and employment opportunities with the City by authorizing the development of light industrial and business park land uses at a sufficient scale to attract financially stable, long-term tenants and fund the necessary proposed critical infrastructure improvements that will serve Rio Vista and the greater Jurupa Valley community; adopting a Specific Plan that allows for a range of industrial uses, research and development uses, business park and other nonresidential uses that would encourage private capital investment sufficient to support the significant public infrastructure improvements proposed on the Project site; and providing for the establishment of a mixed-use master planned community that is sensitive to the environment and is aesthetically pleasing.

Furthermore, this alternative contains significantly reduced open space and would therefore not fully meet the objectives of creating a community design that complements the land's topography by respecting and preserving the geology, rock formations, and basic landforms; protecting valuable scenic resources within large expanses of open space, thereby preserving Rio Vista's character and identity and the surrounding region; and establishing a cohesive trail system that promotes active recreational uses and provides pedestrian links between the school site, parks, residential neighborhoods, and open space. Therefore, this alternative would be environmentally inferior to the Project.

Findings: The Council finds the No Project, Develop the Approved Specific Plan Alternative infeasible and less desirable than the Project and rejects this Alternative for the following "[s]pecific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations": the Project benefits, such as meeting the objectives of providing for a mixture of residential, light industrial, and business park land uses that are marketable and financially feasible within the City's evolving economic profile; providing economic growth and employment opportunities with the City by authorizing the development of light industrial and business park land uses; providing for the establishment of a mixed-use master planned community that is sensitive to the environment and is aesthetically pleasing; and other benefits of the Project, "make infeasible the project alternatives identified in the [F]inal EIR." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091(a)(3).) The No Project, Develop the

Approved Specific Plan Alternative would not achieve any of the objectives for the Project which are identified above. For these reasons, the Council rejects the No Project, Develop the Approved Specific Plan Alternative as infeasible within the meaning of CEQA. The Council further finds that each of these reasons, separately and independently, justifies rejection of this Alternative.

5.3 Alternative 3: Develop the 2017 Proposed Land Use Plan

Description of Alternative: Under the Develop the 2017 Proposed Land Use Plan Alternative, the Project site would be developed in accordance with the previously proposed, but not analyzed or approved, 2017 Land Use Plan. This previously contemplated land use plan would allow for the development of a targeted 1,299 dwelling units (but up to 1,799), a school, a 12-acre community park, 23 acres of circulation, and 14 acres of public facilities. An area of natural open space encompassing 579 acres would also be included.

Under the Develop the 2017 Proposed Land Use Plan Alternative, several of the current General Plan land use designations would change to allow for a variety of density levels. While the majority of the Project site is currently designated as MDR, this alternative would also include the same designation as well as areas designated as Low-Medium Density Residential (LMDR) and HDR. There would not be a Very High Density Residential (VHDR) designation. A larger area would be dedicated to Open Space than the Project. Under this scenario there would be no industrial, commercial, or business park designations.

Comparison to the Proposed Project: The Develop the 2017 Proposed Land Use Plan Alternative would not increase the severity of any impacts. This alternative would have similar impacts to the Project's no impact or less than significant impacts with regard to aesthetics; agriculture and forestry resources; energy; hydrology and water quality; land use and planning; minerals; population and housing; recreation; public services; and wildfire. This alternative would have reduced impacts on air quality, noise and transportation. This alternative would require similar mitigation measures and could be mitigated to a less than significant level, similar to the Project's impacts on biological resources; hazards and hazardous materials; geology and soils; and utilities and service systems. Similar to the Project, this alternative would have significant and unavoidable impacts associated with cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, and tribal cultural resources.

The Project's significant unavoidable impacts are generally caused by a large amount of ground disturbance. Alternative 3, Develop the 2017 Proposed Land Use Plan Alternative, would achieve the greatest reduction in air quality impacts, and thus would yield the greatest reduction in impacts. As such, Alternative 3 is the environmentally superior alternative.

However, the Develop the 2017 Proposed Land Use Plan Alternative does not meet all of the Project objectives because it does not include the Light Industrial/Business Park uses. Therefore, this alternative would not meet the objectives of providing for a mixture of residential, light industrial, and business park land uses that are marketable and financially feasible within the City's evolving economic profile; providing economic growth and employment opportunities with the City by authorizing the development of light industrial and business park land uses at a sufficient scale to attract financially stable, long-term tenants and fund the necessary proposed critical infrastructure improvements that will serve Rio Vista and the greater Jurupa Valley community; adopting a Specific Plan that allows for a range of industrial uses, research and development uses, business park and other nonresidential uses that would encourage private capital

investment sufficient to support the significant public infrastructure improvements proposed on the Project site; and providing for the establishment of a mixed-use master planned community that is sensitive to the environment and is aesthetically pleasing. Therefore, this alternative would be environmentally inferior to the Project.

Findings: The Council finds the Develop the 2017 Proposed Land Use Plan Alternative infeasible and less desirable than the Project and rejects this Alternative for the following "[s]pecific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations": the Project benefits, such as meeting the objectives of providing for a mixture of residential, light industrial, and business park land uses that are marketable and financially feasible within the City's evolving economic profile; providing economic growth and employment opportunities with the City by authorizing the development of light industrial and business park land uses; providing for the establishment of a mixed-use master planned community that is sensitive to the environment and is aesthetically pleasing; and other benefits of the Project, "make infeasible the project alternatives identified in the [F]inal EIR." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091(a)(3).) The Develop the 2017 Proposed Land Use Plan Alternative would not achieve any of the objectives for the Project which are identified above and would not allow the City to grow and develop in the manner that the City, as a matter of policy, seeks to grow and develop. For these reasons, the Council rejects the Develop the 2017 Proposed Land Use Plan Alternative as infeasible within the meaning of CEQA. The Council furhter finds that each of these reasons, separately and independently, justifies rejection of this Alternative.

Exhibit B

Statement of Overriding Considerations

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The following Statement of Overriding Considerations is made in connection with the approval of Rio Vista Specific Plan (the "Project").

The California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") requires the decision-making agency to balance the environmental, economic, social, technological, and other benefits of a project against its significant unavoidable environmental effects when determining whether to approve a project. If the benefits of the project outweigh the significant unavoidable environmental effects, then those effects may be considered acceptable. CEQA requires the agency to make written findings supporting the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant environmental effects are unavoidable. The reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the EIR or elsewhere in the administrative record. The reasons for proceeding with this Project, despite the significant unavoidable environmental effects that may result, are provided in this Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that, "In the event specific economic, social and other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects can be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof." In addition, Public Resources Code section 21002.1(c) provides that, "In the event that economic, social, or other conditions make it infeasible to mitigate one or more significant effects of a project on the environment, the project may nonetheless be approved or carried out at the discretion of a public agency. . ." Finally, CEQA Guidelines (14 C.C.R.) section 15093 (a) provides that "[i]f the benefits of a project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered 'acceptable.'"

The Final EIR for the Project identifies all of the environmental effects of the Project, as well as the mitigation measures that can reduce the effects either to a less than significant level where feasible or to the lowest feasible level. The Final EIR also identifies the environmental effects of the Project that will remain significant and unavoidable, even after the imposition of all feasible mitigation measures. The Final EIR also presents Project alternatives. As identified in the Findings for the Rio Vista Specific Plan Project ("Findings") the City Council finds that there are no feasible alternatives to the Project that would mitigate the significant and unavoidable environmental effects of the Project to a less-than-significant level or avoid those environmental effects entirely, while still attaining the objectives of the Project.

The City Council has carefully balanced the benefits of the Project against the significant unavoidable environmental effects identified in the EIR that cannot be feasibly mitigated to a less than significant level. Notwithstanding the significant unavoidable environmental effects

that are identified in the EIR that cannot feasibly be eliminated, lessened, or mitigated to a less than significant level, the City Council, acting pursuant to Public Resources Code sections 21002 and 21002.1 and CEQA Guidelines sections 15092 and 15093, hereby determines that significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the overriding considerations described herein.

Based on the objectives of the Project identified in the EIR, the City Council has determined that the Project should be approved and that the significant unavoidable environmental effects attributable to the Project are outweighed by the following environmental, economic, social, technological and other overriding considerations, each one being a separate and independent basis upon which to approve the Project. Substantial evidence in the record demonstrates that approval and implementation of the Project will provide the benefits listed below. The City Council thus finds as follows:

1. As set forth in detail in the Findings, all feasible mitigation measures have been imposed to reduce Project environmental effects to the extent feasible. Furthermore, as supported by the Findings, the City Council finds that alternatives to the Project are infeasible because they generally have similar impacts, or they do not provide the benefits of the Project, or are otherwise socially or economically infeasible.

2. The Project will be consistent with and contribute to achieving the goals and objectives established by the General Plan. Furthering and implementing the City's General Plan is a legal and social prerogative of the City. The City's General Plan includes policies intended to attract economically and environmentally sustainable development to the area. The Project will further these General Plan policies by providing opportunities for development of the area that balance economic development with preservation of natural resources through planned and thoughtful growth.

3. Implementation of the Project will provide a range of housing opportunities that will diversify the City's housing stock, support the City's efforts to meet the State's Regional Housing Needs Assessment requirements. The diverse range of home types are also designed to integrate and blend into the City's rural character.

4. The Project implements the City's values of thoughtfully-planned development, local control, quality aesthetics, and meeting community needs. The Project allows the City to regulate development in the area and ensure that it meets the City's high-quality standards.

5. The Project will provide employment opportunities, both in the short term for construction of the Project and the longer term during operation of the Project. The Project anticipates a range of industrial and business park uses, which will provide for job opportunities

across multiple sectors and industries. The Project will facilitate a balance of job-to-housing growth within the City.

6. The Project will attract new employment-generating business to Jurupa Valley, thereby reducing the needs for the local workforce to commute outside the area for employment.

7. The Project's economic and growth opportunities will help to fund necessary proposed critical infrastructure improvements that will serve Rio Vista and the greater Jurupa Valley community.

8. The Project reflects a conscious effort to develop land in a manner that is sensitive to the environment. The Project will create a community design that complements the land's topography by respecting and preserving the geology, rock formations, and basic landforms.

9. The Project will protect valuable scenic resources within large expanses of open space, thereby preserving Rio Vista's character and identity and the surrounding region.

10. The Project will provide a site for a future school, should JUSD determine that a school is needed to serve projected demand. This will help the community to ensure that future educational needs can be addressed. Provide a community park and neighborhood parks to meet the needs of Rio Vista residents and surrounding neighborhoods.

11. The Project will increase recreational opportunities. The Project will establish a cohesive trail system that promotes active recreational uses and provides pedestrian links between the school site, parks, residential neighborhoods, and open space. These recreational opportunities benefit the community's well-being.

12. The Project includes guidelines for architecture, landscaping, entry treatments, walls, fencing, parks, and trails that reinforce this community's identity and its relationship to the City. These guidelines ensure that the Project will be developed in a manner that reflects the policy preferences of the City and its residents.

In conclusion, the City Council has balanced the Project's benefits against the Project's significant unavoidable impacts. The City Council finds that the Project's benefits outweigh the Project's significant unavoidable impacts, and those impacts, therefore, are considered acceptable in light of the Project's benefits. The City Council finds that each of the benefits described above is an overriding consideration, independent of the other benefits, that warrants approval of the Project notwithstanding the Project's significant unavoidable impacts.

Exhibit C

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

FIRSTCARBONSOLUTIONS™

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Rio Vista Specific Plan Project Environmental Impact Report City of Jurupa Valley, Riverside County, California

Prepared for:
City of Jurupa Valley
Community Development Department
8930 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
951.332.6464

Contact: Jim Pechous, Principal Planner

Prepared by:
FirstCarbon Solutions
2999 Oak Road, Suite 250
Walnut Creek, CA 94597
925.357.2562

Contact: Jason Brandman, Project Director
Yael Marcus, Project Manager

Report Date: May 31, 2024

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

PREFACE

Section 21081.6 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097 require a Lead Agency to adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) whenever it adopts an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in conjunction with a project approval. The purpose of the MMRP is to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures occurs during project implementation.

The Draft EIR prepared for the proposed Rio Vista Specific Plan Project (proposed project) concluded that project implementation could result in potentially significant effects on the environment and mitigation measures were incorporated into the proposed project or are required as a condition of project approval that reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, the Final EIR for the proposed project identified additional required mitigation as well as minor revisions to the mitigation presented in the Draft EIR. This MMRP documents how and when the mitigation measures adopted by the Lead Agency will be implemented and confirms that potential environmental impacts are reduced to less than significant levels as identified in the Draft EIR and Final EIR.

This document does not discuss those subjects that the environmental analysis demonstrates would result in less than significant impacts and for which no mitigation was proposed or necessary.

The City of Jurupa Valley will coordinate the monitoring of the mitigation measures and regulatory requirements with each applicable City department or division, while various City departments/divisions would be responsible for verifying compliance of specific mitigation measures and regulatory requirements (see Table 1). Monitoring will include: 1) verification that each mitigation measure and regulatory requirement has been implemented; 2) recordation of the actions taken to implement each mitigation measure and regulatory requirement; and 3) retention of records in the project file.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table 1: Rio Vista Specific Plan Project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
Section 3.1—Aesthetics						
Threshold AES-1: Would the proposed project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	No mitigation is required.	**PPP 3.1-1** As required by the Rio Vista Specific Plan Chapter 2 (Land Use Element), Chapter 3 (Mobility Element), and Chapter 4 (Conservation and Open Space).	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold AES-2: Would the proposed project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a State Scenic Highway?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No impact.
Threshold AES-3: Would the proposed project, 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 proposed project is in an urbanized area, would the proposed project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	No mitigation is required.	**PPP 3.1-1** As required by the Rio Vista Specific Plan Chapter 2 (Land Use Element), Chapter 3 (Mobility Element), and Chapter 4 (Conservation and Open Space). **PPP 3.1-2** Jurupa Valley Municipal Code Section 7.50.010 requires that all utilities serving and within the Project site shall be placed underground unless exempted by this section. **PPP 3.1-3** All outdoor lighting shall be designed and installed to comply with California Green Building Standard Code Section	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
		5.106 or Municipal Section 9.150.040(11), whichever is more stringent.				
Threshold AES-4: Would the proposed project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	No mitigation is required.	**PPP 4.1-4** All outdoor lighting shall be designed and installed to comply with California Green Building Standard Code Section 5.106 or Municipal Section 9.150.040(11), whichever is more stringent.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.2—Agriculture and Forestry Resources						
Threshold AG-1: Would the proposed project 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 nonagricultural use?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold AG-2: Would the proposed project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No impact.
Threshold AG-3: Would the proposed project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?						
Threshold AG-4: Would the proposed project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No impact.
Threshold AG-5: Would the proposed project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland to nonagricultural use, or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.3—Air Quality						
Threshold AIR-1: Would the proposed project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	**MM AIR-1a:** To identify potential implementing development project-specific impacts resulting from construction activities, proposed development projects requiring discretionary approvals or are otherwise subject to CEQA shall have construction-related air quality impacts analyzed using the latest available California Emissions	No applicable PPPs.	City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to project approval.	Significant and unavoidable impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Estimator Model (CalEEMod)—or other analytical method determined in conjunction with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)—and shall be compared with the applicable thresholds of significance in effect as recommended by the SCAQMD or as established by the City of Jurupa Valley as the lead agency. The results of the construction-related air quality impacts analysis shall be included in the development project's CEQA documentation. To address potential localized impacts, the air quality analysis shall incorporate the SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold (LST) analysis or other appropriate analyses as determined in conjunction with SCAQMD. If such analyses identify potentially significant regional or local air quality impacts, the City of Jurupa Valley shall require the incorporation of appropriate mitigation to reduce emissions to the extent feasible, in accordance with mitigation measures recommended by the SCAQMD and the California Air Resources Board (ARB). Proposed mitigation					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	measures to reduce construction-related criteria pollutant emissions may include: • Extending the construction period as feasible in order to ensure air quality daily thresholds are not exceeded. • The use of zero-emission or electric construction fleets to reduce emissions from NO_X, $PM_{2.5}$ exhaust, and PM_{10} exhaust. • Grading activity limitations to reduce fugitive dust or use of construction equipment. • Construction traffic control plans to reduce sensitive receptor exposure to emissions from NO_X, $PM_{2.5}$ exhaust, and PM_{10} exhaust. • The analysis shall address pollution levels near sensitive receptors and require mitigation to reduce emissions.					
	MM AIR-1b: As part of a standard building permit submittal, prior to the issuance of building or grading permits, the project applicant shall provide the City of Jurupa Valley with documentation demonstrating that project construction will use "super-compliant" low-volatile organic compound (VOC) Architectural		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to the issuance of building or grading permits.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Coatings, as defined by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), with VOC content of 10 grams per liter (g/L) or less.					
	MM AIR-1c: Each individual implementing development project shall apply paints using either high volume low pressure (HVLP) spray equipment or other application techniques with a minimum transfer efficiency of at least 65 percent or other application techniques with equivalent or higher transfer efficiency.		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to and during construction.	
	MM AIR-1d: As part of a standard grading permit submittal, the project applicant shall submit documentation to the City of Jurupa Valley that demonstrates that all off-road construction equipment in excess of 50 horsepower is equipped with engines meeting the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Tier IV Final off-road engine emission standards or cleaner. The construction contractor shall maintain records concerning its efforts to comply with this requirement during construction,		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to the issuance of grading permits; During construction activities.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	including equipment lists. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include but are not limited to equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, and engine serial number. The project applicant and/or construction contractor shall submit the construction operations plan and records of compliance to the City of Jurupa Valley. If engines that comply with Tier IV Final off-road emission standards are not commercially available, then the construction contractor shall use the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment (e.g., Tier IV Interim) available. For purposes of this mitigation measure, "commercially available" shall mean the availability of Tier IV Final engines taking into consideration factors such as (i) critical-path timing of construction; and (ii) geographic proximity to the project site of equipment. The contractor can maintain records for equipment that is not commercially available by providing letters from at least					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	two rental companies for each piece of off-road equipment where the Tier IV Final engine is not available.					
	MM AIR-1e: To identify potential implementing development project-specific impacts resulting from operational activities, proposed development projects that are subject to CEQA shall have long-term operational-related air quality impacts analyzed using the latest available California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), or other analytical method determined by the City of Jurupa Valley as lead agency in conjunction with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The results of the operational-related air quality impacts analysis shall be included in the development project's CEQA documentation and shall be compared against thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD or the City of Jurupa Valley as the lead agency. To address potential localized impacts, the air quality analysis shall incorporate SCAQMD's Localized Significance Threshold (LST) analysis, carbon monoxide (CO) Hot Spot analysis, or		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to the issuance of grading permits; Prior to individual development approval of final designs.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	other appropriate analyses as determined by the City of Jurupa Valley in conjunction with SCAQMD. For industrial uses, such as warehouses and distribution centers, the analysis shall consider mitigation measures included in the 2021 California Department of Justice guidance, "Warehouse Projects: Best Practices and Mitigation Measures to Comply with the California Environmental Quality Act," or the latest appropriate guidance available at the time, as determined by the City in conjunction with SCAQMD. For warehouse or distribution center projects, the CEQA analysis shall specify the amount of cold storage space proposed as part of the project and quantify the air pollutant (including toxic air contaminants [TACs]) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with refrigerant use. If such analyses identify potentially significant regional or local air quality impacts, the City shall require the incorporation of appropriate mitigation documented on applicable site plans or operational plans prior to issuance of grading permits or as part of Conditions of Approval. Mitigation					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	should reduce identified impacts to the maximum extent feasible using, among others, measures identified in the Air Quality Element Policies of the General Plan and the most recent Air Quality Management Plan, as well as mitigation from the most recent CEQA Air Quality Handbook available at the SCAQMD. Example topics include, but are not limited to, energy conservation, reduction of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), overall trip reduction, and reduction of particulate matter emissions. The identified measures shall be included as part of the Project Conditions of Approval and approved by the City of Jurupa Valley Community Development Department.					
	MM AIR-1f: Industrial projects in the planning area shall place signs that identify the California Air Resources Board (ARB) anti-idling regulations prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for each industrial building. At a minimum, each sign shall include: (1) instructions for truck drivers to shut off engines when not in use; (2) instructions for trucks drivers to restrict idling to no more than 5 minutes once the vehicle is		City of Jurupa Valley	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of occupancy permits; Prior to the issuance of building permits.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park," and the parking brake is engaged; and (3) telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and ARB to report violations. Project applicants shall submit plans (1) identifying the location of the signs, (2) required details of the signs that meets this mitigation measure, and (3) dimensions of the sign prior to the issuance of any building permit for each industrial building.					
	MM AIR-1g: All nonresidential buildings shall be designed to provide infrastructure to support use of electric-powered forklifts and/or other on-site equipment with a charging stations on the interior and a charging station in the yard for outdoor equipment. Additionally, the City of Jurupa Valley shall require use of off-road equipment be zero-emissions, such as forklifts and yard trucks for indoor areas. Outdoor cargo handling equipment (including yard trucks, hostlers, yard goats, pallet jacks, forklifts, and other outdoor on-site equipment) will be powered by compressed natural gas, propane, or electric engines. These		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of occupancy permits; During project operations.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	requirements shall be noted on all site plans submitted to the City. Installation of the infrastructure to support electric equipment shall be verified by the City of Jurupa Valley prior to issuance of occupancy permits. During operation, the building tenant and/or building owner shall maintain a list of all off-road equipment used on-site. The equipment list shall state the makes, models, and numbers. These records shall be made available to the City of Jurupa Valley upon request.					
	MM AIR-1h: Prior to issuance of building permits for non-single-family residential and mixed-use residential development projects in the planning area, the project applicant shall indicate on the building plans that the following features have been incorporated into the design of the building(s). Proper installation of these features shall be verified by the City of Jurupa Valley prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. • Electric vehicle charging shall be provided as specified in Section A4.106.8.2 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the California		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of building permits; Prior to issuance of occupancy permits.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) Code. • Bicycle parking shall be provided as specified in Section A4.106.9 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code.					
	MM AIR-1i: Prior to the issuance of building permits for nonresidential development projects in the planning area, project applicants shall indicate on the building plans that the following features have been incorporated into the design of the building(s). Proper installation of these features shall be verified by the City of Jurupa Valley prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. • For buildings with more than 10 tenant-occupants, changing/shower facilities shall be provided as specified in Section A5.106.4.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) Code. • Preferential parking for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles shall be provided as specified in Section A5.106.5.1 (Nonresidential		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of building permits; Prior to issuance of occupancy permits.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code.					
Threshold AIR-2: Would the proposed project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard?	Implementation of MM AIR-1a through MM AIR-1i**.**	**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 implementing best available dust control measures during construction activities that generate fugitive dust, such as earthmoving and stockpiling activities, grading, and equipment travel on unpaved roads. **PPP 3.3-2** The project is required to comply with California Code of Regulations Title 13, Division 3, Chapter 1, Article 4.5, Section 2025, "Regulation to Reduce Emissions of Diesel Particulate Matter, Oxides of Nitrogen and Other Criteria Pollutants from In-Use Heavy-Duty Diesel-Fueled Vehicles" and California Code of Regulations Title 13, Division 3, Chapter 10, Article 1, Section 2485, "Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling."	See Threshold AIR-1.	See Threshold AIR-1.	See Threshold AIR-1.	Significant and unavoidable impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
		PPP 3.3-3 The project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113, "Architectural Coatings" and Rule 431.2, "Sulfur Content of Liquid Fuels." Adherence to Rule 1113 limits the release of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) into the atmosphere during painting and application of other surface coatings. Adherence to Rule 431.2 limits the release of sulfur dioxide (SO2) into the atmosphere from fuel burning. **PPP 3.3-4** The project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1186 "PM10 Emissions from Paved and Unpaved Roads and Livestock Operations" and Rule 1186.1, "Less-Polluting Street Sweepers." Adherence to Rule 1186 and Rule 1186.1 reduces the release of criteria pollutant emissions into the atmosphere during construction. **PPP 3.3-6** The project must comply with the Provisions of South Coast Air Quality				

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
		Management District Rules 2305 and 316 (Warehouse Indirect Source Rule). Adherence to Rules 2305 and 316 would implement the WAIRE program designed to reduce harmful air pollution caused by warehouse-related activities.				
Threshold AIR-3: Would the proposed project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard?	**MM AIR-3a:** The City of Jurupa Valley shall require minimum distances between potentially incompatible land uses, as described below, unless a project-specific evaluation of human health risks defines, quantifies and reduces the potential incremental health risks through site design or the implementation of additional reduction measures to levels below applicable standards (e.g., standards recommended or required by the California Air Resources Board [ARB] or South Coast Air Quality Management District [SCAQMD]). The Health Risk Assessment (HRA) shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the most current California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the SCAQMD. At a minimum, the project-specific health risk	No applicable PPPs.	City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to approval of final design.	Significant and unavoidable impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	analysis shall include emissions from sources including project trips, evaluated using appropriate emission factors and assumptions; stationary sources; area sources; on-site off-road equipment; Transport Refrigeration Units (TRUs); etc. a. Proposed dry cleaners and film processing services that use perchloroethylene shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing sensitive land uses including residential, schools, day care facilities, congregate care facilities, hospitals, or other places of long-term residency for people. b. Proposed auto body repair services shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing sensitive land uses. c. Proposed gasoline dispensing stations with an annual throughout of less than 3.6 million gallons shall be sited at least 50 feet from existing sensitive land uses. Proposed gasoline dispensing stations with an annual throughput at or above 3.6 million gallons shall be					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	sited at least 300 feet from existing sensitive land uses. d. Other proposed sources of toxic air contaminants (TACs) including furniture manufacturing and repair services that use methylene chloride or other solvents identified as a TAC shall be sited at least 300 feet from existing sensitive land uses. e. Avoid siting distribution centers or other industrial land uses that accommodate more than 100 truck trips per day (or more than 40 truck trips operating TRUs per day, or where TRUs operate more than 300 hours per week) within 1,000 feet of existing sensitive land uses. f. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing freeways, major urban roadways with 100,000 vehicles per day or more and major rural roadways with 50,000 vehicles per day or more. g. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing dry cleaners and film processing services that use perchloroethylene.					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	h. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 500 feet from existing auto body repair services. i. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 50 feet from existing gasoline dispensing stations with an annual throughput of less than 3.6 million gallons and 300 feet from existing gasoline dispensing stations with an annual throughput at or above 3.6 million gallons. j. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 300 feet from existing land uses that use methylene chloride or other solvents identified as a TAC. k. Proposed sensitive land uses shall be sited at least 1,000 feet from existing distribution centers that accommodate more than 100 trucks per day, accommodate more than 40 trucks per day with transportation refrigeration units, or where transportation refrigeration units operate more than 300 hours per week.					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	MM AIR-3b: All future residents of the planning area shall be provided with information that describes the potential health risks from localized and regional air pollution and that the incorporation of an advanced air filtration system has been provided in their housing unit to reduce that risk. The information shall also indicate that the residents have the option to open windows for circulation, however that by opening windows, they reduce or eliminate the effectiveness of the air filtration system within their unit for as long as the unit is open to unfiltered air.		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	During project operation.	
	MM AIR-3c: Prior to future discretionary approval for projects that require environmental evaluation under CEQA, the City of Jurupa Valley shall evaluate new development proposals for new commercial land uses that include gasoline fueling pumps. Such projects shall submit a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) to the appropriate City department. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the most current California Office of Environmental		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to preliminary design review.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). If the HRA shows that the incremental health risks exceed their respective thresholds, as established by the SCAQMD at the time a project is considered, the applicant shall be required to identify and demonstrate that best available control technologies for toxics (T-BACTs), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms to reduce risks to an acceptable level.					
Threshold AIR-4: Would the proposed project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	**MM AIR-4:** Prior to future discretionary approval for projects that require environmental evaluation under CEQA, the City of Jurupa Valley shall evaluate new development proposals for new industrial land uses that may generate significant operational odor impacts, as determined through a review of South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) odor complaint history for similar facilities and consultation with the SCAQMD, to prepare an odor impact assessment and to implement odor control measures as recommended by the SCAQMD or the City as needed to reduce the	**PPP 3.3-5:** The project is required to comply with the provisions of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 402 "Nuisance." Adherence to Rule 402 reduces the release of odorous emissions into the atmosphere.	City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of permit to operate; During project operation.	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	impact to a less than significant threshold, as compared to the applicable significance criteria. Prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy, the City shall require project applicants for projects that have the potential to emit nuisance operational odors to prepare an odor management plan that identifies project design features, measures, and control technologies to ensure compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 402 "Nuisance," which prohibits the discharge of air contaminants or other material (including odors) which may cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to the public or to business or property. The City shall verify that all odor control measures have been incorporated into the project design specifications prior to issuing a permit to operate. During operation of the proposed facility, the City shall conduct periodic evaluation of on-site odors per the schedule and reporting requirements outlined in the odor management plan.					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
Section 3.4—Biological Resources						
Threshold BIO-1: Would the proposed project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or United States Fish and Wildlife Service?	**MM BIO-1a: Flag or Fence Impact Areas** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, or clearing and grubbing, all designated conservation areas within the project site boundary shall be clearly flagged or fenced prior to grading or vegetation clearing to prevent incursion into sensitive habitats. The approximately 510.8 acres of designated areas are identified as "OS-C" on Exhibit 2-7 of the Draft EIR.	No applicable PPPs.	City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Biologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading permits; Prior to ground-disturbing activities.	Less than significant impact.
	MM BIO-1b: Conserve Open Space Prior to recordation of the final map, those areas of the project site not impacted by the proposed project footprint, including Riparian/Riverine and Delhi sands, shall be designated as Open Space-Conservation (OS-C). The OS-C areas shall be deed restricted, and ownership shall be transferred to a City-approved conservation entity prior to recordation of the final map.		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Biologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to Final Map recordation.	
	MM BIO-1c: Special-status Plants A pre-construction survey of the proposed development area shall be conducted by a Multiple Species		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Biologist; City of Jurupa	Prior to issuance of grading permits.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP)-qualified Biologist prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The purpose of the survey is to determine whether special-status plant species are present in the development area. If any of the species are observed, impacts shall be avoided and minimized to the extent feasible. If mesa horkelia or Robinson's pepper grass plants are observed within the development footprint, they shall be salvaged or propagules shall be collected for use in the project conservation area or local restoration projects. If either of these species are found within the development footprint, the applicant shall develop and implement a planting plan to address plant salvage, propagule collection, selection and preparation of a receiver site, propagation and planting methods, maintenance, monitoring, and reporting. At a minimum, the plan shall include the following information: 1. Plant numbers and location on the site. 2. Plant salvage, propagule collection, storage, and growing.			Valley Planning Division.		

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	3. A description of the existing conditions of the receiver site(s) characterizing the suitability of the site(s) for the species, and documenting the acreage of the site. 4. A description of how the receiver site will be preserved in perpetuity, e.g., conservation easement, deed restriction, etc., and the name of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)-approved due diligence entity that shall hold the easement/deed restriction, etc. 5. Qualifications of the supervising Biologist. At a minimum the Biologist shall possess a minimum of 5-years' experience conducting habitat restoration projects in Southern California. 6. Receiver site preparation for planting/transplanting. 7. Transplant and propagule installation methods. 8. Schedule and monitoring period. 9. Performance criteria. 10. Maintenance, monitoring, and reporting procedures.					
	MM BIO-1d: Wildlife Hazards The Biological Monitor shall inspect all excavations for trapped wildlife		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Biologist; City of Jurupa	During construction activities.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	daily. All potential wildlife pitfalls (trenches, bores, and other excavations) shall be backfilled or securely covered at the end of each workday. If backfilling or covering is not feasible, wildlife escape ramps shall be installed, in consultation with the Biological Monitor (as required under MM BIO-1h), sufficient to allow trapped wildlife to escape. All debris piles, construction pipes, culverts, or other such materials shall be securely covered or capped while stored on the project site to prevent wildlife access. All such materials shall be inspected for wildlife before being moved, buried, or capped. If wildlife become trapped, the Biological Monitor shall remove the animal (if feasible and safe to do so) and place it in nearby suitable habitat outside of the impact area. If the Biological Monitor is unable to remove the animal, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or other wildlife authority shall be immediately contacted for guidance and/or assistance. Any wildlife encountered on the project site shall be allowed to leave the area			Valley Planning Division.		

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	unharmed or moved or encouraged to move out of harm's way by the Biological Monitor, if safe, feasible, and permitted to do so. Vehicles traveling on unpaved roads within the project site shall be limited to 15 miles per hour (mph). Construction work shall be limited to daylight hours (and in accordance with the Municipal Code, only between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, excluding holidays). If water is applied to the site to control dust, ponding of this water shall be minimized to avoid creating predator subsidies.					
	MM BIO-1e: Invasive Plants Invasive plant species shall not be installed in landscaping. Design guidelines for the proposed project shall provide the homeowners with a list of native landscaping materials recommended for use within the project site, and the list shall be included in the project Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) (to be confirmed prior to final map recordation). These materials shall be selected for their compatibility with the unique natural environment in the area.		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division	Prior to approval of final design; During construction activities.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	None of the plants listed in the California Invasive Plant Council Inventory (cal-ipc.org) or Section 6.1.4 of the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) shall be utilized in the development design/landscape plans and their use by future homeowners will be discouraged to the extent possible. The MSHCP has identified invasive plants that should be eliminated from open space areas. This list is included in Table 6-2 of the MSHCP. To ensure that invasive plants are not used in landscaping within the project site, the project proponent shall include a list of plant species to avoid within the CC&Rs for the development. To prevent the spread of invasive plants, all heavy equipment used on-site shall be washed, particularly the wheels, undercarriage, outriggers, and other parts that come in contact with soil and vegetation, prior to bringing it onto the project site from other construction sites. Care shall be taken to remove soil and debris that may contain seeds or propagules of invasive plants.					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Any straw, mulch, or similar products used on the project site shall be certified weed-free. Any erosion control planting or seeding shall consist of native species, native seed mix, or other ecologically appropriate, non-invasive plants. Insofar as possible, staging areas shall be placed in areas that have been previously disturbed or have degraded habitat within the project footprint, but that do not show an infestation of non-native species. Staging areas shall be maintained free of invasive species.					
	MM BIO-1f: Urban/Wildlands Interface As the approximately 510.8 acres of open space may be transferred to a City-approved conservation entity, the project shall incorporate design measures to ensure compliance with Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Urban/Wildlands Interface guidelines and requirements. These measures, as listed in Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP, shall address Drainage, Toxics, Lighting, Noise, Barriers, Access, Pets, and Grading/Land Development.		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to approval of final design.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	MM BIO-1g: Nesting Birds To prevent impacts to nesting birds (including raptors), clearing or other work in native habitats shall be avoided during the nesting season. If work cannot be avoided during this timeframe, a nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified Biologist within 3 days prior to site preparation activities (such as ground disturbance, construction activities, and/or removal of trees and vegetation). The survey results shall be provided to the City's Planning Division and the project applicant shall adhere to the following: 1. The project applicant shall designate a Biologist (Designated Biologist) experienced in: identifying local and migratory bird species of special concern; conducting bird surveys using appropriate survey methodology; nesting surveying techniques, recognizing breeding and nesting behaviors, locating nests and breeding territories, and identifying nesting stages and nest success; determining/establishing appropriate avoidance and		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Biologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to and during construction activities.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	minimization measures; and monitoring the efficacy of implemented avoidance and minimization measures. 2. Pre-activity field surveys shall be conducted at the appropriate time of day/night, during appropriate weather conditions, no more than 3 days prior to the initiation of project activities. Surveys shall encompass all suitable areas including trees, shrubs, bare ground, burrows, cavities, and structures. Survey duration shall take into consideration the size of the project site; density, and complexity of the habitat; number of survey participants; survey techniques employed; and shall be sufficient to ensure the data collected is complete and accurate. If no nesting birds are observed during the survey, site preparation and construction activities may begin. If an active nest or nesting birds are present, avoidance buffers shall be implemented as determined by the Designated Biologist approved by the City of					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Jurupa Valley, based on their best professional judgment and experience in accordance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) regulations and the California Fish and Wildlife Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513. The Designated Biologist shall monitor the nest at the onset of project activities, and at the onset of any changes in such project activities (e.g., increase in number or type of equipment, change in equipment usage, etc.) to determine the efficacy of the buffer. The Designated Biologist shall halt all construction activities within proximity to an active nest if it is determined that the activities are harassing the nest and may result in nest abandonment or take. Active bird nests shall be mapped utilizing a handheld Global Positioning System (GPS), getting as close as possible without disturbing the nest. The buffer shall be of a distance to ensure avoidance of adverse effects to the nesting bird by accounting for topography, ambient conditions, species, nest location, and activity type. All nests shall be monitored as determined by the Designated Biologist until					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	nestlings have fledged and dispersed or it is confirmed that the nest has been unsuccessful or abandoned. Construction shall not be permitted within buffer areas while the nest continues to be active. Once fledging has occurred or the nest otherwise becomes inactive, no further avoidance shall be required. An active nest is defined as a nest that is being built or in use as part of the reproductive process, including a nest with eggs, chicks, or dependent juveniles. The Designated Biologist shall also have the authority to require implementation of avoidance measures related to noise, vibration, or light pollution if indirect impacts are resulting in harassment of the nest. Work can resume within these avoidance areas when no other active nests are found. Upon completion of the survey and nesting bird monitoring, a report shall be prepared and submitted to the City for mitigation monitoring compliance record keeping. The Designated Biologist shall also have the authority to require implementation of avoidance					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	measures related to noise, vibration, or light pollution if indirect impacts are resulting in harassment of the nest. Work can resume within these avoidance areas when no other active nests are found. Upon completion of the survey and nesting bird monitoring, a report shall be prepared and submitted to the City for mitigation monitoring compliance record keeping.					
	MM BIO-1h: Biological Monitoring and Clearance Surveys Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a qualified Biologist with experience surveying for each of the following species shall be retained: Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), Southern California rufous-crowned sparrow (*Aimophila ruficeps canescens*), Lawrence's goldfinch (*Spinus lawrencei*), northern harrier (*Circus hudsonius*), great egret (*Ardea alba*), Costa's hummingbird (*Calypte costae*), red-diamond rattlesnake (*Crotalus ruber*), orange-throated whiptail (*Aspidoscelis hyperythra*), and San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit (*Lepus californicus bennettii*). Prior to commencing any project-related ground-disturbing		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Biologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading permits; During construction activities.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	activities, the qualified Biologist should conduct surveys for where suitable habitat is present. Project related activities include construction, equipment and vehicle access, parking, and staging. Focused surveys should consist of daytime surveys and nighttime surveys no more than one month from the start of any ground-disturbing activities. The surveys should include mapping of current locations of special-status wildlife species for avoidance and relocation efforts and to assist construction monitoring efforts. The survey should be conducted so that 100 percent coverage of the project site and surrounding areas is achieved. In addition, resumes/and or statements of qualifications shall be provided to the City by the applicant identifying one or more qualified Biological Monitors that will be assigned to the project to monitor construction activities. Monitors shall be responsible for ensuring that impacts to special-status species, native vegetation, wildlife habitat, jurisdictional waters, and sensitive or unique					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	biological resources are avoided to the extent possible. The City in consultation with the Designated Biologist should prepare a Workers Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training prior to implementation of project ground-disturbing activities. Biological Monitors shall conduct WEAP training to inform construction personnel of applicable mitigation measures and permit conditions, and any potential for infraction and should include effective, specific, enforceable, and feasible actions. The qualified Biologist should have prepared maps showing locations where Species of Special Concern (SSC) were detected and share this information to workers as part of training. The qualified Biologist shall meet with the construction crew at the project site at the onset of construction to educate the construction crew on the following: (1) a review of the project boundaries; (2) all special-status species that may be present, their habitat, and proper identification; and (3) the specific mitigation measures that shall be incorporated					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	into the construction effort. The qualified Biologist should communicate to workers that upon encounter with a SSC, work must stop, a qualified Biologist must be notified, and work may only resume once a qualified Biologist has determined that it is safe to do so. Any contractor or employee that inadvertently kills or injures a special-status animal, or finds one either dead, injured, or entrapped, should immediately report the incident to the qualified Biologist and/or on-site representative identified in the worker training. The Biological Monitor shall submit a weekly report to the City inspector, and shall promptly identify any concerns or violations, as needed. A Biological Monitor shall be present during initial site clearing activities (vegetation clearing, soil preparation, and ground disturbance), during work adjacent to avoided Delhi soils and jurisdictional waters and Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Riparian/Riverine habitat, and at appropriate intervals throughout construction to ensure					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	compliance with mitigation measures and regulatory permit conditions. In addition, a qualified Biologist shall conduct clearance surveys for special-status plant or wildlife resources within or adjacent to the project disturbance area within three calendar days prior to initial vegetation clearing and ground disturbance, including fence installation. Daily biological monitoring should be conducted during any activities involving vegetation clearing or modification of natural habitat. Surveys for SSC should be conducted prior to the initiation of each day of vegetation removal activities in suitable habitat. Surveys for SSC should be conducted in the areas flagged in earlier surveys before construction and activities may occur in or adjacent to those areas. Work may only occur in these areas after a qualified Biologist has determined it is safe to do so. Even so, workers should be advised to work with caution near flagged areas. If SSC is encountered, qualified Biologist should safely protect or relocate the					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	animal per relocation and handling protocols. If any special-status plants or wildlife are found, the Biologist shall take appropriate action as defined in the MSHCP, mitigation measures, permit conditions, and regulations. The qualified Biologist should use visible flagging to mark the location where SSC was detected. The qualified Biologist should take a photo of each location, map each location, and provide the specific species detected at that location. The qualified Biologist should provide a summary report of SSC surveys to the City before any project-related ground-disturbing activities. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) should be notified and consulted regarding the presence of any special-status wildlife species found on-site during surveys. If an Endangered Species Act-listed species is found prior to or during grading of the site, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) should also be notified. If any special-status or listed species are/have been observed on or in proximity to the project site,					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	permittee shall submit California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) forms and maps to the CNDDB within 5 working days of the sightings. Additional avoidance and minimization measures may need to be developed with the CDFW/USFW. Where applicable, wildlife should be protected, allowed to move away on its own (non-invasive, passive relocation), or relocated to adjacent appropriate habitat within the open space on-site or in suitable habitat adjacent to the project area (either way, at least 200 feet from the grading limits). Special status wildlife should be captured only by a qualified Biologist. The qualified Biologist should prepare a species-specific list (or plan) of proper handling and relocation protocols and a map of suitable and safe relocation areas. The list (or plan) of protocols should be implemented during project construction and activities/biological construction monitoring. The City/qualified Biologist may consult with the CDFW/USFWS to prepare species-specific protocols for proper handling and relocation procedures.					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Only a USFWS approved Biologist should be authorized to capture and relocate Endangered Species Act-listed species. A relocation plan should be submitted to CDFW and USFWS for review and comment prior to implementing project-related ground-disturbing activities. If any SSC are harmed during relocation or a dead or injured animal is found, work in the immediate area should stop immediately, the qualified Biologist should be notified, and dead or injured wildlife documented immediately. The qualified Biologist should contact the USFWS, CDFW, and the City by telephone by the end of the day, or at the beginning of the next working day if the agency office is closed. In addition, a formal report should be sent to the City, CDFW, and USFWS (as appropriate) within three calendar days of the incident or finding. The report should include the date, time of the finding or incident (if known), and location of the carcass or injured animal and circumstances of its death or injury (if known). Work in the immediate area may only resume once the proper					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	notifications have been made and additional mitigation measures have been identified to prevent additional injury or death. Monitoring and survey activities shall be documented, and summaries shall be submitted on a monthly basis during periods of project activity until project completion or monitoring is complete. Monitoring reports of any passively relocated species shall also be included. At the conclusion of project construction activities, a final construction report shall be submitted to CDFW and the City at least two weeks after the proposed project is fully completed including color photographs of before and after project-related activities, including the surrounding staging areas. The construction report at a minimum shall contain pre-project photographs, total amount of area impacted post-project, post-project photographs, and biological survey notes (including construction monitoring). All monitoring reports and communications shall be retained in project files to allow review by the lead agency and Wildlife Agencies.					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	MM BIO-1i: Burrowing Owl a) Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Planning Division shall verify that the burrowing owl breeding season protocol survey is not more than one year old. If it is older than one year, an updated breeding season protocol survey for burrowing owl shall be conducted within all suitable burrowing owl habitat on the site and a 150-meter buffer. A copy of the report shall be provided to the Planning Division and to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) (jointly referred to as the Wildlife Agencies) before grading occurs. If one or more owl-occupied burrows are identified by the breeding season protocol survey, then the project applicant shall immediately prepare a Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan (BOPaRP) for review and approval by USFWS and CDFW, without deferring such preparation to a later time, and the 30-day pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall no		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Biologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of a grading permit; During project construction.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	longer be required. The proposed BOPaRP shall be submitted to the two Wildlife Agencies through the City once the City has reviewed the Draft BOPaRP. b) If no burrowing owls are detected in the project vicinity by the most recent breeding-season burrowing owl protocol survey, then, prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a pre-construction burrowing owl survey in accordance with the March 2006 Burrowing Owl Survey Instructions for the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Plan Area shall be conducted by a qualified Biologist no more than 30 days before ground or vegetation disturbance, including grubbing, tree removal, or site watering. The surveys shall be conducted as close to the actual construction initiation date as possible. In addition, a preconstruction survey for burrowing owl shall be conducted within 3 days prior to initiation of project activities and reported to CDFW. Additionally, if					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	ground-disturbing activities occur, but the site is subsequently left without further disturbance for more than 30 days, a pre-construction survey shall again be necessary to reconfirm that burrowing owls have not colonized the site since it was last disturbed. If no burrowing owls are observed during all the surveys, site preparation and construction activities may begin. If burrowing owls are detected by the pre-construction survey, the Biologist shall notify the Planning Division and consult with local and State agencies, as appropriate, and develop a mitigation plan. A copy of the plan shall be provided to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division, the CDFW, and the USFWS field office in Palm Springs with written notification sent within 48 hours of detecting the burrowing owls. If owl-occupied burrows are identified on an implementing project site during the pre-construction survey, the project applicant shall					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	not commence activities until the City receives CDFW and USFWS approval of a Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan, as described below. If owl presence is difficult to determine, a qualified Biologist shall monitor the burrows with motion-activated trail cameras for at least 24 hours to evaluate burrow occupancy. The on-site qualified Biologist shall verify the nesting effort has finished according to methods identified in the Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan. A copy of the plan shall be provided to the Planning Division. The BOPaRP shall be implemented prior to any construction activities that may disturb burrowing owls. Mitigation shall be based on the following goals and requirements in the MSHCP: 1. If the site contains or is part of an area supporting less than 35 acres of suitable habitat or the survey reveals that the site and the surrounding area supports					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	fewer than three pairs of burrowing owls, on-site burrowing owls shall be passively or actively relocated following accepted protocols. 2. If the project site (including adjacent areas) supports three-or more pairs of burrowing owls, supports greater than 35 acres of suitable habitat, and is noncontiguous with MSHCP Conservation Area lands, at least 90 percent of the area with long-term conservation value and burrowing owl pairs shall be conserved on-site. The qualified Biologist and the project applicant shall coordinate with the City, CDFW, and USFWS to develop a Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan to be approved by CDFW and USFWS prior to commencing project activities. The Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan shall describe the project's proposed avoidance, relocation, monitoring, minimization, and/or mitigation actions to protect burrowing owls from harm and					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	to maintain their survival and numbers in the MSHCP Plan Area. The Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan shall include the number and location of occupied burrow sites and details on proposed buffers if avoiding the burrowing owls, or information on the adjacent or nearby suitable habitat available to owls for relocation. If no suitable habitat is available nearby for relocation, details regarding the creation and funding of artificial burrows (numbers, location, and type of burrows) and management activities for relocated owls shall also be included in the Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan. The City shall implement the Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan following CDFW and USFWS review and approval. If burrowing owls are observed within project site(s) during project implementation and construction, the project applicant shall notify the Wildlife Agencies immediately in writing within 48 hours of detection. A					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Burrowing Owl Plan shall be submitted to the Wildlife Agencies for review and approval within 2 weeks of detection and no project activities shall occur within 1,000 feet of the burrowing owls' burrows until the Wildlife Agencies approves the Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan. The City shall be responsible for implementing appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures, including burrow avoidance, passive or active relocation, or other appropriate mitigation measures as identified in the Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan. A final survey report shall be prepared by a qualified Biologist documenting the results of the burrowing owl surveys and detailing avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures. The final report shall be submitted to the City and the Wildlife Agencies within 30 days of completion of the survey for mitigation monitoring compliance record keeping.					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	MM BIO-1j: Bat Roosts Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, potential roosts for special-status bats (e.g., caves, crevices, mines, hollow trees, palm trees, rock outcrops, buildings, etc.) shall be inspected by a qualified Biologist within 7 days prior to initial ground or vegetation disturbance. If special-status bats are roosting or hibernating, an avoidance buffer shall be implemented where bats are present and a bat exclusion plan shall be prepared and submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley and CDFW for review prior to impacts. If a maternity roost is discovered during the breeding season (March through October), the Biologist shall determine appropriate avoidance measures, including, but not limited to sound walls, buffers, and construction phasing/timing to avoid and minimize disturbance to the roost until all young are weaned and capable of foraging independently.		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Biologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading permits.	
	MM BIO-1k Crotch's Bumble Bee Because of suitable habitat within the project site, within one year prior to vegetation removal and/or grading, a qualified entomologist		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Biologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to ground-disturbing activities; During	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	familiar with Crotch's bumble bee behavior, as approved by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and life history conduct surveys in accordance with any Crotch's bumble bee survey protocol provided by CDFW to determine the presence/absence of Crotch's bumble bee. Surveys should be conducted during flying season when the species is most likely to be detected above ground, between March 1 to September 1. Surveys should be conducted within the project site and areas adjacent to the project site where suitable habitat exists. If a colony is present, a 100-foot avoidance buffer shall be established. Survey results, including negative findings, should be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) prior to project-related vegetation removal and/or ground-disturbing activities. If a survey finds that a Crotch's bumble bee colony is present on the project site or Crotch's bumble bee are observed during project activities, the project Biologist shall consult with CDFW. The qualified Biologist should identify the location of all				construction activities.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	nests in or adjacent to the project site. If project activities could result in disturbance or potential take, the qualified Biologist, in coordination with the CDFW, should expand the buffer zone as necessary to prevent disturbance or take. If the proposed project impacts Crotch's bumble bee, an Incidental Take Permit from the CDFW shall be obtained pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 2081 subdivision (b) and/or other mitigation shall be implemented as required by the CDFW.					
	MM BIO-1l Noise Plan Prior to approval of the Final Design, a Noise Plan shall be submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley for review and approval. Proposed The Noise Plan shall identify noise generating land uses that may affecting the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Conservation Area and shall incorporate setbacks, berms or walls to minimize the effects of noise on MSHCP Conservation Area resources pursuant to applicable rules, regulations and guidelines related to land use noise standards. For planning purposes, wildlife within the MSHCP Conservation		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to approval of final design.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Area should not be subject to noise that would exceed residential noise standards. The Noise Plan shall include monitoring during construction and post-project to demonstrate noise levels in the Conservation Area do not exceed residential standards. If noise standards are exceeded, the project applicant is responsible for immediate implementation of remedial actions to reduce noise levels to acceptable levels.					
Threshold BIO-2: Would the proposed project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or United States Fish and Wildlife Service?	**MM BIO-2a: MSHCP Riparian/Riverine Habitat** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall provide mitigation for the loss of Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Riparian/Riverine areas at no less than a 2:1 basis, or as determined through consultation with the City of Jurupa Valley and wildlife agencies based on a functions and values analysis. Equal or greater value mitigation shall be provided in the form of one or more of the following: off-site acquisition and preservation, participation in an approved mitigation bank, on-site creation, off-site creation and/or enhancement, or	No applicable PPPs.	City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Biologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading permits.	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	reestablishment. If off-site mitigation is incorporated, the preferred choice shall be to find mitigation within or adjacent to the Santa Ana Watershed and within Riverside County. If on-site mitigation is proposed, a Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (MMRP) shall be developed and provided for review and approval by local and other regional regulatory agencies and shall include, but not be limited to, the following: • Recommendations for soil preparation. • A plant palette to include native species appropriate for the project site. • Planting methods. • Irrigation and maintenance requirements. • Quantitative success criteria (vegetation cover and species richness). • • A long-term management plan.					
	MM BIO-2b: Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP),		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading permits.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	employing standard Best Management Practices (BMPs), to prevent discharges from entering jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands during construction. BMPs shall include, but not be limited to: • Use of erosion control or sedimentation prevention methods, such as fiber rolls, sand or gravel bags, rice mats, straw wattles, or similar measures, where appropriate. • Proper use and disposal of oil, gasoline, diesel fuel, antifreeze, and other toxic substances.					
Threshold BIO-3: Would the proposed project have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	**MM BIO-3a: RWQCB Jurisdictional Areas** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall consult with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to determine the need and if necessary, obtain a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit under the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.	No applicable PPPs.	City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading permits.	Less than significant impact.
	MM BIO-3b: CDFW Jurisdictional Areas Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall enter into an agreement with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) (via issuance and		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading permits.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	implementation of a Streambed Alteration Agreement, Section 1600) to replace State jurisdictional streambeds and wetlands impacted by the project at no less than a 2:1 ratio, or as specified by the CDFW, through a combination of off-site acquisition and preservation, participation in an approved mitigation bank, and/or on-site or off-site creation, enhancement, or reestablishment of streambed. The exact ratio shall be based on a functions and values assessment.					
Threshold BIO-4: Would the proposed project 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 wildlife nursery sites?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold BIO-5: Would the proposed project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	**MM BIO-5: Palmer's Oak** Prior to the recordation of the Final Map, a lettered open space lot shall be identified to avoid the Palmer's oak and a minimum of 200 feet beyond its mapped limits, as mapped in the Revised Updated Biological Resources Assessment, Jurisdictional Delineation, Multiple	No applicable PPPs.	City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to Final Map recordation; During construction activities.	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Narrow Endemic Plant, Burrowing Owl Breeding Season, and Two-year Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly Focused Surveys for Rio Vista, Specific Plan 16001, Jurupa Valley, Riverside County, California, prepared by L&L Environmental, Inc. in December 2016 and most recently updated in September 2023. No project-related construction activities may occur within the tree's mapped limit and the 200-foot buffer. This includes, but is not limited to, staging of supplies and equipment, vegetation removal, grading, stockpiling, paving, and any other activity related to development of the proposed project. A City-approved conservation entity shall be responsible for maintenance of the natural open space areas, which includes the area of the Palmer's oak, and it would monitor the health of this tree. The area surrounding the Palmer's oak would be designated as a preserve with limited public access. In addition, no heavy equipment may operate within 259 feet of the mapped limits of the tree.					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
Threshold BIO-6: Would the proposed project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan?	Implement MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-1c, MM BIO-1e, MM BIO-1f, MM BIO-1i, MM BIO-2a, and MM BIO-2b throughout the project site.	**PPP 3.4-6:** The project is required to pay mitigation fees under the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) as required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.80.	See individual MMs in this table	See individual MMs in this table	See individual MMs in this table	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.5—Cultural Resources						
Threshold CUL-1: Would the proposed project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	**MM CUL-1a: Protection of the Hurunga Oak** The Hurunga Oak, also known as the Palmer's oak (*Quercus palmeri*), is both a historic resource and a historic Tribal cultural resource, as defined by Public Resources Code Section 21074 (a) (1) (A). It is called the "Hurunga Oak" by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation. Direct or indirect impacts to the Hurunga Oak, located within a portion of the Native American sacred area (MRN 45), resulting from the proposed project that may lead to its decay or death would constitute a significant impact on the environment. To ensure the continued existence of the Hurunga Oak, the following steps shall be taken in accordance with City of Jurupa Valley General Plan Policy COS 7.1:	No applicable PPPs.	City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to Final Map recordation; During construction activities.	Significant and unavoidable impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	• The project proponent shall design the project to avoid direct impacts to the Hurunga Oak in coordination with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation. Additionally, because the Hurunga Oak (aka Palmer oak) is also a sensitive biological resource, the avoidance area shall include the area identified in MM BIO-5.					
	MM CUL-1b: Rattlesnake Mountain (Junā'av) Park Site The following measures/conditions will be required to reduce the Project's potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impact on Rattlesnake Mountain (*Junā'av*) Ethnographic Area in accordance with the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan Policies COS 7.1, COS 7.2, COS 7.5, COS 7.7, COS 7.8, COS 7.9, and Program COS 7.1.4. • The Project proponent shall name one of its dedicated open space parks Junā'av Park and commission the production of an informational kiosk that will be installed in the park. Installation will occur prior to the approval/sign off of the		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to Final Map recordation.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	landscape and irrigation systems within the park. The kiosk will include photos and/or illustrations and a narrative description of the Rattlesnake Mountain (*Junā'av*) Ethnographic Area and its contribution to the cultural heritage of the local Indigenous population. The information presented on the kiosk will be developed in coordination with the City and the consulting Native American Tribes.					
	MM CUL-1c: California Department of Parks and Recreation 523D District Record Form for Junā'av Ethnographic Area Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project proponent shall hire a qualified Archaeologist identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archaeologist), to provide evidence that a California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523D District Record Form for *Junā'av* Ethnographic Area has been completed that identifies contributing and noncontributing		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Archaeologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading permits.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	resources, describes its historic function or use, and includes a narrative description and narrative statement of significance in accordance with pertinent guidelines. This measure shall be done in conjunction with MM CUL-2b.					
	MM CUL-1d: Rattlesnake Mountain [Junā'av], Jurupa Hills [Sokáva], etc. Educational Booklet Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project proponent shall hire a qualified Archaeologist identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archaeologist), to conduct archival research and prepare an educational booklet for the public that describes Jurupa (*Hurúpa/ Hurú'ŋa/ Húutsuvaxpa'/Haránka*) and its various ethnographic areas (e.g., Rattlesnake Mountain [*Junā'av*], Jurupa Hills [*Sokáva*], etc.) that contribute to the cultural heritage of indigenous population(s) and Jurupa's local history. The project proponent shall circulate the booklet to the Native American Tribes who participated in the AB 52 consultation process for		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Archaeologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading permits.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	review and comment prior to publication if requested. The project proponent shall make the booklet available to the City of Jurupa Valley, and provide the local public libraries, government buildings, etc., with copies and potentially on the City's website.					
Threshold CUL-2: Would the proposed project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	**MM CUL-2a: Photogrammetric Documentation and Viewshed Analysis** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project proponent shall hire a qualified Archaeologist identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archaeologist), to provide evidence that a close range photogrammetric documentation and viewshed analysis (i.e., direct line of sight and 180-degree viewsheds) of all prehistoric sites within the project's direct impact area through the completion of field work. The results of the analysis, including all photos and figures, shall be presented in a technical report attached to the data recovery report. Final reports must be submitted by the project Archaeologist to the City, project	No applicable PPPs.	City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Archaeologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading permits.	Significant and unavoidable impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	proponent, consulting Native American Tribes, the Eastern Information Center (EIC) located on the campus of the University of California, Riverside, and the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) located on the campus of California State University, Fullerton prior to final building inspection and approval (see MM CUL–2f below). The reports shall be transmitted by U.S. Mail, return receipt requested.					
	MM CUL-2b: Archaeological Phase II Resting and Data Recovery Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project proponent shall hire a qualified Archaeologist identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archaeologist), to conduct Phase II testing and a data recovery program, if avoidance is not feasible, through the completion of field work to City of Jurupa Valley standards. Based on the current project design, the testing and data recovery (as needed) will apply to 13 impacted archaeological resources within the project's direct impact area, and		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Archaeologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading permits.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	any additional resources within 100 feet of the project impact limits. In addition, surface collection of the four prehistoric isolates that fall within the project's direct impact area (33-024196 [MRN 33], 33-024772 [MRN 36], 33-024774 [MRN 38], and 33-024775 [MRN 39]) shall be included in the data recovery plan. If the project design changes, the sites that are impacted may correspondingly change (see MM CUL-2h below). The Phase II testing and data recovery program shall include preparation of a testing and data recovery plan, completion of testing and data recovery field work, archival research, lab analysis of artifacts recovered, preparation of a data recovery report, and curation of archaeological materials in a local museum or repository or an agreement that artifacts/materials shall be buried within a designated conservation area within the project area limits. The data recovery plan must include an archaeological research design for prehistoric archaeological resources that presents specific research					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	domains/themes of interest, offer questions that shall be investigated through archaeological research and analysis, and identify data requirements necessary to address those questions. The plan shall also include, at a minimum, the following: site descriptions, background contexts, field methods, lab methods, reporting requirements, and a curation agreement with a local repository or a repatriation agreement with consulting Native American Tribes. The plan shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist and circulated for review and comment to the consulting Native American Tribes and the City prior to implementation.					
	MM CUL-2d: Cultural Resources Management Plan Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project proponent shall hire a qualified Archaeologist identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archaeologist), to prepare, in consultation with the consulting Native American Tribes, the contractor, and the City, a Cultural		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Archaeologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading permits.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Resources Management Plan (CRMP), to address the details, timing and responsibility of all archaeological and Tribal cultural activities that shall occur on the project site. A consulting Native American Tribe is defined as a Tribe that initiated the AB 52 Tribal consultation process for the project, has not opted out of the AB 52 consultation process, and is engaged in or has completed AB 52 consultation with the City as provided for in California Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.2(b)(1) of AB52. Details in the CRMP shall include: a) Project description and location; b) Project grading and development scheduling; c) Roles and responsibilities of individuals on the proposed project; d) The pre-grading meeting and Cultural Resources Worker Sensitivity Training details; e) The protocols and stipulations that the contractor, City, consulting Native American Tribe(s) and Project Archaeologist shall follow in the event of inadvertent cultural					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	resources discoveries, human remains/cremations, sacred and ceremonial items, including any newly discovered cultural resource deposits that shall be subject to a cultural resources evaluation. f) The type of recordation needed for inadvertent finds and the stipulations of recordation of sacred items. g) Contact information of relevant individuals for the proposed project.					
	MM CUL-2e: Archaeological Monitoring During Ground Disturbance Prior to the issuance of a grading permit or any permit authorizing ground disturbance, the project proponent shall provide a copy an engagement letter with a qualified Archaeologist, identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archaeologist), to oversee archaeological and Native American monitoring (per MM TCR-1a and MM TCR-1b) on a full-time basis for all grading and ground-disturbing activities until the Project Archaeologist in coordination with		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Archaeologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	During all grading and ground-disturbing activities.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	the consulting Tribe(s) and the City determines that resources are not likely to be encountered. Should any cultural resources be discovered during ground disturbance, the Monitor(s) shall be authorized to temporarily halt all construction-related activities within a 100-foot radius of the discovery while the resource is recorded onto appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 Forms and evaluated for significance per the Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP).					
	MM CUL-2f: Final Archaeological Reports Prior to final building inspection and approval, the project proponent shall provide the City of Jurupa Valley with a draft Phase II testing and data recovery report, draft archaeological monitoring report, draft California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523D District Record Form for the *Junā'av* Ethnographic Area including the photogrammetric documentation and viewshed analysis, draft educational booklet for Jurupa (*Hurúpa/ Hurú'ŋa/ Húutsuvaxpa'/Haránka*), and one or		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Archaeologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to final building inspections and approvals.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	more of the following, (1) a receipt of payment to a local museum or repository for the curation of archaeological materials generated during implementation of the data recovery program and/or monitoring program, (2) an agreement that artifacts/materials will be buried within a designated conservation area within the project area limits or (3) a Tribal repatriation agreement. The Phase II testing, data recovery report and archaeological monitoring report should follow Archaeological Resource Management Report (ARMR) format and content guidelines developed by the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). They shall, at a minimum, present the results of field work, lab analysis, archival research, special studies, and identify the final disposition of artifacts. The project proponent shall provide a final testing, data recovery and monitoring reports. Reports shall address comments from the City, project proponent, and/or consulting Native American Tribe(s). Final reports shall be submitted to the City, project					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	proponent, consulting Native American Tribe(s), the Eastern Information Center (EIC) located on the campus of the University of California, Riverside, and the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) located on the campus of California State University, Fullerton. The reports shall be transmitted by the project proponent or their designee via US Mail return receipt requested.					
	MM CUL-2g: Resurvey of Site 33-003494 (MRN 3) and Site 33-003497 (MRN 6) Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project proponent shall hire a qualified Archaeologist identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archaeologist), to resurvey sites 33-003494 (MRN 3) and 33-003497 (MRN 6). These previously recorded archaeological resources were not found during the current study and may have been obscured. These resources fall within the current direct impact area. Should the previously recorded resources be found, they would be subject to the same treatment measures		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Archaeologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading permits.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	placed on other prehistoric archaeological sites to reduce potentially significant impacts resulting from the project. The results of this survey shall be reported by the Project Archaeologist in a letter report and provided to the City by the project proponent at or before grading permit issuance.					
	MM CUL-2h: Project Design Modifications The following steps shall be taken to reduce potential impacts to historic and archaeological resources resulting from Project design modifications: If at any time, the Rio Vista Specific Plan development footprint is modified, project impacts to cultural resources shall be reviewed by an Archaeologist identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archaeologist) to determine whether additional studies may be required prior to issuance of the grading permit, or prior to any project related disturbances. The Project Archaeologist in coordination with		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Archaeologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading permits; Prior to any project-related disturbances.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	the City of Jurupa Valley, shall determine whether an update of existing literature searches, consultation, or coordination with the NAHC and the consulting Native American Tribes, survey work, Phase II testing, data recovery and/or other work is necessary based upon the nature of the proposed project and resultant impacts to cultural resources or Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs). Project modifications may include, but are not limited to, an increase in development impact acreage beyond what is addressed in this Draft EIR, or within 100 feet of any resources, and/or the addition of recreational trails, trailheads utilizing existing dirt paths, or any other development that may increase public accessibility and the potential for vandalism or disturbance to cultural resources in areas proposed as open space.					
Threshold CUL-3: Would the proposed project disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	**MM CUL-3a: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains** There is always the possibility that ground-disturbing activities during construction may uncover previously unknown buried human	**PPP 3.5-1:** The proposed project is required to comply with the applicable provisions of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 as well as Public	City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Archaeologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	During construction activities.	Significant and unavoidable impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	remains. In the event that human or potential human remains are encountered, the following steps shall be taken to reduce potential impacts to inadvertent discoveries of human remains: In the event of discovery of human bone, potential human bone, or a known or potential human burial or cremation, all ground-disturbing work within 100-feet of the discovery shall halt immediately and the County Coroner and the Lead Agency shall be immediately notified. California State Health and Safety Code 7050.5 dictates that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to CEQA regulations and PRC Section 5097.98. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the NAHC shall be notified within 24 hours and guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in treatment and disposition of the remains.	Resources Code Section 5097 *et seq*.				

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
Section 3.6—Energy						
Threshold ENER-1: Would the proposed project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	No mitigation is required	**PPP 3.6-1** Construction vehicle operators must comply with CCR Title 13, Motor Vehicles, section 2449(d)(3) Idling, which limits the idling times of construction vehicles to no more than five minutes. Before issuance of a grading permit, the City shall verify that grading plans contain the following note: "A sign shall be posted on-site stating that construction workers need to shut off engines at or before five minutes of idling."	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold ENER-2: Would the proposed project conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	No mitigation is required	**PPP 3.6-2** Before issuing a building permit, the Building and Safety Department will ensure that the Project is designed, constructed, and operated to meet or exceed incumbent CCR Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards and CCR Title 24 CALGreen Standards.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.7—Geology and Soils						
Threshold GEO-1: Would the proposed project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects,	No mitigation is required.	**PPP 3.7-1:** As required by Municipal Code Section 8.05.010, the Project shall comply with the most recent edition of the California Building Code, which	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
including the risk of loss, injury or death involving: i) Ground Rupture? ii) Strong Seismic Ground Shaking? iii) Seismic-related Ground Failure, including Liquefaction? iv) Landslides?		requires the Project to comply with the approved recommended seismic design requirements contained in the Geotechnical Evaluation, EEI Engineering Solutions, and be incorporated in the construction of each structure, to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic hazards.				
Threshold GEO-2: Would the proposed project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold GEO-3: Would the proposed project 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 off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold GEO-4: Would the proposed project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
Threshold GEO-5: Would the proposed project 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?	No mitigation is required.	**PPP 3.7-2** Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit for any lot in PA 11, the City's Building Department standards require submittal of successful results of a Soil Percolation Test for any proposed septic system to ensure soil suitability.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold GEO-6: Would the proposed project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	**MM GEO-6a: Implement Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Plan** Prior to ground-disturbing activities, the applicant shall implement the Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Plan (PRIMP) prepared by L&L Environmental, Inc. on March 20, 2015, and most recently revised on December 21, 2021, and included in Appendix E of the Draft EIR. The measures identified in the PRIMP are listed below, and detailed requirements for each is provided in the PRIMP. • Review Geotechnical Report data • Museum storage agreement • Discovery clause/treatment plan • Preconstruction Meeting • Monitoring of ground-disturbing activities • Large-specimen evaluation and recovery option	No applicable PPPs.	City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to ground-disturbing activities.	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	• Small-specimen sample evaluation, recovery, and processing • Fossil treatment • Final report					
	MM GEO-6b: Paleontological monitoring during ground-disturbing activities Ground-disturbing activities shall be monitored by a Paleontological Monitor supervised by a qualified paleontologist, as defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) 2010 guidelines (Supervising Paleontologist). Monitoring shall be conducted in areas within the project site determined by the Supervising Paleontologist to have high potential to yield fossils, specifically within the Quaternary older alluvial fan deposits present in several areas around the outer edges of the project site. Monitoring shall consist of visually inspecting freshly exposed rock and debris for larger fossil remains and periodically screening a small (25 pound) sample with a 20-mesh box screen for micro vertebrate fossil remains.		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Paleontologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	During ground-disturbing activities.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Monitors shall be equipped with water, screens, and a 10x magnifying lens so that any sediments encountered that are not clean sands or gravels can be periodically checked for microvertebrate fossils. Monitoring shall be conducted on a full-time basis until the Supervising Paleontologist has determined that additional fossil remains are not likely to be uncovered by earth moving or ground disturbance in specific area(s) underlain by a specific rock unit. Where warranted, the Supervising Paleontologist may reduce monitoring to half- to quarter-time based on monitoring results. The Supervising Paleontologist may terminate monitoring of rock unit(s) which do not yield fossil resources after 50 percent of the earth has been moved in that rock unit. Alternatively, if sufficient fossil remains are uncovered by earth moving or ground disturbance, and with consultation with the City of Jurupa Valley Community Development Department, monitoring may be increased in areas underlain by the fossil-					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	bearing rock unit, at least in the immediate vicinity of the fossil site.					
Section 3.8—Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy						
Threshold GHG-1: Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	**MM GHG-1a:** To identify potential implementing development project impacts, project applicants for proposed development projects that are subject to CEQA shall analyze, or shall have analyzed by a qualified air quality consultant, the construction and operational-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emission impacts of the proposed development project using the latest available CalEEMod model or other analytical method determined by the City of Jurupa Valley as lead agency in conjunction with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The results of this GHG impact analysis shall be included in the development project's CEQA documentation. If such analysis identifies that emissions would exceed the latest recommended SCAQMD significance thresholds for GHG emissions, the City shall require the incorporation of appropriate mitigation. Mitigation should reduce identified impacts to	**PPP 3.8-1:** Before issuing a building permit, the Building and Safety Department will ensure that the Project is designed, constructed, and operated to meet or exceed applicable CCR Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards and CCR Title 24 CALGreen Standards. **PPP 3.8-2** As required by Municipal Code Section 9.283.010, *Water Efficient Landscape Design Requirements*, before the approval of landscaping plans, the Project Proponent shall prepare and submit landscape plans that demonstrate compliance with this section.	City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to approval of final design.	Significant and unavoidable impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	the maximum extent feasible using, among others, measures identified in the Air Quality Element Policies of the General Plan and the most recent Air Quality Management Plan, as well as mitigation from the most recent CEQA Air Quality Handbook available at the SCAQMD, and the latest version of the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) *Handbook for Analyzing Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions, Assessing Climate Vulnerabilities, and Advancing Health and Equity.* Example topics include, but are not limited to, energy conservation and efficiency measures, use of renewable energy, reduction of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), use of zero and near-Zero-Emission Vehicles (ZEVs), waste reduction measures, and water conservation. For new nonresidential land uses, the following mitigation shall be considered, where feasible: • The project shall install solar photovoltaic (PV) panels or other source of renewable energy generation on-site, or otherwise acquire energy from the local					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	utility that has been generated by renewable sources, which would provide 100 percent of the expected building load. The buildings shall include an electrical system and other infrastructure sufficiently sized to accommodate the PV arrays. The electrical system and infrastructure must be clearly labeled with noticeable and permanent signage. • Only electric-powered off-road equipment (e.g., yard trucks/hostlers, forklifts, indoor material handling equipment, etc.) shall be utilized on-site for daily warehouse and business operations. The project developer/facility owner shall disclose this requirement to all tenants/business entities prior to the signing of any lease agreement. In addition, the limitation to use only electric-powered off-road equipment shall be included in all leasing agreements.					
	MM GHG-1b: Buildings in the project area will be designed to provide CALGreen Standards with Leadership in Energy and		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of building permits.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Environmental Design (LEED®) features for potential certification and will employ energy and water conservation measures in accordance with such standards. This includes design considerations related to the building envelope, and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC), lighting, and power systems. Additionally, the architectural expression such as roofs and windows in the buildings will relate to conserving energy. Compliance with this mitigation measure shall be verified by the City of Jurupa Valley prior to the issuance of a building permit.					
	MM GHG-1c: Prior to the issuance of building permits for new development projects in the project area, the project applicant shall show on the building plans that all major appliances (dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers) to be provided/installed are Energy Star-certified appliances or appliances of equivalent energy efficiency. Installation of Energy Star or equivalent appliances shall be verified by the City of Jurupa Valley prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of occupancy permits.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
Threshold GHG-2: Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	Implement MM GHG-1a, MM GHG-1b, MM GHG-1c, MM TRANS-2a, MM TRANS-2c, and MM TRANS-2d.	**PPP 3.8-1:** Before issuing a building permit, the Building and Safety Department will ensure that the Project is designed, constructed, and operated to meet or exceed applicable CCR Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards and CCR Title 24 CALGreen Standards. **PPP 3.8-2:** As required by Municipal Code Section 9.283.010, *Water Efficient Landscape Design Requirements*, before the approval of landscaping plans, the Project Proponent shall prepare and submit landscape plans that demonstrate compliance with this section.	See individual MMs in this table.	See individual MMs in this table.	See individual MMs in this table.	Significant and unavoidable impact.
Section 3.9—Hazards and Hazardous Materials						
Threshold HAZ-1: Would the proposed project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	No mitigation is required.	**PPP 4.9-1:** As required by Health and Safety Code Section 25507, a business shall establish and implement a business plan for an emergency response to a release or threatened release of hazardous material in accordance with the standards prescribed in the regulations adopted pursuant to Section 25503 if the business handles a hazardous material or a	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
		mixture containing a hazardous material that has a quantity at any one time above the thresholds described in Section 25507(a) (1) through (6).				
Threshold HAZ-2: Would the proposed project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?	**MM HAZ-2a:** Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit for development of PAs 8, 12, 14, 18 or 19, or the 20th Street extension, whichever occurs first, a limited subsurface soil investigation in the area of the site where the oily debris and soil were removed shall be conducted. If the subsurface investigation results indicate soil concentrations above Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) environmental screening levels, the applicant must obtain regulatory oversight from the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), or the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health under their Site Cleanup Program. A Site Management Plan (SMP), Removal Action Plan (RAP), or equivalent document shall be prepared by a qualified environmental consultant under regulatory oversight and approval that identifies remedial measures and/or soil management	No applicable PPPs.	City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading permits.	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	practices to ensure construction worker safety and the health of future site occupants or other significant impacts. The plan and evidence of case closure and no further action by the regulatory oversight agency shall be provided to the City of Jurupa Valley before issuance of a grading permit for development in PAs 8, 12, 14, 18, or 19.					
	MM HAZ-2b: Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit for any development of the site, potentially hazardous dumped items scattered throughout the site(such as gasoline containers and containers containing vinyl product) shall be properly disposed of before commencement of construction in accordance with the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Occupational Safety and Health regulations. Nonhazardous waste and debris (such as miscellaneous household and construction materials) shall be properly disposed in a permitted facility. The completion of the disposal of dumped items or other applicable abatement activities shall be documented by a qualified		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading and construction permits.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	environmental professional(s) and submitted to the City for review with applications for issuance of construction permits.					
Threshold HAZ-3: Would the proposed project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold HAZ-4: Would the proposed project 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?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold HAZ-5: 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 proposed project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working the project area?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs	N/A	N/A	N/A	No Impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
Threshold HAZ-6: Would the proposed project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	No mitigation is required.	**PPP 4.9-3:** As required by General Plan Policy ME 8.10 Right-of-Way Improvements, developers shall be responsible for right-of-way dedication and improvements that provide access to and enhance new developments. Improvements include street construction or widening, new paving, frontage improvements like curb, gutter, sidewalks, street trees, trails and parkways, installation of traffic signals, pavement markings and annunciators, and other facilities needed for the safe and efficient movement of pedestrians, bicyclists, equestrians, and motor vehicles.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold HAZ-7: Would the proposed project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	No mitigation is required.	**PPP 4.9-2:** The project shall comply with all applicable County of Riverside Fire Department codes (Chapter 8.10 of the City's Municipal Code), 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	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
		availability, and fire sprinkler systems.				
Section 3.10—Hydrology and Water Quality						
Threshold HYD-1: Would the proposed project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	No mitigation is required.	**PPP 3.10-1:** As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Stormwater/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 stormwater runoff to prevent any likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. The City Engineer shall identify the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that may be implemented to prevent such deterioration and identify the implementation manner. Documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) shall be required when requested by the City Engineer. **PPP 3.10-2:** As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Stormwater/Urban Runoff	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
		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, Stormwater/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section C, new development, or redevelopment projects shall control stormwater runoff to prevent any deterioration of water quality that would impair subsequent or competing uses of the water. The City Engineer shall identify the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that may be implemented to prevent such deterioration and				

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
		identify the implementation manner. Documentation on the effectiveness of BMPs implemented to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) shall be required when requested by the City Engineer. **PPP 3.10-4:** As required by Municipal Code Chapter 6.05.050, Stormwater/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, Section E, any person or entity that owns or operates a commercial 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 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the State Water Resource Control Board, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Water Code Section 13000 et seq.), Title 33 USC Section 1251 et seq. (Clean Water Act), any applicable State or federal regulations promulgated thereto,				

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
		and any related administrative orders or permits issued in connection therewith.				
Threshold HYD-2: Would the proposed project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold HYD-3: Would the proposed project 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 which 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	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?						
Threshold HYD-4: Would the proposed project be located in a flood hazard zone, tsunami, or seiche zone, or risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No impact.
Threshold HYD-5: Would the proposed project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.11—Land Use and Planning						
Threshold LU-1: Would the proposed project physically divide an established community?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold LU-2: Would the proposed project 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?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
Section 3.12—Mineral Resources						
Threshold MIN-1: Would the proposed project 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?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold MIN-2: Would the proposed project 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?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.13—Noise						
Threshold NOI-1: Would the proposed project expose persons to or generate 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?	**MM NOI-1a: Construction Noise Mitigation Plan** Prior to issuance of grading and/or building permits, a note shall be provided on grading and building plans indicating that, during grading and construction, the property owner/developer shall be responsible for requiring contractors to implement the following measures to limit construction-related noise: • The construction contractor shall limit commercial construction activities adjacent to or within 200 feet of residential uses to	**PPP 3.13-1:** As required by General Plan Policy NE 3.4 Construction Equipment, all construction equipment shall utilize noise reduction features (i.e., mufflers and engine shrouds) that are at least as effective as those originally installed by the equipment's manufacturer. **PPP 3.13-2:** As required by General Plan Policy NE 3.5 Construction Noise, limit commercial construction	City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading and building permits.	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	weekdays, between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., and limit high-noise-generating construction activities (e.g., grading, demolition, pile driving) near sensitive receptors to weekdays between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. • The construction contractor shall ensure that all internal combustion engine-driven equipment is equipped with mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment. • The construction contractor shall locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction project area. In addition, the project contractor shall place such stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the project site. • The construction contractor shall prohibit unnecessary idling (no more than 5 minutes) of internal combustion engines.	activities within 200 feet of residential uses to weekdays, between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., and limit high noise-generating construction activities between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.				

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	• The construction contractor shall, to the maximum extent practical, locate on-site equipment staging areas to maximize the distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction. • For construction activity within 50 feet of any noise-sensitive receptors, a temporary noise barrier shall be installed by the applicant/developer. This temporary noise barrier shall be installed prior to the onset of construction activities that would require the use of heavy construction equipment. The barrier shall be located between the construction zone and all adjacent sensitive receptor land uses. The temporary sound barrier shall provide a reduction in noise that shall meet the City's construction noise threshold of 55 dBA L_{max} as measured at the façade of the sensitive receptor land uses. The noise barrier shall be a minimum height of 8 feet and be free of gaps and holes and must achieve a Sound Transmission Class (STC) of 35 or					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	greater. The barrier can be either (a) a 0.75-inch-thick plywood wall or (b) a hanging blanket/curtain with a surface density or at least 2 pounds per square foot. For either configuration, the construction side of the barrier shall have an exterior lining of sound absorption material with a Noise Reduction Coefficient (NRC) rating of 0.7 or higher. • The construction contractor shall designate a "disturbance coordinator" who would be responsible for responding to any complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., a bad muffler) and shall require that measures be implemented to correct the problem. • The construction contractor shall designate a "disturbance coordinator" who would be responsible for responding to any complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., a bad muffler) and shall					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	require that measures be implemented to correct the problem. • These measures may only be granted an exception if an application for construction-related exception is made to and considered by the Building Official of the City in accordance with Section 11.05.070 of the Municipal Code.					
	MM NOI-1b: Stationary Source Operational Noise Reduction Plan Prior to issuance of building permits, the property owner/developer shall be responsible to implement the following measures to limit on-site operational stationary noise source impacts: • Any proposed large scale, mixed-use, or master-planned developments shall demonstrate compliance with Noise Policy NE 1.9 and NE 1.10 of the City's Noise Element by incorporating acoustic site planning to the satisfaction of the Planning Director that minimizes potential noise impacts to adjacent land uses to meet the City's standards shown in General Plan Figure 7-3.		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of building permits.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	In addition, in compliance with Noise Policy NE 3.1 of the City's Noise Element, such projects shall submit an Operational Noise Reduction Plan to the Planning Director for review and approval. The plan shall identify specific techniques and measures to reduce on-site stationary operational noise to ensure compliance with the noise performance standards of Section 11.05.040 of the Municipal Code. Noise reduction design features may include, but are not limited to, locating stationary noise sources on the site to be shielded by structures (buildings, enclosures, or sound walls) or by using equipment that has a quieter noise rating. • Any future commercial or industrial development projects that would include stationary noise sources, such as loading, shipping, or parking facilities within 200 feet of a residential parcel, shall demonstrate compliance with Noise Policy NE 3.3 of the City's Noise Element and shall submit an Operational Noise Reduction Plan to the					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Planning Director for review and approval. The plan shall identify specific techniques and measures to reduce on-site stationary operational noise to ensure compliance with the noise performance standards of Section 11.05.040 of the Municipal Code. Noise reduction design features may include, but are not limited to, locating stationary noise sources on the site to be shielded by structures (buildings, enclosures, or sound walls).					
Threshold NOI-2: Would the proposed project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	**MM NOI-2: Construction Vibration Reduction Plan** Prior to issuance of grading and/or building permits, a note shall be provided on grading and building plans indicating that, during grading and construction, the property owner/developer shall be responsible for requiring contractors to implement the following measures to limit construction-related vibration impacts: • For any future development projects that would necessitate the use of pile driving within 100 feet of an off-site structure, shall	No applicable PPPs.	City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading and building permits.	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	submit a Construction Vibration Reduction Plan that identifies specific techniques, such as the depth and location of temporary trenching, that would reduce potential vibration impacts to less than significant for the impacted structure. • For any future development projects that would necessitate the use of large vibratory rollers within 30 feet of an off-site structure, or the use of other heavy construction equipment within 15 feet of an off-site structure, shall submit a Construction Vibration Reduction Plan that identifies specific techniques, such as the depth and location of temporary trenching, that would reduce potential vibration impacts to less than significant for the impacted structure. • The individual project owner/developer shall submit the Construction Vibration Reduction Plan to the Planning Director for review and approval. Upon approval by the City, the construction vibration reduction					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	measures shall be incorporated into the construction documents.					
Threshold NOI-3: Would the proposed project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels 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?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No impact.
Section 3.14—Population and Housing						
Threshold POP-1: Would the proposed project 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)?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold POP-2: Would the proposed project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
Section 3.15—Public Services						
Threshold PUB-1: Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 fire protection?	No mitigation is required.	**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.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold PUB-2: Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 police protection?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
Threshold PUB-3: Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 schools?	No mitigation is required.	**PPP 3.15-2:** Before issuing building permits, the project applicant shall pay required Development Impact Fees to the Jurupa Unified School District following protocol for impact fee collection.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold PUB-4: Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 parks?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold PUB-5: Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical	No mitigation is required.	**PPP 3.15-5:** As required by Municipal Code Chapter 3.75, the project must pay a Development	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 other public facilities (including libraries)?		Impact Fee that the City can use to improve public facilities and offset the incremental increase in the demand for public services that the project would create.				
Section 3.16—Recreation						
Threshold REC-1: 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?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold REC-2: Would the proposed project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	No mitigation is required.	**PPP 3.16-1:** Before issuing a building permit, the Project Applicant shall pay required park development impact fees to the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District according to District Ordinance No. 01-2007 and 02-2008.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
Section 3.17—Transportation						
Threshold TRANS-1: Would the proposed project conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy of the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	No mitigation is required.	**PPP 4.17-1:** As required by General Plan Policy ME 3.17 Public Transit Connections, ensure safe pedestrian access from developments to existing and future transit routes and terminal facilities through project design. **PPP 4.17-2:** As required by General Plan Policy ME 3.36, Bicycle Improvements Conditionally Required require the construction or rehabilitation of bicycle facilities improvements as a condition of approving new development, per Zoning Ordinance standards. **PPP 4.17-3:** As required by General Plan Policy ME 4.1 Equestrian and Multi-Purpose Trails, provide trails for the safe movement of pedestrians and equestrians within and between new developments where appropriate, and as specified in the General Plan and City Engineering and trail standards. **PPP 4.17-4:** As required by General Plan Policy ME 5.5 Transit	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
		Right-of-Way, reserve sufficient right-of-way to plan for and accommodate public transit service.				
Threshold TRANS-2: Would the proposed project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	**MM TRANS-2a: Transportation Demand Management Program** Prior to recordation of the Final Map, the Property Owner shall provide assurances that the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures described below, will be perpetually implemented, regardless of property ownership, and a mechanism for informing subsequent property owners of the transportation demand management plan requirements. These requirements may be accomplished through recordation of covenants, conditions and restrictions and/or the formation of a transportation management association which assumes responsibility for implementation and monitoring of the Transportation Demand Management measures or other measures deemed acceptable by the City. TDM Requirements for Nonresidential Uses include:	No applicable PPPs.	City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Department of Public Works and Engineering.	Prior to Final Map recordation; Prior to issuance of building permits; Prior to issuance of commercial occupancy permits; Prior to issuance of first certificate of occupancy.	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	• Prior to the issuance of a building permit for any phase, the Project Applicant shall consult with the Riverside Transit Authority (RTA) on the need to provide infrastructure to connect the proposed project with transit services and to relocate the existing bus stop on northbound Rubidoux Boulevard at Frontage Road southward to the intersection of Rubidoux Boulevard and proposed A Street. The Project Applicant shall fund such relocation. The Project Applicant shall fund a study on behalf of RTA to determine whether adding bus service along proposed A Street in the project site would be warranted by potential ridership and be practicable for RTA. Evidence of compliance with this requirement may include correspondence from the local transit provider(s) regarding the potential need for installing bus turnouts, shelters, or bus stops at the site. • Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit for any commercial use, future tenants in employment-generating land					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	uses developed pursuant to the proposed project shall implement measures including, but not be limited to, the following: ride-matching assistance; preferential carpool parking; flexible work schedules for carpools; transportation coordinators; providing a web site or message board for coordinating rides; designating adequate passenger loading and unloading and waiting areas for ride sharing vehicles; and including bicycle end of trip facilities including bike parking, bike lockers, showers, and personal lockers. The measures chosen must achieve a total estimated VMT reduction not less than 8.3 percent. This list may be updated as new methods become available. TDM Requirements for Residential Units: • Owner-Occupied Units. Upon a residential dwelling being sold or offered for sale, the Project Applicant shall notify and offer to the buyer or prospective buyer, as soon as it may be done, materials describing public transit, ride sharing, and					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	nonmotorized commuting opportunities available in the vicinity of the Project. Such information shall be transmitted no later than the close of escrow. This information shall be submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division for review and approval prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy. • Rental Units. Upon a residential dwelling being rented or offered for rent, the Project Applicant shall notify and offer to the tenant or prospective tenant, materials describing public transit, ride sharing, and nonmotorized commuting opportunities in the vicinity of the development. The materials shall be approved by the City of Jurupa Valley. The materials shall be provided no later than the time the rental agreement is executed. This information shall be submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division for review and approval, prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy.					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	MM TRANS-2b: Implement a School Pool Program If the Jurupa Valley Unified School District purchases the school site in Planning Area 18 by the buildout of the 800th residential unit and constructs a school, then the City of Jurupa Valley shall encourage the District to implement a ride sharing program for school children.		City of Jurupa Valley.	Jurupa Valley Unified School District.	Prior to approval of final design.	
	MM TRANS-2c: Implement Transit Access Improvements If the Riverside Transit Agency (RTA) or successor, proposes the installation or construction of bus shelters and/or turnouts within the public right-of-way within the boundaries of the Rio Vista Specific Plan, the City shall consult with RTA to issue encroachment permits for up to four bus shelters and/or turnouts. The City Engineer may allow modification of the roadway cross-sections identified in Figures II-4A and 4B, *Roadway Cross Sections,* of the Rio Vista Specific Plan to accommodate bus turnouts and/or shelters.		City of Jurupa Valley.	Riverside Transit Agency or successor.	Prior to issuance of encroachment permits.	
	MM TRANS-2d: Improve Street Connectivity Before the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for Phase		City of Jurupa Valley	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of Phase 1	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	1, the Project Applicant shall install a signal fiber interconnect along 20th Street between Sierra Avenue and Rubidoux Boulevard. If deemed infeasible by the City, the Project Applicant shall pay cash-in-lieu in the amount to be determined by the City to install an equivalent length of signal interconnect elsewhere Citywide.				certificate of occupancy.	
Threshold TRANS-3: Would the proposed project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold TRANS-4: Would the proposed project result in inadequate emergency access?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.18—Tribal Cultural Resources						
Threshold TCR-1: Would the proposed project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal cultural resource that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical	**MM TCR-1a: Tribal Resources Component of the Cultural Resources Management Plan** Prior to issuance of grading permit, or excavation, trenching, cleaning, grubbing, tree removals, grading and trenching, a qualified Archaeologist identified on the County of Riverside's Cultural	**PPP 3.18-1:** The proposed project is required to comply with the applicable provisions of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 as well as Public Resources Code Section 5097 *et seq*.	City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Tribal Monitor; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to issuance of grading permits.	Significant and unavoidable impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?	Resource Consultant List which is used by the City of Jurupa Valley (Project Archaeologist), in consultation with the consulting Native American Tribes, the contractor, and the City, shall include in the Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP) required by MM CUL-2d, the following components regarding Native American Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) as provided for in Public Resources Code Section 21084.3: a) Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, including, but not limited to, planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context, or planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria. b) Treating the resources with culturally appropriate dignity taking into account the Tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	1) Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resources. 2) Protecting the traditional use of the resource. 3) Protecting the confidentiality of the resource. c) Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places. d) Protecting the resource. If the Developer/Permit Applicant and the consulting Tribe(s) are unable to reach an agreement, the mitigation measure shall be considered satisfied if the Developer/Permit Applicant provides sufficient documented evidence that they have made a reasonably good faith effort to reach an agreement, as determined by the City, with the consulting Tribes with regards to items a-d as listed above. If, after conducting consultations in good faith and within the spirit of the definition, the Tribe or local government cannot reach					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	agreement on preservation or mitigation of any impact to a California Native American cultural place, neither party is required to take any action. **MM TCR-1b: Native American Component of the Cultural Resources Management Plan** Consistent with the provisions of Assembly Bill (AB) 52 which recognizes that California Native American Tribes may have expertise with regard to their Tribal history and practices, which concern the Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) with which they are traditionally and culturally affiliated, Tribal knowledge about the land and TCRs at issue shall be considered for inclusion in the Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP) as requested by the consulting Tribes.					
	MM TCR-2: Avoidance and Preservation of Significant Resources and Locations Prior to the issuance of grading permits, efforts shall be devised in consultation with the consulting Native American Tribes, to avoid specific locations based on substantial evidence provided by a		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to final map recordation.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	consulting Native American Tribe so as to protect the cultural and natural context of the resource through project re-design, and the designation of open space where significant resources are located.					
	MM TCR-3: Conservation Areas Permanent conservation easements or restrictive covenants shall be required and created in consultation with the project applicant, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division, and the consulting Native American Tribes for all open space avoidance areas based on substantial evidence provided by a consulting Native American Tribe. Any and all conservation easements shall be transferred, managed, or maintained only by a third-party entity as approved by the City.		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Biologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to final map recordation.	
	MM TCR-4: Long-Term Management Plan for Tribal Cultural Resources A Tribal Cultural Resources Long-Term Management Plan (TCR TLMP) shall be created in consultation with the project applicant, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division, and the consulting Native American Tribes,		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division	Prior to final map recordation.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	for significant locations based on substantial evidence provided by a consulting Native American Tribe which are avoided in open space areas. The TCR TLMP shall address periodic maintenance, such as any necessary fuels modification, natural deterrents for unauthorized access, etc., in a manner that is culturally appropriate management criteria for the purpose of preserving or utilizing the resources or places, as described in Public Resources Code Section 21084.3(b).					
	MM TCR-5: Documentation and Relocation of Significant Tangible Elements For significant locations based on substantial evidence provided by a consulting Native American Tribes the Project Archaeologist shall submit photo documentation of contributing elements (cultural and natural) of any Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) that cannot be avoided. The resources shall be photo documented using high resolution (at least 300 pixels per inch [dpi]). Bedrock Milling Features (BRMs) that cannot be avoided shall be captured in three-dimensional (3D) images for the creation of 3D		City of Jurupa Valley.	City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to final map recordation.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	models and shall be relocated to mutually agreed upon areas within the 917.3-acre Specific Plan area. These areas must be placed in a conservation easement so they are preserved in perpetuity.					
	MM TCR-12: Retain a Native American Monitor Prior to Commencement of Ground-disturbing Activities 1. The project applicant/lead agency shall retain a Native American Monitor from or approved by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation. The monitor shall be retained prior to the commencement of any "ground-disturbing activity" for the subject project at all project locations (i.e., both on-site and any off-site locations that are included in the project description/definition and/or required in connection with the project, such as public improvement work). "Ground-disturbing activity" shall include, but is not limited to, demolition, pavement removal, potholing, auguring, grubbing, tree removal,		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Native American Monitor; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	Prior to and during ground-disturbance activities.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	boring, grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching. 2. A copy of the executed monitoring agreement between Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation and the Developer shall be submitted to the lead agency prior to the earlier of the commencement of any ground-disturbing activity, or the issuance of any permit necessary to commence a ground-disturbing activity. 3. The monitor will complete daily monitoring logs that will provide descriptions of the relevant ground-disturbing activities, the type of construction activities performed, locations of ground-disturbing activities, soil types, cultural-related materials, and any other facts, conditions, materials, or discoveries of significance to the Tribe Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation. Monitor logs will identify and describe any discovered TCRs, including but not limited to, Native American cultural and historical artifacts, remains, places of significance, etc., (collectively,					

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Tribal Cultural Resources, or "TCR"), as well as any discovered Native American (ancestral) human remains and burial goods. Copies of monitor logs will be provided to the project applicant/lead agency upon written request to the Tribe. 4. On-site Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation Tribal monitoring shall conclude upon the latter of the following (1) written confirmation to the Kizh from a designated point of contact for the project applicant/lead agency that all ground-disturbing activities and phases that may involve ground-disturbing activities on the project site or in connection with the project are complete; or (2) a determination and written notification by the Kizh to the project applicant/lead agency that no future, planned construction activity and/or development/construction phase at the project site possesses the potential to impact Kizh TCRs.					
	MM TCR-13: Unanticipated Discovery of Tribal Cultural		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Native American Monitor	During grading and	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Resource Objects (Non-Funerary/Non-Ceremonial) 1. Upon discovery of any Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs), all construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall cease (i.e., not less than the surrounding 50 feet) and shall not resume until the discovered TCR has been fully assessed by the Kizh Monitor and/or Kizh Archaeologist. The Kizh will coordinate with the landowner or the relevant governmental agency (as applicable) regarding treatment and curation of these resources.			and/or Archaeologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	construction activities.	
	MM TCR-14: Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains and Associated Funerary or Ceremonial Objects 1. Native American human remains are defined in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 (d)(1) as an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness. Funerary objects, called associated grave goods in Public Resources Code		City of Jurupa Valley.	Project Native American Monitor and/or Archaeologist; City of Jurupa Valley Planning Division.	During grading and construction activities.	

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
	Section 5097.98, are also to be treated according to this statute. 2. If Native American human remains and/or grave goods are discovered or recognized on the project site, then Public Resource Code Section 5097.9 as well as Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 shall be followed. 3. Human remains and grave/burial goods shall be treated alike per California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(d)(1) and (2). 4. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment for discovered human remains and/or burial goods. 5. Any discovery of human remains/burial goods shall be kept confidential to prevent further disturbance.					
Threshold TCR-2: Would the proposed project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal cultural 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)	Implement MM TCR-1a, MM TCR-1b, MM TCR-2, MM TCR-3, MM TCR-4, MM TCR-5, MM TCR-12, MM TCR-13, and MM TCR-14.	**PPP 3.18-1:** The proposed project is required to comply with the applicable provisions of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 as well as Public Resources Code Section 5097 *et seq*.	See individual MMs in this table.	See individual MMs in this table.	See individual MMs in this table.	Significant and unavoidable impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1?						
Section 3.19—Utilities and Service Systems						
Threshold UTIL-1: Would the proposed project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Implementation of all construction-related mitigation measures in this table: Implement MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-1c, MM BIO-1d, MM BIO-1e, MM BIO-1f, MM BIO-1g, MM BIO-1h, MM BIO-1i, MM BIO-1j, MM BIO-1k, MM-BIO-1l, MM BIO-2a, MM BIO-2b, MM BIO-3a, MM BIO-3b, MM BIO-5, MM CUL-1a, MM CUL-1b, MM CUL-1c, MM CUL-2a, MM CUL-2b, MM CUL-2d, MM CUL-3a, MM GEO-6a, and MM GEO-6b.	**PPP 3.19-1** The project is subject to compliance with the Rubidoux Community Services District rules, regulations, conditions, requirements, and payment of fees for commercial/industrial/residential projects concerning water and sewer service.	See individual MMs in this table.	See individual MMs in this table.	See individual MMs in this table.	Less than significant impact.
Threshold UTIL-2: Would the proposed project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	No mitigation is required.	**PPP 3.19-1:** The project is subject to compliance with the Rubidoux Community Services District rules, regulations, conditions, requirements, and payment of fees for commercial/industrial/residential projects concerning water and sewer service.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold UTIL-3: Would the proposed project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
or may serve the proposed project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?						
Threshold UTIL-4: Would the proposed project 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?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold UTIL-5: Would the proposed project comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	No mitigation is required.	**PPP 3.19-2:** Before issuing building permits, the project applicant shall submit a construction waste management plan in compliance with Section 4.408 of the 2013 California Green Building Standards Code.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Section 3.20—Wildfire						
Threshold WILD-1: Would the proposed project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold WILD-2: Would the proposed project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.

Threshold	Mitigation Measures (MM)	Plans, Policies, Programs (PPPs)	Responsible Party	Monitoring Party	Implementation Stage	Level of Significance after Mitigation, PPPs, and PDFs
occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?						
Threshold WILD-3: Would the proposed project 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?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.
Threshold WILD-4: Would the proposed project 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?	No mitigation is required.	No applicable PPPs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Less than significant impact.