

# 1. Executive Summary

---

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

This draft environmental impact report (DEIR) addresses the environmental effects associated with the implementation of the proposed Agua Mansa Commerce Park Specific Plan. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies consider the environmental consequences before taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority. An environmental impact report (EIR) analyzes potential environmental consequences in order to inform the public and support informed decisions by local and state governmental agency decision makers.

This DEIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the City of Jurupa Valley's CEQA procedures. The City of Jurupa Valley, as the lead agency, has reviewed and revised all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports as necessary to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on City technical personnel and review of all technical subconsultant reports.

Data for this DEIR derive from onsite field observations, discussions with affected agencies, analysis of adopted plans and policies, review of available studies, reports, data and similar literature, and specialized environmental assessments (aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geological resources, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems).

## 1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

This DEIR has been prepared pursuant to CEQA to assess the environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed project, as well as anticipated future discretionary actions and approvals. CEQA established six main objectives for an EIR:

1. Disclose to decision makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
2. Identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage.
3. Prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures.
4. Disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects.
5. Foster interagency coordination in the review of projects.
6. Enhance public participation in the planning process.

## 1. Executive Summary

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation in CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines; it is intended to provide an objective, factually supported analysis and full disclosure of the environmental consequences of a proposed project with the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts.

An EIR is one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Before approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information in the EIR; determine whether the EIR was prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines; determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency; adopt findings concerning the project's significant environmental impacts and alternatives; and adopt a statement of overriding considerations if significant impacts cannot be avoided.

### 1.2.1 DEIR Format

**Chapter 1. Executive Summary:** Summarizes the background and description of the proposed project, the format of this DEIR, project alternatives, any critical issues remaining to be resolved, and the potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures identified for the project.

**Chapter 2. Introduction:** Describes the purpose of this DEIR, background on the project, the notice of preparation, the use of incorporation by reference, and Final EIR certification.

**Chapter 3. Project Description:** A detailed description of the project, including its objectives, its area and location, approvals anticipated to be required as part of the project, necessary environmental clearances, and the intended uses of this DEIR.

**Chapter 4. Environmental Setting:** A description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project as they existed at the time the notice of preparation was published, from local and regional perspectives. These provide the baseline physical conditions from which the lead agency determines the significance of the project's environmental impacts.

**Chapter 5. Environmental Analysis:** Each environmental topic is analyzed in a separate section that discusses: the thresholds used to determine if a significant impact would occur; the methodology to identify and evaluate the potential impacts of the project; the existing environmental setting; the potential adverse and beneficial effects of the project; the level of impact significance before mitigation; the mitigation measures for the proposed project; the level of significance after mitigation is incorporated; and the potential cumulative impacts of the proposed project and other existing, approved, and proposed development in the area.

**Chapter 6. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts:** Describes the significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project.

**Chapter 7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project:** Describes the alternatives and compares their impacts to the impacts of the proposed project. Alternatives include the No Project Alternative, Existing General Plan Alternative, Reduced Intensity Alternative, and Alternate Land Use Mix Alternative.

## 1. Executive Summary

**Chapter 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant:** Briefly describes the potential impacts of the project that were determined to not be significant by the NOP and public and agency comments received during the NOP comment period.

**Chapter 9. Other CEQA Considerations:** Describes the significant irreversible environmental changes, growth-inducing impacts, and energy impacts associated with the proposed project.

**Chapter 10. Organizations and Persons Consulted:** Lists the people and organizations that were contacted during the preparation of this DEIR.

**Chapter 11. Qualifications of Persons Preparing DEIR:** Lists the people who prepared this DEIR for the proposed project.

**Chapter 12. Bibliography:** The technical reports and other sources used to prepare this DEIR.

**Appendices:** The appendices for this document consist of these supporting documents:

- Appendix A: Notice of Preparation (NOP), NOP Comments, and Scoping Meeting Sign-in Sheet
- Appendix B: Agua Mansa Commerce Park Specific Plan
- Appendix C1a: Air Quality Study
- Appendix C1b: Supplemental Air Quality Assessment
- Appendix C2: Health Risk Assessment
- Appendix C3: Greenhouse Gas Study
- Appendix D: Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis
- Appendix E: Cultural Resources Study
- Appendix F1: Geotechnical Investigation Report Industrial and Business Parks
- Appendix F2: Geologic Evaluation Report Open Space
- Appendix F3: Mine Deformation Study
- Appendix G: Hazardous Materials Reports
- Appendix H: Hydrology & Preliminary Water Quality Management Reports
- Appendix I: Noise Study
- Appendix J: Service Provider Questionnaire Responses
- Appendix K1: Traffic Study
- Appendix K2: Supplemental Traffic Analysis
- Appendix K3: Transportation Impact Summary
- Appendix L: Utility Report
- Appendix M: Water Supply Assessment
- Appendix N: Transportation Energy Use Calculations

## 1. Executive Summary

### 1.2.2 Type and Purpose of This DEIR

This DEIR has been prepared as a “Project EIR,” defined by Section 15161 of the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3). This type of EIR examines the environmental impacts of a specific development project and should focus primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from the development project. The EIR examines all phases of the project, including planning, construction, and operation.

## 1.3 PROJECT LOCATION

The City of Jurupa Valley is in western Riverside County of southern California. Jurupa Valley is bordered by the cities of Eastvale to the west; Norco and Riverside to the south and east; Colton to the northeast; and Ontario, Fontana, and Rialto in San Bernardino County to the north and east (see Figure 3-1, *Regional Location*).

The 302.8-acre Specific Plan area is in the northeastern-most corner of Jurupa Valley and adjacent to the City of Rialto and the unincorporated community of Bloomington in San Bernardino County. The project site is along an existing industrial corridor and on the site of the former Riverside Cement Plant. The site is bounded by El Rivino Road to the north, the North Riverside & Jurupa Company Canal to the south, Rubidoux Boulevard to the west, and a portion of Hall Avenue to the east. A Union Pacific Railroad spur crosses the western project area (see Figures 3-2, *Local Vicinity*, and 3-3, *Aerial Photograph*). Overall, the project site consists of 20 Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APNs): 175-170- 005, portions of 006, 027, 028, 030, 036, 040, 042, 043, 045, and 046; 175-180-001; and 175-200-001 through 005 and 007 through 009. A portion of the canal (APN 175-170-042) is within the Specific Plan boundary near Rubidoux Boulevard. The boundary does not include the private canal (APNs 175-170-007 and 175-180-002) that borders the project site to the south along Agua Mansa Road.

The Specific Plan area is approximately 2.5 miles south of Interstate 10 (I-10), 1.4 miles north of State Route 60 (SR-60), and 2.5 miles west of Interstate 215 (I-215).

## 1.4 PROJECT SUMMARY

The Agua Mansa Commerce Park Specific Plan is a proposed industrial business park with retail overlay and open space development located on the former Riverside Cement facility. The site was used for mining and cement production until operations ceased in 2014. The brownfield site is being decommissioned and prepared for environmental remediation and successful redevelopment under the requirements of the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan area encompasses approximately 302.8 acres of land in the City of Jurupa Valley. The project would consist of three primary land uses 1) an Industrial Park, 2) a Business Park (with possible retail component) and 3) Open Space.

The Industrial Park district is 189.7 acres and would allow for 4,216,000 square feet of industrial park uses, such as manufacturing; research and development; fulfillment centers; e-commerce centers; high-cube, general warehousing, and distribution; and cross-dock facilities. The Business Park district is 33.8 acres and has two options for development: Alternative 1 would develop 200,000 square feet of business park uses; Alternative 2

## 1. Executive Summary

would develop up to 25,000 square feet of retail and/or food service uses as well as 150,000 of business park square footage. Additionally, the Business Park district includes an existing 23,000-square-foot research and development building (CalPortland area). The Specific Plan allows for an additional 41,000 square feet of Business Park use in the CalPortland area either through expansion of the existing building or new construction. The Open Space District is 70.9-acres. Remediation will occur within the Open Space District in accordance with a DTSC approved Response Plan. After remediation, the area is proposed to remain undeveloped.

Table 1-1 includes a summary of the proposed development potential within each land use.

**Table 1-1 Proposed Land Use Development Potential**

Map Area	Specific Plan Land Use Designation	Total Building Area (Square Feet)	Acreage
1	Industrial Park (IP)	4,216,000 sf	189.7
2	Business Park With Retail Overlay (BP)	<p><b>Alternative 1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>200,000 sf of Business Park with no retail</li> <li>Existing research and development building approximately 23,000 sf in size; plus 41,000 sf potential expansion for a total of 64,000 sf</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative 2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to 25,000 sf of Retail with 150,000 sf of Business Park</li> <li>Existing research and development building approximately 23,000 sf in size; plus 41,000 sf potential expansion for a total of 64,000 sf</li> </ul>	33.8
3	Open Space District (OS)	N/A	70.9
4	Railroad Right-of-Way and Canal	N/A	8.4
<b>TOTAL</b>		<p><b>Alternative 1: 4,480,000 SF</b></p> <p><b>Alternative 2: 4,455,000 SF</b></p>	<b>302.8 acres</b>

Additionally, connectivity between Buildings 1 through 5 (Industrial Park) and Rubidoux Boulevard may not be possible because access across the railroad spur line may not be granted (see Figure 3-5, *Conceptual Site Plan*). If access across the rail line is not permitted, then trip distribution for the project would be altered slightly. Alternative 1 has been analyzed as Alternative 1A and Alternative 2 has been analyzed as Alternative 2A to reflect this altered trip distribution.

## 1.5 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

### 1.5.1 Alternatives Evaluated

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an environmental impact report include a discussion of reasonable project alternatives that would “feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives” (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6[a]). As required by CEQA, Chapter 7.0 of this DEIR identifies and evaluates potential alternatives to the proposed project.

## 1. Executive Summary

Based on the analysis in Chapter 5, *Environmental Analysis*, the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts in the areas of air quality, greenhouse gases, and transportation and traffic.

Based on the CEQA criteria, the following four alternatives were determined to represent a reasonable range of alternatives which have the potential to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but which may avoid or substantially lessen any of the environmental effects of the project. These alternatives are analyzed in Chapter 7, *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*.

- **No Project Alternative** (required by CEQA). This alternative assumes that the existing 23,000-square-foot research and development building (CalPortland area) on the site would remain, and leases would be extended/renewed to continue office operations. The existing limestone quarry and cement manufacturing plant structures would remain, and the site would not be remediated.
- **Existing General Plan Alternative.** This alternative is based on a floor to area ratio (FAR) of 0.25 for offices and light industrial across the entire site (294.4 acres (excludes railroad right-of-way)). No heavy industrial or open space uses are allowed under the existing general plan.
- **Reduced Intensity Alternative.** The reduced intensity alternative is based on an FAR for the industrial park of 0.4 instead of the FAR 0.52 associated with the proposed project. The square footage for the business park remains consistent with the development option referred to as “Alternative 1” throughout this DEIR. The expansion of the 23,000 SF research and development building to 64,000 SF is also included in this alternative. This alternative also includes the Park/Open space as with the proposed project. It is assumed that a Specific Plan would be adopted for this alternative.
- **Alternate Land Use Mix.** This alternative assumes an increase in square footage for the business park (500,000-square SF) and a reduction in the industrial park (warehousing) use (2,500,000 SF (FAR of 0.3)) in comparison to the proposed project. Overall building development would be reduced by approximately 1.48M SF. This alternative includes the Park/Open space as with the proposed project. It is assumed that a Specific Plan would be adopted for this alternative.

Table 1-2 provides statistical summary of the project alternatives in comparison to the proposed project.

**Table 1-2 Project Alternative Statistical Summary**

	Proposed Project	No Project/No Development	Existing General Plan	Reduced Intensity Alternative	Alternative Land Use Plan
Dwelling Units	—	—	—	—	—
Business Park/Office <sup>1</sup>	264,000 SF	23,000 SF	3,206,016	264,000 SF	564,000 SF
Industrial	4,216,000 SF	—	—	3,305,300 SF	2,500,000 SF
Railroad Right-of-Way and Canal	8.4 acres	8.4 acres	8.4 acres	8.4 acres	8.4 acres
Park Space	70.9 acres	—	—	70.9 acres	70.9 acres

Note: SF: square feet

<sup>1</sup> Includes light industrial. Alternative 1 considered.

## 1. Executive Summary

### 1.5.2 Alternative Conclusions

An EIR must identify an “environmentally superior” alternative, and where the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the EIR is required to identify as environmentally superior an alternative from among the others evaluated. Each alternative’s environmental impacts are compared to the proposed project and determined to be environmentally superior, neutral, or inferior. Each alternative is summarized below. Based on the analysis, the No Project alternative would not be environmentally superior. The Reduced Intensity Alternative was identified as the environmentally superior alternative.

#### 1.5.2.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The No Project alternative would result in similar impacts to 2 impact categories, reduced impacts to 11 environmental impacts, and increased impacts to 5 categories. Impacts would be similar for agricultural resources and population and housing. This alternative would reduce impacts for air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, mineral resources, noise, public services, transportation and traffic, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems. Impacts to aesthetics, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, and recreation would increase. Impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and transportation and traffic would be reduced from significant and unavoidable to less than significant. Overall, impacts under this alternative would be decreased in comparison to the proposed project.

Moreover, the No Project alternative would not achieve any of the project objectives. The No Project Alternative would not provide any of the project benefits that would occur with implementation of the proposed project, including promoting remediation and reuse of the contaminated brownfield site, the adoption of a specific plan that allows for high-cube logistics warehouse uses, fulfillment centers, e-commerce centers, research and development uses, and retail uses that would encourage private capital investment in the City, facilitating job growth and capitalizing on predictable and marketable future development opportunities, and locating industrial, warehousing, and service-commercial uses to areas readily accessible from major highways or rail traffic sufficiently separated and buffered to protect residential uses.

#### 1.5.2.2 EXISTING GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVE

The Existing General Plan alternative would result in similar impacts to 6 impact categories and increased impacts to 12 categories. It would not reduce any impacts relative to the proposed project. Impacts would be similar for agricultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, and population and housing. This alternative would increase impacts to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, tribal cultural resources, and utility services. As with the proposed project, impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and transportation and traffic would remain significant and unavoidable. Overall, impacts under this alternative would be increased in comparison to the proposed project.

The Existing General Plan alternative meets only one of the project objectives, promoting remediation and reuse of contaminated brownfield sites. The remaining three objectives would not be met: adoption of a

## 1. Executive Summary

specific plan that allows for high-cube logistics warehouse uses, and e-commerce centers uses that would encourage private capital investment in the City; facilitating job growth and capitalizing on predictable and marketable future development opportunities; and locating warehousing in an area that is readily accessible from major highways or rail traffic, and sufficiently separated and buffered to protect residential uses. While this alternative could generate more jobs than the proposed project, there is a limited market and capital availability for this use, particularly for a site with environmental complexity and scale.

### 1.5.2.3 REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

The Reduce Intensity Alternative would reduce impacts to 6 environmental impacts and result in similar impacts to 12 categories. It would not increase any impacts. It would reduce impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise (operational), public services, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems. Impacts would be very similar for aesthetics, agricultural resources, biological and cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, population and housing, recreation, and tribal cultural resources. As with the proposed project, impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emission, and traffic would remain significant and unavoidable. Overall, impacts under this alternative would be reduced in comparison to the proposed project. The Reduced Intensity alternative is identified as “environmentally superior” to the proposed project.

The Reduced Intensity alternative would represent a similar project as the proposed project, but with a substantial reduction in allowable industrial use. This alternative would achieve Objectives No.’s 1 and 4. It would promote site remediation and reuse and would locate new industrial warehousing and service-commercial uses in areas easily accessible to major highways or rail, and sufficiently buffered from residential areas. It is not certain, however, whether this alternative could achieve Objectives No.’s 2 and 3. The extent to which a reduced use could attain these objectives is dependent upon the economic viability of this alternative. With a reduction in almost one million square feet of warehousing uses, this alternative may not be able to absorb the extensive site remediation costs. If this alternative is not economically viable, it would not provide the anticipated job growth, or provide projected economic and infrastructure benefits to the City.

### 1.5.2.4 ALTERNATE LAND USE MIX

The Alternate Land Use Mix would reduce impacts to 5 environmental impacts and have similar impacts to 13 categories. It would not increase any impacts. It would reduce impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise (operational), public services, and utilities and service systems. Impacts would be very similar for aesthetics, agricultural resources, biological and cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, population and housing, recreation, transportation and traffic, and tribal cultural resources. As with the proposed project, impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emission, and traffic would remain significant and unavoidable. Overall, impacts under this alternative would be reduced in comparison to the proposed project.

The Alternate Land Use Mix would more than double business park use (from approximately 264,000 SF to 564,000 SF) and would reduce the allowable industrial use (warehousing) by approximately 40% (from approximately 4.2 million SF to 2.5 million SF). As with the Reduced Intensity alternative, the ability for the alternative to achieve project objectives is dependent upon its economic viability. It is anticipated that this



## 1. Executive Summary

alternative would achieve Objectives No.'s 1 and 4. It would promote site remediation and reuse and would locate new industrial warehousing and service-commercial uses in areas easily accessible to major highways or rail, and sufficiently buffered from residential areas. It is unknown whether this alternative could achieve Objectives No.'s 2 and 3. It is not known whether the site could support double the business park uses, and if so, how long it would take to absorb that level of development of service and retail uses. Moreover, with a substantial reduction in industrial use, it may not be possible for this alternative to fund the extensive site remediation. Given the uncertainty of this alternative's economic viability, it cannot be assumed that this alternative would facilitate job growth and economic opportunities for the City. Even if viable, it would not achieve this objective at the same level as the proposed project.

### 1.6 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. With regard to the proposed project, the major issues to be resolved include decisions by the lead agency as to:

1. Whether this DEIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the project.
2. Whether the benefits of the project override the environmental impacts which cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a level of insignificance.
3. Whether the proposed land use changes are compatible with the character of the existing area.
4. Whether the identified goals, policies, or mitigation measures should be adopted or modified.
5. Whether there are other mitigation measures that should be applied to the project besides the Mitigation Measures identified in the DEIR.
6. Whether there are any alternatives to the project that would substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed project and achieve most of the basic project objectives.

### 1.7 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

In accordance with Section 15123(b)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR summary must identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. Prior to preparation of the DEIR, the Notice of Preparation was distributed for comment from July 19 through August 17, 2017. A public scoping meeting was held on July 27, 2017. A summary of the NOP comment letters received are summarized in Chapter 2, *Introduction* (see Table 2-1). No verbal or written comments were received during the scoping meeting. The scoping meeting was held at the Jurupa Valley City Hall, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509. Comments received were primarily related to the project's potential impacts on land use and planning. There were concerns that the project is inconsistent with the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and that potential hazardous materials on-site may pose a threat to air and water quality.

## 1. Executive Summary

### **1.8 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION**

Table 1-3 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained in this EIR. Impacts are identified as significant or less than significant, and mitigation measures are identified for all significant impacts. The level of significance after imposition of the mitigation measures is also presented.

## 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>5.1 AESTHETICS</b>			
<b>AE-1:</b> The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>AE-2:</b> The proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	No Impact
<b>AE-3:</b> The proposed project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. Furthermore, the proposed project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>AE-4:</b> The proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>5.3 AIR QUALITY</b>			
<b>AQ-1:</b> Operation of the proposed project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	Potentially Significant	No mitigation measures are available.	Significant and Unavoidable
<b>AQ-2:</b> Construction activities associated with the proposed project could generate short-term emissions in exceedance of SCAQMD'S regional construction significance thresholds for VOC and NO <sub>x</sub> . Operation activities associated with the proposed project could generate long-term emissions in exceedance of SCAQMD'S regional construction significance thresholds for VOC, NO <sub>x</sub> , and PM <sub>10</sub> .	Potentially Significant	MM AQ-1 For construction equipment greater than 150 horsepower (>150 HP), the Construction Contractor shall use off-road diesel construction equipment that complies with EPA/CARB Tier 3 emissions standards during all construction phases and will ensure that all construction equipment is tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.  MM AQ-2 The project shall utilize "Super-Compliant" low-VOC paints that have been reformulated to exceed the regulatory VOC limits of SCAQMD's Rule 1113 (RR-AQ-4). Super-Compliant low VOC paints shall be no	Significant and Unavoidable

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>MM AQ-3 more than 10g/L of VOC. Alternatively, the applicant may utilize tilt-up concrete buildings that do not require the use of architectural coatings. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the applicant and/or building operators shall submit construction plans and a construction vehicle management plan to the City of Jurupa Valley denoting the proposed schedule and projected equipment use. The construction vehicle management plan shall include such things as: idling time requirements; requiring hour meters on equipment; and documenting the serial number, horsepower, age, and fuel of all onsite equipment. The plan shall include that California state law requires equipment fleets to limit idling to no more than 5 minutes. Construction contractors shall provide evidence that low emission mobile construction equipment will be utilized or that their use was investigated and found to be infeasible for the project as determined by the City.</p> <p>MM AQ-4 The project shall place signs that identify CARB anti-idling regulations. 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 CARB to report violations.</p> <p>MM AQ-5 The City shall require operators of the proposed facilities to encourage the vendor trucks to incorporate energy efficiency improvement features through the Carl Moyer Program—including truck modernization, retrofits, and/or aerodynamic kits and low rolling resistance tires—to reduce fuel consumption.</p> <p>MM AQ-6 All buildings shall be designed to provide infrastructure to support use of electric-powered forklifts and/or other on-site equipment.</p>	
<p><b>AQ-3:</b> Operational activities associated with the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>AQ-4:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<p><b>5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b></p>			
<p><b>BIO-1:</b> Project development could impact several sensitive animal species</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p><b>MM BIO-1 Preconstruction burrowing owl survey.</b> Within 30 calendar days prior to grading, a qualified biologist shall implement focused preconstruction surveys. Surveys shall be conducted by a CDFW-approved biologist prior to the initiation of ground disturbance (including, but not limited to mobilization and staging, clearing, grubbing, vegetation removal, fence installation, demolition, and grading). In conformance with Burrowing Owl Survey Instructions for the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Area (2006) and California Burrowing Owl Consortium’s 1993 protocols (which are recommended by the CDFW), the surveys will consist of a minimum of three site visits. A brief biological technical report will be prepared and submitted to the City and RCA that describes the results of the preconstruction survey. The report shall be reviewed by the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit. If the preconstruction survey does not identify burrowing owls in the impact area, a grading permit may be issued without restriction. If it is determined that burrowing owls have colonized the project site prior to the initiation of construction, the project proponent shall immediately inform RCA, USFWS, and CDFW and will be required to prepare a Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan for approval by RCA USFWS, and CDFW prior to initiating ground disturbance. If burrowing owls are determined to be present in areas proposed for ground disturbance, the following avoidance measures will be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Occupied burrows shall not be disturbed during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31) unless a qualified biologist approved by CDFW verifies through noninvasive methods that either the birds have not begun egg laying and incubation or that juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival. Owls on-site after February 1 will be assumed to be nesting unless evidence indicates otherwise.</li> </ul>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>This nest protection buffer will be maintained until August 31 or, based on monitoring evidence, until the young owls are foraging independently or the nest is no longer active.</p> <p>Unless otherwise authorized by CDFW and/or the RCA, a 250-foot buffer, within which no activity will be permissible, will be maintained between project activities and nesting burrowing owls during the nesting season. This protected area will remain in effect until August 31 or, based upon monitoring evidence, until the young owls are foraging independently. For burrowing owls present during the nonbreeding season (generally September 1 to January 31), a 150-foot buffer zone will be maintained around the occupied burrow(s).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. If there is any possibility that owls will be injured or killed as a result of construction activities, the birds may be passively relocated during the nonbreeding season in coordination with the City, RCA, and CDFW. Relocation of owls will be performed by a qualified biologist using one-way doors, which should be installed in all burrows within the impact area and left in place for at least two nights. Immediately prior to the initiation of grading, these one-way doors will be removed and the burrows backfilled. To avoid the potential for owls evicted from a burrow to occupy other burrows in the impact area, one-way doors will be placed in all potentially suitable burrows in the impact area when eviction occurs.</li> <li>c. Preparation of a Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan may be required if active and/or passive relocation is necessary. The relocation plan will outline the basic process and provides options for avoidance and mitigation. The relocation plan will be approved by the RCA, USFWS, and CDFW prior to implementation..</li> </ul> <p>MM BIO-2 <b>Least Bell's vireo.</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Planning Department shall verify that construction activities are scheduled (to the extent feasible) to commence outside of the least Bell's vireo nesting season (approximately mid-March until September), depending on when the birds arrive from and depart to wintering areas or whenever nesting birds are present, as determined by a biological monitor with demonstrated LBV experience.</p>	

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>a) Any construction activities that commence during the least Bell's vireo nesting season shall require preconstruction surveys for nesting LBV. Such surveys shall be conducted within three business days prior to construction by a qualified biologist that is experienced with accurately identifying LBV and possesses knowledge of the species' biology and life history. The survey area shall consist of the impact area and a 500-foot buffer around Crestmore Lake and the commercial quarry.</p> <p>b) If any active LBV nests are detected within the survey area, a nest protection buffer of 500 feet around the nest shall be delineated, flagged, and avoided until the nesting cycle is complete. The avoidance buffer may be modified and/or other recommendations proposed to minimize impacts, as determined appropriate by a full-time biological monitor. Supporting documentation shall be prepared and submitted to the RCA and wildlife agencies prior to construction to outline any proposed LBV monitoring activities. In addition, the following measures shall be taken to minimize potential indirect impacts to active LBV nests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Prior to construction, a training program shall be developed and implemented by the project biologist to inform all construction personnel about the federal- and state-listed LBV, the location of suitable habitat in relation to the work area, and the importance of complying with species avoidance and impact minimization measures pursuant to FESA and CESA.</li> <li>▪ Construction contractors shall stage equipment in areas that will create the greatest distance (minimum of 500 feet) between construction noise sources and LBV-suitable habitat.</li> <li>▪ All construction work within 500 feet of LBV habitat shall occur during daylight hours. The construction contractor shall limit all construction-related activities that would result in high noise levels according to the construction hours determined by the City. Construction contractors shall install properly operating and maintained mufflers on all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, to reduce construction equipment noise. Mufflers shall be installed consistent with manufacturers' standards.</li> </ul>	

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Construction contractors shall orient stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from any occupied LBV habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Any construction-related activities that could occur within 500 feet of an active LBV nest will require daily noise monitoring. A qualified biologist who possesses experience monitoring LBV nesting behavior will establish a baseline of hourly ambient noise levels by collecting measurements at several noise monitoring stations using an RCA-approved sound monitoring device (e.g., Mastech MS6700 digital sound level meter or equivalent). Noise monitoring stations will be located 1) adjacent to construction areas within 500 feet of suitable LBV habitat and 2) along the edge of suitable LBV habitat area where access is feasible. The exact location and number of noise monitoring stations will be determined by the qualified biologist. Baseline noise measurements will be collected at the established monitoring stations prior to the nesting season and prior to construction (if feasible). On a daily basis during construction, the qualified biologist shall collect hourly noise measurements at the monitoring stations using the RCA-approved noise monitoring device. If the qualified biologist determines that nesting activities are being disturbed at any time during construction, the noise level that triggered the disturbance to nesting LBV will be recorded and identified as the "disturbance threshold," and the qualified biologist will issue a stop work order to the contractor immediately. All construction activities within the 500-foot nest protection buffer will cease until the noise levels can be reduced below the disturbance threshold. To do this, the qualified biologist shall direct the contractor to make operational changes, utilize technology to reduce construction noise such as mufflers, and/or install a barrier to alleviate noise levels during the breeding season. Installation of noise barriers and any other corrective actions taken to mitigate noise during the construction period shall be completed prior to the LBV</li> </ul>	



1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>nesting season and would be done in coordination with the RCA, CDFW, and USFWS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Daily noise monitoring will continue following implementation of the corrective actions to ensure that the disturbance threshold for nesting LBV is not exceeded and that no further disturbance to nesting LBV occurs. The results of daily noise monitoring measurements will be tabulated, and a summary of all monitoring activities and corrective actions will be recorded in daily monitoring reports. These reports will be compiled and submitted to the RCA and wildlife agencies on a monthly basis.</li> <li>▪ If, after all corrective actions are implemented, the monitoring biologist determines that the normal expected breeding behavior of birds is still being affected, work shall again cease, and the RCA and wildlife agencies shall be contacted to discuss the appropriate course of action.</li> </ul> <p>Any activities in the Open Space District—including remediation or if a recreational use is proposed in the future—shall avoid direct and indirect impacts to LBV habitat, and the applicant will be responsible for implementing the following avoidance and minimization measures, which will be included in project plans, to safeguard long-term conservation and sustainability of the species:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Open Space District will be fenced and will restrict all access, except for areas that are required to undergo remediation or construction pursuant to approved plans. Prior to any public access into the Open Space District and the City's issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy or equivalent documentation for the completion of recreation facilities in the Open Space District, the applicant shall execute and record a deed restriction, conservation easement, or other instrument in a form acceptable to the Riverside Conservation Authority that provides for the permanent protection of the occupied least Bell's vireo habitat, as depicted on Figure 9, Proposed Fencing and Protection Areas, in the General Biological Resources Assessment in Appendix D of this DEIR. The instrument shall clearly</li> </ol>	

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>indicate that the restricted area shall be preserved and no development within the restricted area is allowed other than environmental remediation and routine property maintenance activities, which may occur under the guidance of a qualified biologist.</p> <p>b) A fencing plan that uses both geographic site features and fencing will be implemented to prevent access to the protected least Bell's vireo habitat within the proposed restricted area. A draft fence alignment and proposed feasible buffer are illustrated on Figure 9 of the GBRA, included as Appendix D to this DEIR. The locations of the restricted area, proposed fencing, and any buffer areas are subject to review and approval by the resource agencies party to the MSHCP as well as the DTSC</p> <p>MM BIO-3 <b>Delhi sands flower-loving fly.</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for the area impacted by the Delhi sands flower-loving fly, RCA will purchase 50 acres of DSFLF mitigation credits from the existing Colton Dunes Conservation Bank. The applicant entered into the agreement with RCA for funding and acquisition dated September 10, 2018, amended April 1, 2019. The agreement establishes the terms and conditions for the applicant to contribute to the purchase price of the DSFLF mitigation credits. Payment by the applicant to the RCA to acquire the DSFLF mitigation credits would represent the project's compliance and consistency with the MSHCP goals for DSFLF habitat conservation. If the agreement to purchase the Colton Dunes Conservation Bank DSFLF mitigation credits cannot be consummated, the project applicant may acquire 43 acres of DSFLF habitat within Riverside County or San Bernardino County subject to approval by the RCA and the wildlife agencies and provided the property has long-term conservation value for the species and will be managed in perpetuity.</p> <p>MM BIO-4 <b>Silvery legless lizard.</b> Within 30 days prior to ground-disturbing activities associated with project construction, the applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct focused silvery legless lizard surveys within areas of suitable habitat, to be determined by the biologist. The qualified biologist will be familiar with legless lizard ecology and survey methods and will</p>	

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>have approval from CDFW to relocate this species. The scope of the survey shall be determined by the qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW and shall be sufficient to determine presence or absence in the areas of disturbance. If the focused survey results are negative, a letter report shall be submitted to the City, RCA, and CDFW, and no further action shall be required.</p> <p>If the silvery legless lizard is found during the preconstruction surveys in the proposed work areas during any phase of the project, the following steps shall be taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Silvery legless lizards shall be captured by hand by the qualified biologist and relocated to nearby suitable protected habitat at a preapproved location outside of the project site. This may include areas in the proposed Open Space District or on public lands in the vicinity if approved by the landholding agency.</li> <li>• Construction monitoring shall be required for all new ground-breaking activities within silvery legless lizard habitat. Construction monitors shall capture and relocate lizards as specified above.</li> <li>• A letter report shall be submitted to the City, RCA, and CDFW within 30 days of legless lizard relocation, or as directed by CDFW. The report will document trapping and relocation methods and results and identify any mortality that occurred during the relocation event. This report shall be submitted to the City, RCA, and CDFW no more than 14 days following the last day of each phase of project construction.</li> </ul> <p>MM BIO-5 <b>American badger.</b> No more than 30 days prior to the commencement of industrial business park construction activities, the applicant shall retain a CDFW-approved biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys for American badger within suitable habitat on the project site in brittlebush scrub, eucalyptus grove, and southern willow scrub where friable soils are present. If present, occupied badger dens shall be flagged, and ground-disturbing activities avoided within 50 feet of the occupied den. Maternity dens shall be avoided during pup-rearing season (February 15 through July 1), and a minimum 200-foot protection buffer established. The extent of buffers shall be flagged in the field utilizing a method highly visible by</p>	

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>construction crews. Buffers may be modified with the concurrence of CDFW and/or RCA. Maternity dens shall be flagged for avoidance and identified on construction maps, and a biological monitor shall be present during construction to monitor for adequate protection of all identified dens and to ensure that all flagging is kept in good working order.</p> <p>If avoidance of a nonmaternity den (impacts to maternity dens are not allowed) is not feasible, badgers shall be relocated by slowly excavating the burrow (either by hand or mechanized equipment under the direct supervision of the biologist, removing no more than 4 inches at a time) before or after the rearing season (15 February through 1 July). Any passive relocation of badgers shall occur only after consultation with CDFW and the biological monitor.</p> <p>Prior to the final CDFW or RCA inspection or occupancy, whichever comes first, a written report documenting all badger-related activities (den flagging, monitoring, badger removal, etc.) shall be provided to the City, RCA, and CDFW.</p> <p>MM BIO-6 <b>Southern grasshopper mouse.</b> Prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities (i.e., vegetation removal, grubbing, and grading) during any time of the year, the applicant shall retain a CDFW-approved biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys for southern grasshopper mouse. Surveys shall focus on all areas of suitable burrow habitat within nonnative grassland and brittlebush scrub communities. If this species is observed within the project site during preconstruction surveys, it will be relocated with the approval of the City, RCA, and CDFW, to an approved site with suitable habitat for this species. Surveys and relocation of southern grasshopper mouse may occur prior to construction; however, focused surveys must occur within 30 days prior to construction to ensure that no special-status wildlife is present within the project site during construction. Survey and relocation methods shall be approved by CDFW prior to commencement of grading.</p>	

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>MM BIO-7 <b>Special Status Bat Species</b></p> <p>a. Maternity colony surveys for special-status bat species shall be conducted during the maternity season (March 1 to July 31). If no active roosts are found, then no further action is required. If the biologist detects the presence of active maternity roost or hibernacula (i.e., a non-maternity roost), then MM BIO-7b, -7c, and -7d will be implemented, as appropriate. Additionally, no more than 30 days prior to the removal of trees or structures, the applicant shall retain a biologist holding a CDFW collection permit and a Memorandum of Understanding with CDFW allowing the biologist to handle bats, to conduct preconstruction surveys for sensitive bats within 50 feet of project activities.</p> <p>b. If active maternity roosts or hibernacula are found in a structure or tree scheduled for demolition/removal, the biologist shall survey (through the use of radio telemetry or other CDFW-approved methods) for nearby alternative maternity colony sites. If the biologist determines in consultation with the CDFW and/or RCA that there are alternative roost sites used by the maternity colony and young are not present, then bat eviction procedures as outlined in MM BIO-7d would apply. However, if there are no alternative roost sites used by the maternity colony nearby, MM BIO-7c (providing substitute maternity roost nearby) would be required. If active maternity roosts are absent, but a hibernaculum is present, then MM BIO-7c would not be necessary, but MM BIO-7d would be required.</p> <p>c. If a maternity roost will be impacted by the project, and no alternative maternity roosts are in use near the site, substitute roosting habitat for the maternity colony shall be provided on, or in close proximity to, the project site no less than three months prior to the eviction of the colony. Eviction procedures are outlined in MM BIO-7d. Alternative roost sites will be constructed in accordance with the specific bat's requirements in coordination with CDFW. By making the roosting habitat available prior to eviction (MM BIO-7d), the colony will have a better chance of finding and using the roost. Alternative roost sites must be of comparable size and proximal in location to the impacted</p>	

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>colony. The CDFW shall also be notified of any hibernacula or active nurseries within the construction zone</p> <p>d. If nonbreeding bat hibernacula are found in structures or trees scheduled to be removed, the individuals shall be safely evicted under the direction of a qualified biologist, by opening the roosting area to allow airflow through the cavity or other means determined appropriate by the bat biologist (e.g., installation of one-way doors). In situations requiring one-way doors, a minimum of one week shall pass after doors are installed and temperatures should be sufficiently warm for bats to exit the roost, because bats do not typically leave their roost daily during winter months in southern coastal California. This action should allow all bats to leave during the course of one week. Roosts that need to be removed in situations where the use of one-way doors is not necessary in the judgment of the qualified biologist shall first be disturbed by various means at the direction of the bat biologist at dusk to allow bats to escape during the darker hours, and the roost tree shall be removed or the grading shall occur the next day (i.e., there shall be no less or more than one night between initial disturbance and the grading or tree removal).</p> <p>If an active maternity roost is in an area that will be impacted by the project and alternative roosting habitat is available, the demolition of the roost site must commence before maternity colonies form (i.e., prior to 1 March) or after young are flying (i.e., after July 31) using the exclusion techniques described above.</p>	
<p><b>BIO-2:</b> Project development would impact 0.332 acre of southern willow scrub that is regulated as a riparian habitat by CDFW</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>MM BIO-8 Prior to remediation of the mining pit and subsequent construction of the industrial business park, the project proponent shall obtain a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (LSAA) from CDFW to authorize permanent impacts to 0.332 acre of riparian habitat (K). The project applicant will be responsible for complying with all permit conditions. Such conditions may include, but are not limited to, implementation of best management practices (i.e., erosion and sediment control measures) and seasonal work restrictions, as appropriate. In addition, CDFW is expected to require compensatory mitigation for impacts to jurisdictional riparian habitat. The amount of required compensatory habitat acreage</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>will be based on the functions and values of impacted features. Habitat compensation will be provided at a ratio of up to 3:1 of created to filled or disturbed in-kind habitat, pending coordination with CDFW. This ratio may be reduced through the permit process if CDFW find that a different ratio is sufficient to mitigate impacts to jurisdictional riparian habitat. Riparian habitat K shall not be removed until the LSAA is received from CDFW or correspondence is received from CDFW indicating no permit is needed..</p>	
<p><b>BIO-3:</b> Development of the proposed project would impact 0.332 acre of non-wetland riparian habitat regulated as Waters of the State by RWQCB</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>MM BIO-9 The US Army Corps of Engineers considers the project site outside of its regulatory jurisdiction, and no federal permit is required. However, 0.332 acre of state jurisdictional riparian habitat (K) would be removed during implementation of the project. The applicant will be required to submit a Notice of Intent to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to receive Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs), and all conditions will be agreed upon prior to project construction. The project applicant will be responsible for complying with all conditions of the WDRs.</p> <p>The applicant may be required to prepare a habitat mitigation monitoring plan to be submitted with the agency permit applications, including an agreed-upon replacement ratio of wetlands with the RWQCB. Compensatory mitigation may include in-kind restoration at a minimum 3:1 ratio of created to filled wetlands. If the ratio is increased by the RWQCB, then the more conservative ratio will be used. The amount of compensatory wetland acreage will be based on the functions and values of impacted features. As an alternative to wetland restoration, equivalent mitigation credits may be purchased at a mitigation bank, or the applicant may enter into an in-lieu fee agreement to offset impacts to jurisdictional features. Purchase of mitigation credits shall be subject to approval and verification by the RWQCB. A qualified biologist shall prepare a mitigation plan that provides detailed information about the bank or in-lieu fee agreement and how this approach will result in no net loss of wetlands. The plan shall be prepared pursuant to and through consultation with the RWQCB. As conditions of permit approval, impact minimization measures may also be required and could include implementation of best</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>management practices (e.g., erosion and sediment control measures) and seasonal work restrictions, as appropriate.</p> <p>State jurisdictional features shall not be removed until the permit is received from the RWQCB or correspondence is received indicating that a permit is not required.</p>	
<p><b>BIO-4:</b> Development of the proposed project would impact vegetation that could be used by nesting birds.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>MM BIO-10 <b>Nesting Bird Survey</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. To avoid impacts to nesting birds associated with development of the industrial business park, construction activities and construction noise should occur outside the avian nesting season (prior to February 1 or after September 1). If construction and construction noise occur within the avian nesting season (during the period from February 1 to September 1), all suitable habitats within 100 feet of the project site shall be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nests by a qualified biologist no more than five days before commencement of any vegetation removal. If it is determined that the project site is occupied by nesting birds, Mitigation Measure BIO-10b shall apply.</li> <li>b. If pre-construction nesting bird surveys result in the location of active nests, no grading, vegetation removal, or heavy equipment activity shall take place within 300 feet of non-raptor nests and 500 feet of raptor nests, or as determined by a qualified biologist and subject to review and approval by the Planning Department. Protective measures (e.g., sampling) shall be required to ensure compliance with the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code. The qualified biologist shall serve as a construction monitor when construction activities take place near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts occur. A report of the findings, prepared by a qualified biologist, shall be submitted to the City and RCA prior to construction-related activities that have the potential to disturb any active nests during the nesting season. The nests and buffer zones shall be field checked weekly by a qualified biological monitor. The approved buffer zone shall be marked in the field with construction fencing, and no vegetation</li> </ol>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>



1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		clearing or ground disturbance shall commence within the fenced area until the qualified biologist and Planning Department verify that the nests are no longer occupied and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests.	
<p><b>BIO-5:</b> Project development could conflict with City of Jurupa Valley General Plan policies protecting riparian habitats, significant trees, and other vegetation</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>MM BIO-7, MM BIO-8, MM BIO-9, and MM BIO-10 apply to Impact BIO-5 in addition to:</p> <p>MM BIO-11 A tree replacement planting program shall be implemented to mitigate for the loss of 1,604 trees as a result of the business park development. A project-specific tree mitigation ratio was developed to offset this impact and is based upon whether trees planned for removal are native or non-native and their overall health and condition. A detailed methodology for determining tree mitigation requirements is included in the Tree Removal Impact Analysis and Mitigation Determination memorandum (Appendix K). To compensate for the loss of 31 native trees and 1,573 non-native trees, the Applicant will be required to plant a minimum of 61 native trees and 507 native or non-native trees. Trees shall be selected that provide similar habitat functions and values as the trees planned for removal. Native replacement trees will be 1- to 5-gallon size, or as deemed appropriate by a qualified biologist or arborist. In addition to individual trees, several trees shall be planted in groupings of 10 trees or more, subject to availability of space and where site conditions permit (i.e., topography and soils). These groupings will provide optimal structure and cover to support potential nesting birds and roosting bats. The identification of suitable replacement trees shall be determined by a qualified biologist in coordination with an arborist and/or landscape architect and will be subject to approval by the City's Planning Department. In accordance with MSHCP provisions, the replacement trees shall not include invasive, nonnative species in the portions of the development that are adjacent to the Open Space District, which contains sensitive habitats. Invasive plants that should be avoided are included in Section 6.1 of the MSHCP, Table 6-2, "Plants That Should Be Avoided Adjacent to the MSHCP Conservation Area."</p>	Less Than Significant

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Replacement trees may be planted at entry points, common areas, adjacent to roadways, between buildings, along the perimeters of parking lots, and within landscape screening/buffer areas. All replacement trees shall be planted within the development area and buffer areas between the development area and the proposed Open Space District. Replacement tree stands shall be mostly concentrated within the development area north of the proposed Open Space District and within buffer/screening areas along El Rivino Road.</p> <p>Tree mitigation performance standards shall be incorporated into the landscape plan to ensure the successful establishment and survivorship of replacement tree plantings. The landscape and planting plans shall be developed in accordance with the City of Jurupa Valley's Ordinance Number 2015-17, Chapter 9.50, related to implementing the City's Water Efficient Landscape Design Requirements. The applicant shall be required to maintain the replacement trees on the project site for no less than five years from the date of planting and shall replace any trees that die during this period; this exceeds the City's landscape maintenance requirement of one year per Ordinance Number 2015-17.</p>	
<p><b>BIO-6:</b> Project development could conflict with the provisions of the Western Riverside County Multiple-Species Habitat Conservation Plan</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>MM BIO-1, MM BIO-2, and MM BIO-3 apply to Impact BIO-6 in addition to:</p> <p>MM BIO-12 <b>MSHCP Urban Wildland Interface Guidelines.</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Planning Department shall verify that the following MSHCP Urban Wildland Interface Guidelines are incorporated into the project plans and implemented as conditions of approval for the project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Lighting.</b> Night lighting associated with the proposed development that is adjacent to existing or proposed Conservation Areas shall be directed away to reduce potential indirect impacts to wildlife species, including LBV.</li> <li>• <b>Noise.</b> Proposed noise-generating land uses affecting the MSHCP Conservation Area shall incorporate setbacks, berms, or walls to minimize the effects of noise on MSHCP Conservation Area resources pursuant to applicable rules, regulations, and guidelines</li> </ul>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>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 applicant shall verify that the noise impact analysis to be prepared for the proposed project will include a noise assessment and require mitigation measures to reduce noise impacts from the construction and operation of the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fuels Management.</b> The fuels management guidelines in Section 6.4 of the MSHCP address brush management activities around new development within or adjacent to MSHCP Conservation Areas. The final project design will ensure that no fuel modification will extend into adjacent preserved Open Space lands and least Bell's vireo habitat areas.</li> <li>• <b>Invasive Species.</b> The landscape plans for the project shall not include invasive, nonnative species for the portions of the development areas adjacent to the Open Space District. Invasive plants that shall be avoided are in Section 6.1 of the MSHCP, Table 6-2, "Plants That Should Be Avoided Adjacent to the MSHCP Conservation Area".</li> </ul> <p>The above measures would serve to minimize adverse project effects on conservation configurations and would minimize management challenges that can arise during development located adjacent to preserved least Bell's vireo and/or conservation habitat areas. The project design and BMPs incorporated into the proposed project design will address and minimize edge effects associated with the urban-wildlands interface.</p>	
<b>5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>			
<p><b>CR-1:</b> Eligible historic resources would be impacted by development of the proposed project.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>An Interpretive Exhibit that is open to the public will be developed in the Business Park area. The development of the plant and the important relationship between the cement industry and economic development of the community, and the historical relationship between the plant and agriculture in the area would be explored in the interpretive exhibit. The eligible buildings within the plant, including the Stock House and the White Cement Plant, would be recorded in a Secretary of the Interior's Standards and</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation report, and their key character-defining features would be identified and assessed for feasibility to salvage in a Salvage Inventory Report. Items appropriate for salvage and interpretation would be utilized in the Interpretive Exhibit or donated to the California Citrus State Historic Park or other entities for educational purposes. All other existing buildings on the project site would be demolished.</p> <p>MM CR-1 The Interpretive Exhibit shall be open to the public, present a photographic history of the plant, and showcase other information and artifacts that would educate the public about the historical significance of the plant and the cement industry in the region. The construction of the Interpretive Exhibit shall be completed prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the last industrial building of the Specific Plan.</p> <p>MM CR-2 Prior to issuance of any demolition permit, the Stock House and White Cement Plant shall be recorded in accordance with the Historic American Engineering Record Level III requirements. The recordation document shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian or historic preservation professional. The recordation document shall include a historical narrative regarding the architectural and historical importance of each building being salvaged, relocated, or demolished and its contributions to the history of cement production in the region. The document shall also record the existing appearance of each building being salvaged, relocated, or demolished, in professional large-format photographs, including exteriors, representative interior spaces and character-defining features. The property setting and contextual views shall also be documented. All recordation document components shall be completed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation. Copies of the completed report shall be distributed to the Eastern Information Center at the University of California, Riverside.</p> <p>MM CR-3 Prior to the issuance of any demolition permit, a qualified architectural historian or historic preservation professional shall prepare an inventory of key character-defining physical features of the eligible buildings appropriate for salvage and interpretation in a Salvage Inventory Report.</p>	

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Artifacts that are unsound, decayed, or contain toxic materials (including asbestos, lead paint, PCBs, hexavalent chromium, etc.) need not be included in the salvage process. A qualified architectural historian should prepare the interpretive materials, including historic and modern photos, for placement on a website that the applicant shall maintain for ten years. It would be appropriate for this to be on the City website or a local historic society website..</p> <p>MM CR-4 The items identified in the Salvage Inventory Report shall be made available for use in an interpretive exhibit developed for the project or donated for curatorial and/or educational purposes to a local historical society, preservation organization, or the like. Salvage materials that will not be reused for the project shall be offered for donation or advertised for a period of not less than 30 days on historic preservation websites, in the Press Enterprise newspaper, posted on the project site itself, and by other means deemed appropriate. The salvage efforts shall be conducted by the project applicant. Salvage efforts shall be documented in writing by summarizing all measures taken to encourage receipt of salvage materials by the public. Copies of notices, evidence of publication of such notices, a summary of results from the publicity efforts, a list of salvage offers (if any) that were made, and an explanation of why the features were not or could not be accepted, shall be included in the appendix of the Salvage Inventory Report. The Salvage Inventory Report shall be filed by the project applicant with the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department after completion of the salvage</p>	
<p><b>CR-2:</b> Potentially undiscovered archaeological resources could be impacted by project development.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>MM CR-5 <b>Archaeological Monitoring.</b> A qualified archaeologist shall be retained by the developer prior to the issuance of a grading permit. If unanticipated discoveries are made during construction, all work will halt within 50 feet until the resource can be evaluated by the on-call qualified archaeologist. The project archaeologist will be allowed to make an evaluation of the find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure CR-12 shall apply.</p> <p>MM CR-6 <b>Archeological Treatment Plan.</b> If a significant archaeological resource(s) is discovered on the property, ground-disturbing activities</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). The archaeological monitor, the project proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented by the archaeologist to protect the identified archaeological resource(s) from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the archaeological resource(s) in accordance with current professional archaeology standards (typically this sampling level is 2 to 5 percent of the volume of the cultural deposit). At the completion of the laboratory analysis, any recovered archaeological resources shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department and the Eastern Information Center.</p>	
<b>5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>			
<p><b>GEO-1(i):</b> The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault. (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)</p>	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	No Impact

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>GEO-1(ii),(iii),(iv):</b> The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving , strong seismic ground shaking.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>GEO-2:</b> The proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>GEO-3:</b> Project development could exacerbate existing hazards related to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	Potentially Significant	<p>MM GEO-1 Prior to commencement of mass excavation and grading, the project applicant shall coordinate with the excavation/grading contractor, civil engineer and geotechnical consultant to provide a detailed work schedule to the City. This team shall be available to meet onsite with the City inspector, if requested, to address schedule details and any issues related to the geotechnical aspects of site grading.</p> <p>MM GEO-2 Prior to construction, to reduce hazards related to geologic conditions onsite, including the potential for settlement from collapsible soils and foundational damage from expansive soils, remedial grading may include but shall not be limited to the following :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All vegetation and deleterious materials shall be disposed of off-site prior to initiation of grading operations.</li> <li>• Soil over-excavation shall extend laterally a distance equal to the depth of removal but no less than five feet beyond the limits of the structures. In addition, within building limits, existing soil shall be removed and replaced as engineered fill (over-excavated) to a depth of at least five feet below the bottom of the building foundations, to the bottom of artificial fill, or five feet below existing grade, whichever is the greater depth. Beyond building limits, existing soil shall be removed and replaced as engineered fill (over-excavated) to a depth of at least two feet below proposed grade. The actual depths of removal shall be evaluated in the field by a representative of the geotechnical consultant based on actual conditions exposed during grading.</li> <li>• All surficial units consisting of artificial fill, upper five feet of alluvial soils, soil with roots, and loose surficial soil are considered unsuitable for support of the proposed fills and improvements</li> </ul>	Less Than Significant

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>following removal of vegetation and deleterious materials. These materials shall be over-excavated to expose competent soil.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmentally unsuitable soils encountered during the excavation process shall be properly disposed of off-site in accordance with all state and local regulations. Over-excavated soils, free of deleterious and environmentally unsuitable materials, may be reused as compacted fill.</li> <li>• All over-excavation bottoms shall be observed by the geotechnical consultant prior to fill placement. Prior to placement of fill material, the over-excavation bottom shall be scarified to a depth of at least six inches, moisture conditioned to within one to two percent of optimum moisture content, and proof-rolled.</li> <li>• The geotechnical consultant shall be provided with appropriate survey staking during grading to verify that depths and locations of recommended over-excavations have been achieved. Observations and detailed geologic mapping of over-excavations shall be performed by the engineering geologist or geotechnical engineer to verify the anticipated conditions.</li> <li>• Any foundation remnants or construction debris associated with former structures or developments encountered within excavations shall be fully removed, and any void spaces that may be created shall be backfilled with approved compacted structural fill.</li> <li>• On site excavated materials to be used as compacted fill shall be placed in uniform lifts restricted to about six inches in thickness, moisture conditioned to near optimum moisture content, then mechanically compacted. Fill placement shall be subject to controlled engineering inspection by the engineer.</li> <li>• Fill slopes shall be designed at a slope ratio of 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) or flatter and be overbuilt and subsequently cut back to a compacted core. Fill slopes shall be constructed with keyways, backcuts, and backdrains. Keyways shall be a minimum of 15 feet wide for slopes up to 30 feet high and a minimum of half the slope height for slopes higher than 30 feet. Keyways shall be tilted a minimum 2 percent toward the back of the keyway and</li> </ul>	



## 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>embedded a minimum of three feet into competent material at the toe. Backcut benches shall be excavated to expose competent material where fill is placed on slopes steeper than approximately 5:1 (horizontal:vertical). Notes should be added to the grading plan to indicate these mitigation measures.</p>	
<p><b>GEO-4:</b> Expansive soils are found onsite and could cause geologic hazards to future workers and visitors of the project site.</p>	Potentially Significant	MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-2 are applicable to Impact GEO-4.	Less Than Significant
<p><b>GEO-5:</b> The proposed project would 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.</p>	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	No Impact
<p><b>GEO-6:</b> The proposed project could destroy paleontological resources or a unique geologic feature.</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>MM GEO-3 Paleontological Monitoring. A qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the developer prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Project Paleontologist will be on-call to monitor ground-disturbing activities and excavations on the Project site following identification of potential paleontological resources by project personnel. If paleontological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project, ground-disturbing activities will be temporarily redirected from the vicinity of the find. The Project Paleontologist will be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading or excavation activities in the vicinity in order to make an evaluation of the find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure CR-5 shall apply.</p> <p>MM GEO-4 Paleontological Treatment Plan. If a significant paleontological resource(s) is discovered on the property, the qualified paleontologist shall develop a plan of mitigation in consultation with the project proponent and the City. The plan which shall include salvage excavation and removal of the find, removal of sediment from around the specimen (in the laboratory), research to identify and categorize the find, curation of the find in a local qualified repository, and preparation of a report summarizing the find.</p>	Less Than Significant

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>5.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b>			
<p><b>GHG-1:</b> The proposed project would generate a net increase in GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment.</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>The mitigation measures from Section 5.3, <i>Air Quality</i>, would also reduce GHG emissions impacts of the project.</p> <p>AQ-4 The project shall place signs that identify CARB anti-idling regulations. 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 CARB to report violations.</p> <p>AQ-5 The City shall require operators of the proposed facilities to encourage the vendor trucks (e.g., commercial deliveries) to incorporate energy efficiency improvement features through the Carl Moyer Program — including truck modernization, retrofits, and/or aerodynamic kits and low rolling resistance tires—to reduce fuel consumption.</p> <p>AQ-6 All buildings shall be designed to provide infrastructure to support use of electric powered forklifts and/or other on-site equipment.</p> <p>The project also includes PDF-GHG-1 through PDF-GHG-8 and PDF-AQ-1 through PDF-AQ-2, which would reduce GHG emissions to the extent feasible.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable
<p><b>GHG-2:</b> The proposed project would conflict with applicable plan, policy, and regulations adopted to reduce GHG emissions</p>	Potentially Significant	No feasible mitigation measures exist that would reduce these emissions to levels that are less than significant.	Significant and Unavoidable
<b>5.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>			
<p><b>HAZ-1:</b> The proposed project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials.</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>HAZ-1 Prior to issuance of project demolition permits by the City of Jurupa Valley, the project applicant shall submit a Demolition Plan to the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) for review and approval and shall submit proof of that approval to the City of Jurupa Valley. The project applicant shall also provide written verification to the City of Jurupa Valley demonstrating DTSC approval of a Waste Management Plan. The applicant shall fully comply with the approved plans, which together shall</p>	Less Than Significant

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>ensure compliance with local air district requirements; ensure appropriate equipment and structures/buildings decontamination, tank removal, if applicable, and building/equipment demolition; designate appropriate waste and recycling material staging areas; and provide protocols to identify areas that require additional sampling based on visual observations and field monitoring instruments (e.g., photo ionization detector) during demolition activities. A Contingency Plan shall be included as part of the Demolition Plan. The Contingency Plan shall address actions to be taken in the event that, during demolition activities, unanticipated conditions are discovered that warrant additional assessment and remediation. If such conditions are discovered, the project applicant shall promptly comply with DTSC notice requirements and shall provide the City with a copy within 24 hours of any such notification made to DTSC.</p> <p>HAZ-2 Prior to issuance of project grading permits on the industrial portion of the project site, the project applicant shall provide written verification to the City of Jurupa Valley demonstrating DTSC approval of: 1) a Site Assessment Workplan, 2) Summary of Findings, and 3) a Response Plan. The Site Assessment Workplan shall comply with California Health and Safety Code Section 25395.94 and Section 5.3 of the CLRRRA Agreements between the project applicant and DTSC. The Site Assessment Workplan will provide protocols for additional sampling in areas identified by DTSC staff to ensure that on-site soils are fully characterized, to the extent practicable, and to ensure proper classification of on-site soils for on-site reuse or for off-site disposal. The Report of Findings (or Summary of Findings) combined with the Site Assessment Workplan will constitute the Site Assessment Plan required under California Health and Safety Code Section 25395.94 and Section 5.3 of the CLRRRA Agreements between the project applicant and DTSC. The Response Plan shall comply with California Health and Safety Code Section 25395.96 and Section 5.4 of the CLRRRA Agreements between the project applicant and DTSC. Potential response actions include soil management, land use controls, cover, capping, and long-term operation and maintenance, as needed. The Response Plan will include measures to address worker and public safety, air quality, groundwater protection, and fugitive dust generated from the</p>	

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>earthmoving activities during implementation of the response action. The Response Plan will include components such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Soils Management Plan to ensure safe and appropriate handling of site soils and transport and off-site disposal, if necessary.</li> <li>• A Contingency Plan for new findings that may occur during site grading.</li> <li>• Dust control measures and an Air Monitoring Plan in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 1156, Rule 1466, and Rule 403, as applicable.</li> <li>• Any other components deemed necessary by the DTSC to protect groundwater, air quality, or human health or as required by California Health and Safety Code Sections 25395.94 and 25395.96.</li> </ul> <p>HAZ-3 Prior to issuance of project grading permits on the SCE Substation portion of the project site, the project applicant shall provide written verification to the City of Jurupa Valley demonstrating DTSC approval of: 1) a Site Assessment Workplan, 2) Summary of Findings, and 3) a Response Plan. The Site Assessment Workplan shall comply with California Health and Safety Code Sections 25395.94 and Section 5.3 of the CLRRRA Agreements between the project applicant and DTSC. The Site Assessment Workplan will provide protocols for additional sampling in areas identified by DTSC staff to ensure that on-site soils are fully characterized, to the extent practicable, and to ensure proper classification of on-site soils for on-site reuse or for off-site disposal. The Report of Findings (or Summary of Findings) combined with the Site Assessment Workplan together will constitute the Site Assessment Plan required under California Health and Safety Code Section 25395.94 and Section 5.3 of the CLRRRA Agreements between the project applicant and DTSC. The Response Plan shall comply with California Health and Safety Code Section 25395.96 and Section 5.4 of the CLRRRA Agreements between the project applicant and DTSC. Potential response actions include soil management, land use controls, cover, capping, and a long-term operation and maintenance plan, as needed. The Response Plan will include measures to address worker and public safety, air quality, groundwater protection, and fugitive dust generated from the earthmoving activities</p>	

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>during implementation of the response action. The Response Plan will include components such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Soils Management Plan to ensure safe and appropriate handling of site soils and transport and off-site disposal, if necessary.</li> <li>• A Contingency Plan for new findings that may occur during site grading.</li> <li>• Dust control measures and an Air Monitoring Plan in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 1156, Rule 1466, and Rule 403, as applicable.</li> <li>• Any other components deemed necessary by the DTSC to protect groundwater, air quality, or human health or as required by California Health and Safety Code Sections 25395.94 and 25395.96.</li> </ul> <p>HAZ-4 Prior to issuance of building permits for construction of project buildings on a particular parcel, the project applicant shall provide a copy or copies of a deed restriction or land use covenant, as applicable, that has been recorded over the parcel for which a building permit is sought. The deed restriction or land use covenant shall serve as a land use control to limit the use of the parcel to commercial/industrial use and prohibit future noncommercial /nonindustrial development, and shall be in a form approved by the DTSC and recorded pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 25395.99.</p> <p>HAZ-5 Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for each building within the Agua Mansa Commerce Park, the project applicant shall undertake and complete the necessary remedial actions identified for that respective parcel within the Response Plan under the oversight of the DTSC. The project applicant shall provide written verification from DTSC to the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Director demonstrating either: 1) that the parcel has been remediated sufficiently to allow safe occupancy; or 2) issuance of a DTSC Certificate of Completion for the Response Action on the parcel for which a Certificate of Occupancy is sought. The written verification shall serve to indicate that the parcel is suitable for commercial/industrial development based upon screening levels appropriate for a commercial land use exposure scenario, or other risk methodology required by the DTSC, and that no further investigation or remediation is required other</p>	

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>than any long-term operation and maintenance requirements or monitoring that may be required by DTSC or other regulatory agencies.</p> <p>HAZ-6 Prior to issuance of project demolition permits by the City of Jurupa Valley for the Open Space/Recreation Park site, the project applicant shall submit a Demolition Plan to the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) for review and approval. The project applicant shall also provide written verification to the City of Jurupa Valley demonstrating DTSC approval of a Waste Management Plan. The applicant shall fully comply with the approved plans, which together shall ensure compliance with local air district requirements; ensure appropriate equipment and structures/buildings decontamination, tank removal, if applicable, and building/equipment demolition; designate appropriate waste and recycling material staging areas; and provide protocols to identify areas that require additional sampling based on visual observations and field monitoring instruments (e.g., Photo Ionization Detector) during demolition activities. A Contingency Plan shall be included as part of the Demolition Plan. The Contingency Plan will address actions to be taken in the event that, during demolition activities, unanticipated conditions are discovered that warrant additional assessment and remediation. If such conditions are discovered, the project applicant shall promptly comply with DTSC notice requirements and shall provide the City with a copy within 24 hours of any such notification made to DTSC.</p> <p>HAZ-7 Prior to issuance of project grading permits in the Open Space/Recreation Park site, the project applicant shall provide written verification to the City of Jurupa Valley demonstrating DTSC approval of: 1) a Site Assessment Workplan, 2) Summary of Findings, and 3) a Response Plan. The Site Assessment Workplan shall comply with California Health and Safety Code Section 25395.94 and Section 5.3 of the CLRRRA Agreements between the project applicant and DTSC. The Site Assessment Workplan will provide for additional sampling in areas identified by DTSC staff to ensure that the soils within the proposed open space area are fully characterized, to the extent practicable, and to ensure proper classification of on-site soils for on-site reuse or for off-site disposal. The Report of Findings (or Summary of Findings) combined with the Site Assessment Workplan will constitute the Site Assessment Plan required under California Health and Safety</p>	

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Code Section 25395.94 and Section 5.3 of the CLRRRA Agreements between the project applicant and DTSC. The Response Plan shall comply with California Health and Safety Code Section 25395.96 and Section 5.4 of the CLRRRA Agreements between the project applicant and DTSC. The Response Plan will include measures to address worker and public safety, air quality, groundwater protection, and fugitive dust generated from the earthmoving activities during implementation of the response action. The Response Plan will include components such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Soils Management Plan to ensure safe and appropriate handling of site soils and transport and off-site disposal, if necessary.</li> <li>• A Contingency Plan for new findings that may occur during site grading.</li> <li>• Dust control measures and an Air Monitoring Plan in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 1156, Rule 1466, and Rule 403, as applicable.</li> <li>• Any engineering or administrative controls or long-term operations and maintenance plan that is required by DTSC; and any other components deemed necessary by the DTSC to protect groundwater, air quality, or human health or as required by California Health and Safety Code Sections 25395.94 and 25395.96.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>HAZ-2:</b> The proposed project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>MM HAZ-1 through MM HAZ-8 apply to Impact HAZ-2.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<p><b>HAZ-3:</b> The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substance, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.</p>	<p>No Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>No Impact</p>

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>HAZ-4:</b> The proposed project is located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.	Potentially Significant	MM HAZ-1 through MM HAZ-8 apply to Impact HAZ-4.	Less Than Significant
<b>HAZ-5:</b> The project site is not located within the airport land use plan of either Flabob or Riverside Municipal Airports and would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area.	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	No Impact
<b>HAZ-6:</b> The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>HAZ-7:</b> The proposed project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	No Impact
<b>5.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>			
<b>HYD-1:</b> The proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>HYD-2:</b> The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant



## 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted).			
<p><b>HYD-3:</b> The proposed 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, in a manner which would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;</li> <li>ii) Substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;</li> <li>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; or</li> <li>iv) Impede or redirect flood flows.</li> </ul>	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<p><b>HYD-4:</b> The proposed project would pose a risk of release of pollutants.</p>	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<p><b>HYD-5:</b> The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.</p>	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>5.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING</b>			
<p><b>LU-1:</b> The proposed project would not physically divide an established community.</p>	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<p><b>LU-2:</b> The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.</p>	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>5.11 MINERAL RESOURCES</b>			
<b>M-1:</b> Project implementation 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..	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>M-2:</b> Implementation of the proposed 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.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>5.12 NOISE</b>			
<b>N-1:</b> The proposed project would not 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.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>N-2:</b> The proposed project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>N-3:</b> The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan and would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	No Impact
<b>5.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING</b>			
<b>P-1:</b> The proposed project would not induce substantial 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).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
P-2: Project implementation would not result in displacing people or housing.	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	No Impact
<b>5.14 PUBLIC SERVICES</b>			
<b>FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY SERVICES</b>			
FP-1: The proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provisions of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection services.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>POLICE PROTECTION</b>			
PP-1: The proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provisions of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection services.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>5.15 RECREATION</b>			
R-1: The proposed project would not generate any additional residents that may increase the use of existing park and recreational facilities.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>R-2:</b> The proposed project does not include recreational facilities which would have an adverse physical effect on the environment.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<p><b>5.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</b></p>			
<p><b>T-1:</b> The proposed project would generate traffic volumes that would result in direct impacts and would cumulatively contribute to traffic congestion that exceeds the LOS standards at some intersections and some roadway segments in the study area.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p><b>Alternative 1</b> <u>Intersections</u> Alt1 T-1 The project applicant shall construct the following intersection improvements prior to the issuance of the occupancy permit (each intersection is followed by its number as included in the traffic reports, Appendix K):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd./Building 6 access (#7):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct a westbound right turn lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. /Project Access (EW) (#8):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB RT (northbound right turn) lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB LT (southbound left turn) lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT (westbound left turn) lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB RT (westbound right turn) lane</li> <li>▪ Construct new signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ Production Circle/Project Access (#9):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal (required by Cal Portland contingent upon development level and meeting signal warrant)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Building 6 Access (NS)/El Rivino Road (#18):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd EB through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Project Access (NS)/El Rivino Road (#19):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct NB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd EB through lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to the following intersections:</p> <p><b>Alternatives 1 and 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. 22 – Hall Avenue/ El Rivino Road, City of Jurupa Valley</li> <li>• No. 33 – Market Street/SR60 EB ramps, Caltrans</li> <li>• No. 5 – Cedar Avenue/Jurupa Avenue, County of San Bernardino</li> <li>• No. 24 – Agua Mansa Road/El Rivino Road, County of San Bernardino</li> <li>• No. 36 – Riverside Avenue/Slover Avenue, City of Rialto</li> <li>• No. 1 – Cedar Avenue/I-10 WB ramps, County of San Bernardino</li> <li>• No. 2 – Cedar Avenue/I-10 EB ramps, County of San Bernardino</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternatives 1A and 2A</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as for Alternative 1 and 2 with the exception of Intersection No. 33 for which impacts would not be significant.</li> </ul>

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> <li>• Cactus Avenue/Project Access @ El Rivino Road (#20):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct NB shared through/RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd EB through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Building 1 Auto Access/El Rivino Road (#21):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB/RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd EB through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Hall Avenue/El Rivino Road (#22):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Hall Avenue/Building 1 Access (EW) (#23):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Alt1 T-2 The project applicant shall pay DIF and TUMF fees that will fund the following improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 20th Street/Market Street (#10:)</li> <li>• Install NB RT overlap</li> <li>• Modify signal phasing</li> <li>• Construct 2 WB LT lanes</li> <li>• Traffic signal modification</li> <li>• Install NB RT overlap</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to the following roadway sections:</p> <p><b>Alternative 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Market Street between Hall Avenue and Rivera Street (City of Jurupa Valley and City of Riverside)</li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road between Hall Street and El Rivino Road (City of Jurupa Valley and County of San Bernardino)</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• El Rivino between Cedar Avenue and Cactus Avenue (City of Jurupa Valley, City of Rialto, and County of San Bernardino)</li> <li>• Market Street between Hall Avenue and Rivera Street (City of Jurupa Valley and City of Riverside)</li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road between Hall Street and El Rivino Road (City of Jurupa Valley and County of San Bernardino)</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternatives 1A and 2A</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• El Rivino between Cedar Avenue and Cactus Avenue (City of Jurupa Valley, City of Rialto, and County of San Bernardino)</li> <li>• Market Street between Hall Avenue and Rivera Street (City of Jurupa Valley and City of Riverside)</li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road between Hall Street and El Rivino Road (City of</li> </ul>

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct 2nd SB LT lane</li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 24th Street (#11):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 26th Street (#12):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 28th Street (#13):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 30th Street / SR60 WB Off Ramp (#14):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ SR60 WB Ramp (#15):</li> <li>• Construct new traffic signal</li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ SR60 EB Ramp (#16):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road @ Holly Street (#25):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road @ Market Street (#29):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct SB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB Through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct second SB RT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street @ Hall Avenue (#30):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct N/S 2-Way LT median</li> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street @ SR60 WB ramp (#32):</li> </ul>	<p>Jurupa Valley and County of San Bernardino)</p>

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Restripe SB RT lane to Shared through/RT lane (2035 Requirement)</li> </ul> <p>Alt1 T-3 The project applicant shall contribute fair share funding for the following intersection improvements prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit: Fair Share calculations are presented in Tables 49 and 50 of the TIA (Appendix K1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hall Avenue/EI Rivino Road (#22):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street/SR60 EB Ramps (#33) (Caltrans):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct 2nd SB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cedar Avenue/I-10 WB Ramp (#1) (Caltrans)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct 2nd WB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cedar Avenue/I-10 EB Ramp (#2) (Caltrans)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cedar Avenue @ Jurupa Avenue (#5)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road/EI Rivino Road (#24) (SB):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Riverside Avenue @ Slover Avenue (#36):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct SB RT lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Roadway Segments</u></p> <p>Alt1 T-4 The project applicant shall contribute fair share (FS) funding or pay DIF/TUMF fees for the following roadway segment prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agua Mansa Road between Market Street and Brown Avenue (2020 Requirement, DIF)</li> </ul>	

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct two additional lanes to widen from two lanes to four lanes</li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road between Hall Street and El Rivino Road (2035 Requirement, FS)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct two additional lanes to widen from two lanes to four lanes (east side pavement currently at ultimate; west wise widening only required (from S/O El Rivino Rd. to S/O Holly Street (approximately 1,200 ft)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd between El Rivino and Production Circle                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improve Rubidoux Blvd. along project frontage (east side from El Rivino Road to southerly edge of Parcel 7; included in PDF T-8)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street between Agua Mansa Road and Hall Avenue (DIF/TUMF)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct two additional lanes to widen from two lanes to four lanes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street between Hall Avenue and Rivera Street (DIF/TUMF/FS)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct two additional lanes to widen from two lanes to four lanes</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative 2</b> <u>Intersections</u></p> <p>Alt2 T-1 The project applicant shall construct the following intersection improvements prior to the issuance of the occupancy permit (each intersection is followed by its number as included in the traffic reports, Appendix K):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd./Building 6 access (#7):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct a WB RT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. /Project Access (EW)(#8):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB RT (northbound right turn) lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB LT (southbound left turn) lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	



## 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct WB LT (westbound left turn) lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB RT (westbound right turn) lane</li> <li>▪ Construct new signal</li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ Production Circle/Project Access (#9):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal (required by Cal Portland contingent upon development level and meeting signal warrant)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Building 6 Access (NS)/El Rivino Road (#18)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd EB through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Project Access (NS)/El Rivino Road (#19)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct NB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd EB through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cactus Avenue/Project Access @ El Rivino Road (#20)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct NB shared through/RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd EB through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Building 1 Auto Access/El Rivino Road (#21)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB/RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd EB through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Hall Avenue/El Rivino Road (#22)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> <li>• Hall Avenue/Building 1 Access (EW) (#23)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Alt2 T-2 The project applicant shall pay DIF and TUMF fees that will fund the following improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 20th Street/Market Street (#10):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Install NB RT overlap</li> <li>▪ Modify signal phasing</li> <li>▪ Construct 2 WB LT lanes</li> <li>▪ Traffic signal modification</li> <li>▪ Install NB RT overlap</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd SB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 24th Street (#11):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 26th Street (#12):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 28th Street (#13):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 30th Street / SR60 WB Off Ramp (#14):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

## 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ SR60 WB Ramp (#15):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ SR60 EB Ramp (#16):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road @ Holly Street (#25):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road @ Market Street (#29):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct SB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB Through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct second SB RT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street @ Hall Avenue (#30):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct N/S 2-Way LT median</li> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street @ SR60 WB ramp (#32):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Restripe SB RT lane to Shared through/RT lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Alt2 T-3 The project applicant shall contribute fair share funding for the following intersection improvements prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hall Avenue/EI Rivino Road (#22):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street/SR60 EB Ramps (#33) (Caltrans):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct 2nd SB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cedar Avenue/I-10 WB Ramp (#1) (Caltrans):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct 2nd WB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cedar Avenue/I-10 EB Ramp (#2) (Caltrans):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cedar Avenue @ Jurupa Avenue (#5)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road/El Rivino Road (#24 ) (SB):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Riverside Avenue @ Slover Avenue (#36):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct SB RT lane Roadway Segments</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Alt2 T-4 The project applicant shall contribute fair share (FS) funding or pay DIF/TUMF fees for the following roadway segment prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agua Mansa Road between Market Street and Brown Avenue (DIF):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct two additional lanes to widen from two lanes to four lanes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road between Hall Street and El Rivino Road (FS):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct two additional lanes to widen from two lanes to four lanes (east side pavement currently at ultimate; west side widening only required from S/O El Rivino Rd. to S/O Holly Street (approximately 1,200 ft)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• El Rivino between Cedar Avenue and Cactus Avenue:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct 1 additional EB lane to widen from 1 EB lane to 2 EB lanes and maintain 1 WB lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street between Agua Mansa Road and Hall Avenue (DIF/TUMF:):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct two additional lanes to widen from two lanes to four lanes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street between Hall Avenue and Rivera Street (DIF/TUMF/FS):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct two additional lanes to widen from two lanes to four lanes</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p><b>Site Access Alternative 1A</b> <u>Intersections</u></p> <p>Alt1A T-1 The project applicant shall construct the following intersection improvements prior to the issuance of the occupancy permit (each intersection is followed by its number as included in the traffic reports, Appendix K):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd./Building 6 access (#7): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct a westbound right turn lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. /Project Access (EW)(#8): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB RT (northbound right turn) lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB LT (southbound left turn) lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT (westbound left turn) lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB RT (westbound right turn) lane</li> <li>▪ Construct new signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ Production Circle/Project Access (#9) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal (required by Cal Portland contingent upon development level and meeting signal warrant)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Building 6 Access (NS)/El Rivino Road (#18) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd EB through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Project Access (NS)/El Rivino Road (#19) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct NB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd EB through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cactus Avenue/Project Access @ El Rivino Road (#20) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct NB shared through/RT lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct 2nd EB through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> <li>• Building 1 Auto Access/EI Rivino Road (#21)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB/RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd EB through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Hall Avenue/EI Rivino Road (#22)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Hall Avenue/Building 1 Access (EW) (#23) (E+P Requirement)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Alt1A T-2 The project applicant shall pay DIF and TUMF fees prior to each building occupancy that will fund the following improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ Tarragon/EI Rivino (#6)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Restripe WB Left/Thru lane to shared Thru/Right turn lane</li> <li>▪ Restripe WB Right turn lane to shared Thru/Right turn lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 20th Street/Market Street (#10)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Install NB RT overlap</li> <li>▪ Modify signal phasing Construct 2 WB LT lanes Traffic signal modification</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd SB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 24th Street (#11)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 26th Street (#12)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 28th Street (#13)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 30th Street / SR60 WB Off Ramp (#14)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ SR60 WB Ramp (#15)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ SR60 EB Ramp (#16)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road @ Holly Street (#25)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road @ Market Street (#29)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct SB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB Through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct second SB RT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street @ Hall Avenue (#30)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct N/S 2-Way LT median</li> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street @ SR60 WB ramp (#32)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Restripe SB RT lane to Shared through/RT lane Alt1A T-3 The project applicant shall contribute fair share funding for the following intersection improvements prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit:</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Hall Avenue/EI Rivino Road (#22)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> <li>• Market Street/SR-60 EB Ramps (#33) (Caltrans)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct 2nd SB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cedar Avenue/I-10 WB Ramp (#1) (Caltrans)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct 2nd WB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cedar Avenue/I-10 EB Ramp (#2) (Caltrans)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cedar Avenue @ Jurupa Avenue (#5)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road/EI Rivino Road (#24)(SB)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Riverside Avenue @ Slover Avenue (#36)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct SB RT lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Roadway Segments</u></p> <p>Alt1A T-4 The project applicant shall contribute fair share (FS) funding or pay DIF/TUMF fees for the following roadway segment prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agua Mansa Road between Market Street and Brown Avenue (2020 Requirement, DIF)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct two additional lanes to widen from two lanes to four lanes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road between Hall Street and EI Rivino Road (2035 Requirement, DIF/FS)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct two additional lanes to widen from two lanes to four lanes (east side pavement currently at ultimate; west side widening only required from S/O EI Rivino Rd. to S/O Holly Street (approximately 1,200 ft)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	



# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• El Rivino between Cedar Avenue and Cactus Avenue (2020 Requirement, FS)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct 1 additional EB lane to widen from 1 EB lane to 2 EB lanes and maintain 1 WB lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Improve Rubidoux Blvd. along project frontage (DIF)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ east side from El Rivino Road to southerly edge of Parcel 7</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street between Agua Mansa Road and Hall Avenue (2020 Requirement, DIF/TUMF)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct two additional lanes to widen from two lanes to four lanes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street between Hall Avenue and Rivera Street (DIF/TUMF/FS)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct two additional lanes to widen from two lanes to four lanes</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Site Access Alternative 2A</b> <u>Intersections</u></p> <p>Alt2A T-1 The project applicant shall construct the following intersection improvements prior to the issuance of the occupancy permit (each intersection is followed by its number as included in the traffic reports, Appendix K):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd./Building 6 access (#7):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct a westbound right turn lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. /Project Access (EW)(#8):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct new signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ Production Circle/Project Access (#9):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal (required by Cal Portland contingent upon development level and meeting signal warrant)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building 6 Access (NS)/El Rivino Road (#18):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd EB through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Project Access (NS)/El Rivino Road (#19):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct NB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd EB through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cactus Avenue/Project Access @ El Rivino Road (#20):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct NB shared through/RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd EB through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Building 1 Auto Access/El Rivino Road (#21):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB/RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd EB through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Hall Avenue/El Rivino Road (#22):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Hall Avenue/Building 1 Access (EW)(#23):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Alt2A T-2</p> <p>The project applicant shall pay DIF and TUMF fees prior to each building occupancy that will fund the following improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ Tarragon/El Rivino (#6) ( <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct NB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Restripe WB Left/Thru lane to shared Thru/Right turn lane</li> <li>▪ Restripe WB Right turn lane to shared Thru/Right turn lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 20th Street/Market Street (#10) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Install NB RT overlap</li> <li>▪ Modify signal phasing</li> <li>▪ Construct 2 WB LT lanes</li> <li>▪ Traffic signal modification</li> <li>▪ Construct 2nd SB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 24th Street (#11) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 26th Street (#12) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 28th Street (#13) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ 30th Street / SR60 WB Off Ramp (#14) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ SR60 WB Ramp (#15) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rubidoux Blvd. @ SR60 EB Ramp (#16)</li> </ul>	

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct NB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road @ Holly Street (#25)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road @ Market Street (#29)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct SB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct SB Through lane</li> <li>▪ Construct second SB RT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street @ Hall Avenue (#30)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct N/S 2-Way LT median</li> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street @ SR60 WB ramp (#32)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Restripe SB RT lane to Shared through/RT lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Alt2A T-3 The project applicant shall contribute fair share funding for the following intersection improvements prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Market Street/SR60 EB Ramps (#33) (Caltrans)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct 2nd SB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cedar Avenue/I-10 WB Ramp (#1) (Caltrans)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct 2nd WB RT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cedar Avenue/I-10 EB Ramp (#2) (Caltrans)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct EB RT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cedar Avenue @ Jurupa Avenue (#5)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct WB LT lane</li> <li>▪ Construct EB LT lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road/EI Rivino Road (#24)(SB)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct new traffic signal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Riverside Avenue @ Slover Avenue (#36)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct SB RT lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

## 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p><u>Roadway Segments</u></p> <p>Alt2A T-4 The project applicant shall contribute fair share funding for the following roadway segment prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agua Mansa Road between Market Street and Brown Avenue (DIF) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct two additional lanes to widen from two lanes to four lanes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Agua Mansa Road between Hall Street and El Rivino Road (DIF/FS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct two additional lanes to widen from two lanes to four lanes (east side pavement currently at ultimate; west side widening only required from S/O El Rivino Rd. to S/O Holly Street (approximately 1,200 ft)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• El Rivino between Cedar Avenue and Cactus Avenue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct 1 additional EB lane to widen from 1 EB lane to 2 EB lanes and maintain 1 WB lane</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street between Agua Mansa Road and Hall Avenue (DIF/TUMF) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct two additional lanes to widen from two lanes to four lanes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Market Street between Hall Avenue and Rivera Street (DIF/TUMF) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construct two additional lanes to widen from two lanes to four lanes</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>T-1:</b> The proposed project would generate traffic volumes that would cumulatively contribute to traffic congestion that exceeds the service standards of the San Bernardino County congestion management agency, Riverside County congestion management agency, and Caltrans.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>None available</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>T-2:</b> The proposed project would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>T-3:</b> The proposed 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).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>T-4:</b> The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant

**5.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

<b>TCR-1:</b> The proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe.	Potentially Significant	<p><b>MM TCR-1</b> Native American Monitoring. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall contact the consulting Native American Tribe(s) that have requested monitoring through consultation with the City during the AB 52 process. The applicant shall coordinate with the Tribe(s) to develop a Tribal Monitoring Agreement(s). A copy of the agreement shall be provided to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit.</p> <p><b>MM TCR-2</b> Treatment of Discovered Native American Resources. If a significant tribal cultural resource is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s). The archaeological monitor and a representative of the appropriate Native American Tribe(s), the Project Proponent, and the City Planning Department shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented to protect the identified tribal cultural resources from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the tribal cultural resources in accordance with current professional archaeology standards. The treatment plan shall require monitoring by</p>	Less Than Significant
---	-------------------------	---	-----------------------

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during data recovery and shall require that all recovered artifacts undergo basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, whichever is appropriate. At the completion of the basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, any recovered tribal cultural resources shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility, or, the artifacts may be delivered to the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) if that is recommended by the City of Jurupa Valley. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department, the Eastern Information Center, and the appropriate Native American Tribe(s).</p> <p>MM TCR-3 Disposition of Discovered Native American Resources. In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this project. The following procedures will be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries:</p> <p>The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the Jurupa Valley Planning Department with evidence of same:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A fully executed reburial agreement with the appropriate culturally affiliated Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed.</li> <li>b) A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to</li> </ul>	

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. c) If more than one Native American Group is involved with the project and cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center by default. d) Should reburial of collected cultural items be preferred, it shall not occur until after the Phase IV monitoring report has been submitted to the Jurupa Valley Planning Department. Should curation be preferred, the developer/permit applicant is responsible for all costs and the repository and curation method shall be described in the Phase IV monitoring report.	
<b>TCR-2:</b> A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	Potentially Significant	MM TCR-1, MM TCR-2, and MM TCR-3 are also applicable to Impact TCR-2.	Less Than Significant
<b>5.18 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>			
<b>WW-1(a):</b> The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>WW-1(b):</b> Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.	Potentially Significant	MM WW-1 The proposed project shall comply with the RCSD TDS Reduction Plan; or if the TDS Reduction Plan has not been adopted prior to the issuance of the first building permit; then the proposed project shall coordinate with RCSD to develop a plan that will insure wastewater delivered into RCSD's sewer collection system for treatment at the City's Treatment Plant will not have a TDS concentration exceeding 650 mg/l. The TDS	Less Than Significant



1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		control methods will be accomplished using standards mutually agreed to with RCSD and may include TDS removal treatment for potable water delivered to the proposed project in whole, or for each individual building within the proposed project. TDS removal is not required for irrigation systems or fire protection systems.	
<b>SD-1:</b> Would require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>SW-1:</b> The proposed 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.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>SW-2:</b> The proposed project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>OU-1:</b> Existing and/or proposed facilities would be able to accommodate project-generated utility demands	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
<b>OU-2:</b> The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant

## 1. Executive Summary

*This page intentionally left blank.*