

2. Introduction

2.1 PURPOSE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that all state and local governmental agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before taking action on those projects. This draft environmental impact report (DEIR) has been prepared to satisfy CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The DEIR is the public document designed to provide decision makers and the public with an analysis of the environmental effects of the proposed project, to indicate possible ways to reduce or avoid environmental damage and to identify alternatives to the project. The DEIR must also disclose significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided; growth inducing impacts; effects not found to be significant; and significant cumulative impacts of all past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.

The lead agency means “the public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project which may have a significant effect upon the environment” (Guidelines § 21067). The City of Jurupa Valley has the principal responsibility for approval of the Agua Mansa Commerce Park Specific Plan and related land use entitlements (project). For this reason, the City of Jurupa Valley is the CEQA lead agency for this project.

The intent of the DEIR is to provide sufficient information on the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project to allow the City of Jurupa Valley to make an informed decision regarding approval of the project. Specific discretionary actions to be reviewed by the City are described in Section 3.4, *Intended Uses of the DEIR*.

This DEIR has been prepared in accordance with requirements of the:

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code, §§ 21000 et seq.)
- State Guidelines for the Implementation of the CEQA of 1970 (CEQA Guidelines), as amended (California Code of Regulations, §§ 15000 et seq.)

The overall purpose of this DEIR is to inform the lead agency, responsible agencies, decision makers, and the general public about the environmental effects of the development and operation of the proposed project. This DEIR addresses effects that may be significant and adverse; evaluates alternatives to the project; and identifies mitigation measures to reduce or avoid adverse effects.

2. Introduction

2.2 NOTICE OF PREPARATION

The City of Jurupa Valley determined that an EIR would be required for this project and issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on July 19, 2017 (see Appendix A). The public was provided with a 30-day public review period to comment on the NOP, from July 19 to August 17, 2017. Table 2-1 compiles the comments received from commenting agencies/persons and identifies the section(s) of this DEIR where the issues are addressed. All NOP comments received during the public review period are in Appendix A.

Table 2-1 NOP Written Comments Summary

| Commenting Agency/Person | Letter Dated | Summary of Comments | Issue Addressed In: |
|---|--------------|--|--|
| Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Gayle Totton, M.A., PhD Associate Governmental Program Analyst | 7/24/17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides details on Senate Bill 18 (SB 18) and Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) requirements Recommends lead agencies consult with all California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Project area per AB 52 and SB 18 requirements States that lead agencies should contact appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System Centers for an archaeological records search of the project area; prepare a professional cultural resources assessment report; contact the NAHC for a Sacred Lands File search; and Native American Tribal Consultation List Lead agencies should include mitigation to reduce impacts to potentially inadvertently discovered archaeological resources during project construction, including plans for the disposition of recovered cultural items and human remains. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i> Section 5.16, <i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i> |
| California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Mark Roberts Office Chief, Community and Regional Planning | 7/24/17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> References a copy of a letter provided by Caltrans on the proposed project dated 1/13/2017 Referenced letter states that all State facilities within a five-mile radius of the project, including Interstate 10 (Riverside Avenue), State Route 60 (Market Street), and Interstate 215 (Center Street), should be analyzed in the traffic impact analysis (TIA) Data from the prepared TIA should not be more than two years old and should be based on the Southern California Association of Governments 2016 Regional Transportation Model The TIA should include adequate truck percentages and utilize adjustment factors for passenger car equivalents Requests all Synchro analyses and hardcopies of the TIA for review once complete | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.15, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> Appendix K, <i>Traffic Study</i> |
| South Coast Air Quality Management District Lijin Sun, J.D. Program Supervisor, CEQA IGR, Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources | 8/10/17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> States that the lead agency should use SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook and CalEEMod land use emissions software when preparing its air quality analysis. The EIR should identify any potential adverse air quality impacts (construction and operation) that | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i> Section 5.6, <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i> |

2. Introduction

Table 2-1 NOP Written Comments Summary

| Commenting Agency/Person | Letter Dated | Summary of Comments | Issue Addressed In: |
|--|----------------|--|---|
| | | <p>could occur from all phases of the project and all air pollutant sources related to the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EIR should quantify criteria pollutant emissions and localized significance thresholds and compare the results to the regional and localized significant thresholds, respectively. • Air quality impacts from all phases (construction and operations) should be calculated. • A mobile health risk assessment is recommended if the proposed project generates or attracts substantial vehicular trips, especially heavy-duty diesel-fueled vehicles. • All feasible mitigation measures should be utilized for significant adverse air quality impacts. If impacts remain significant, project alternatives shall be considered and discussed to avoid or substantially lessen the air quality and health risk impacts. • If the proposed project requires a permit from SCAQMD, SCAQMD should be identified as a responsible agency for the proposed project. | |
| <p>Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA)</p> <p>Charles Landry</p> | <p>8/14/17</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States that the project site is located in the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) criteria cells 21, 22 and 55 which are designated specifically for conservation of the endangered Delhi Sands flower-loving fly (DSFLF) • Projects within criteria cells 21, 22 and 55 shall not require DSFLF surveys. Instead, 50 acres of additional reserve land shall be acquired. • The DEIR should address the project's consistency with the MSHCP's required 50-acre conservation area for projects in criteria cells 21, 22 and 55. • A Joint Project Review for MSHCP consistency is also required and should be completed prior to the DEIR completion and public review. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> • Appendix D, <i>Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis</i> |
| <p>California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) – Inland Deserts Region</p> <p>Leslie MacNair, Regional Manager</p> | <p>8/16/17</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledges that the project is a specific plan and future environmental review may be forthcoming, but recommends as much specificity as possible related to each of the four project phases and that biological surveys be completed over the entirety of the Specific Plan area with results included in the DEIR • The DEIR should include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Habitat assessment and vegetation map – Biological inventory of fish, amphibian, reptile, bird, and mammal species present or have the potential to be present within each habitat type onsite and within adjacent areas that could be affected by the project – A complete, recent inventory of rare, threatened, endangered, and other sensitive | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> • Appendix D, <i>Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis</i> |

2. Introduction

Table 2-1 NOP Written Comments Summary

| Commenting Agency/Person | Letter Dated | Summary of Comments | Issue Addressed In: |
|--------------------------|--------------|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>species within the project footprint and offsite areas with the potential to be effected</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Focused species-specific/MSHCP surveys - A thorough, recent floristic-based assessment of special-status plants and natural communities - Information on regional setting - Discussion of potential impacts from lighting, noise, human activity, and wildlife-human interactions, including project-related changes on drainage patterns and water quality - Discussion of potential indirect impacts on biological resources (e.g., nearby public lands, open space, adjacent natural habitat, riparian ecosystems, wildlife corridors, and any designated and/or proposed reserve or mitigation lands) - Evaluation of impacts to adjacent open space lands from construction and operational activities - Cumulative effects analysis for direct and indirect impacts - Mitigation measures that avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to sensitive plant communities with statewide rankings of S-1, S-2, S-3, and S-4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States that mitigation measures should emphasize avoidance and reduction of project impacts. For unavoidable impacts, onsite habitat restoration and /or enhancement should be evaluated and discussed; if not viable, offsite mitigation through habitat creation and/or acquisition and preservation in perpetuity should be addressed. • Provides details regarding habitat revegetation/ restoration plans if the project's impacts lead to requiring preparation of such plans • Provides details regarding the Migratory Bird Treaty Act • Recommends a qualified biologist be retained onsite prior to and during all ground- and habitat-disturbing activities to move out of harm's way special status species or other wildlife • States that CDFW generally does not support the use of relocation, salvage, and/or transplantation as mitigation for species • The project site is located within the Delhi Sands Area Subunit of the Jurupa Area Plan and within MSHCP Criteria Cells 21, 22 and 55 • States that the project is subject to a Joint Project Review process through the Western Riverside County RCA and will require preparation of a Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation to the RCA, USFWS, and CDFW | |

2. Introduction

Table 2-1 NOP Written Comments Summary

| Commenting Agency/Person | Letter Dated | Summary of Comments | Issue Addressed In: |
|---|----------------|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the proposed project will divert or obstruct the natural flow, or change the bed, channel or bank of a river or stream, a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement will be required • Recommends incorporating water-wise concepts in project landscape design plans (e.g., native landscaping and water-efficient and targeted irrigation systems) | |
| <p>US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) – Palm Springs Office</p> <p>Kennon A. Corey, Assistant Field Supervisor</p> | <p>8/17/17</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledges that the project is a Specific Plan, and that additional environmental review may be forthcoming on a project-by-project basis, but recommends as much specificity as possible related to each of the four project phases and that biological surveys be completed over the entirety of the Specific Plan area with results included in the DEIR • States that recent biological survey data are needed to adequately analyze the direct, indirect, and cumulative project impacts • Requests the DEIR describe the threshold that will be relied on for requiring additional environmental review for each phase and sub-project tiering off of the Specific Plan • States that a project consistency analysis with the MSHCP is required • The project site is located within the Delhi Sands Area Subunit of the MSHCP's Jurupa Area Plan and falls inside MSHCP Criteria Cells 21, 22, and 55 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – No DSF focused surveys shall be required. Instead, 50 acres of additional reserve lands shall be acquired within the geographic areas identified as appropriate in the MSHCP • The undeveloped northernmost part of the project site is the only remaining area within the Jurupa Area Plan for the MSHCP to meet the 50-acre DSFLF habitat conservation objective. The Riverside County soil map prepared by the U.S. Natural Resources Conservation Service indicates that there are 39 to 55 acres of undeveloped DSFLF suitable habitat in the northern quarter of the site. • Recommends the project's conceptual land use plan be revised to shift commercial land uses out of DSF suitable habitat in the northernmost part of the project site (Industrial and Business Park Districts) and move them south into the Open Space District. • States that surveys for narrow endemic plants and burrowing owls should follow MSHCP/CDFW requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Recommends the DEIR include a mitigation measure stating that if three or fewer pairs of burrowing owls are found onsite, the project | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> • Appendix D, <i>Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis</i> |

2. Introduction

Table 2-1 NOP Written Comments Summary

| Commenting Agency/Person | Letter Dated | Summary of Comments | Issue Addressed In: |
|--|----------------|---|--|
| | | <p>applicant will notify the USFWS and CDFW within three working days of discovering the owls, and will subsequently submit a Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan to the USFWS, CDFW, and Western Riverside County RCA for their review and approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> States that a Joint Project Review process for MSHCP consistency is required since the project site is within an MSHCP Criteria Area and that the review should be completed prior to circulation of the DEIR | |
| <p>Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)</p> <p>Terri S. Reeder, Chief, Basin Planning Coastal Waters Section</p> | <p>8/18/17</p> | <p>States that fine cement kiln dust (CKD) disposal areas were covered with a cap of clay and rock by the 1990s as a closure measure, but it appears one large CKD pile remains exposed beside the Wet Weather Quarry and may still pose a threat to air and water quality. RWQCB requests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Remedial Action Plan (RAP) prepared for the DEIR address the onsite CKD disposal areas and fugitive dust generated by project construction Any movement of the caps overlying the CKD disposal areas require a rigorous safety and logistics plan for CKD dust containment All CEQA Appendix G Checklist question be answered in the DEIR given that an Initial Study was not prepared A discussion is provided on how the site's geologic and mining history has led to the construction of quarries and associated infrastructure, as well as the need for careful remediation. Available closure documents be summarized in the DEIR <p>RWQCB also states that the water-filled quarry or "Crestmore Lake" was saturated at depth with groundwater recharged by the Santa Ana River, and pollutants entering it could be carried underground and impact downgradient resources. Surface runoff onsite into Crestmore Lake can also impact groundwater quality. RWQCB requests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The hydrology report addresses the creation of a Water Quality Management Plan to protect the Crestmore Lake from adverse water quality impacts, by using structural and procedural best management practices The EIR include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion of groundwater quality onsite, as well as upgradient and downgradient, and establish a baseline prior to construction. Discuss the Riverside A Groundwater Management Zone (GMZ), over which the site is located <p>State the Project's intentions for the two onsite wells, with their respective casing construction</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> Section 5.7, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> Section 5.8, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> Appendix A, <i>Notice of Preparation (NOP), NOP Comments, and Scoping Meeting Sign-in Sheet</i> Appendix G, <i>Hazardous Materials Reports</i> Appendix H, <i>Hydrology & Preliminary Water Quality Management Reports</i> |

2. Introduction

Table 2-1 NOP Written Comments Summary

| Commenting Agency/Person | Letter Dated | Summary of Comments | Issue Addressed In: |
|--------------------------|--------------|---|---------------------|
| | | <p>measurements (camera survey) and depths to groundwater. Any abandonment must be conducted according to California Well Standards</p> <p>RWQCB further requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A monitoring program of sampling and analyses tracking for groundwater throughout the project; • Establishing a groundwater elevation contour map (with seasonal fluctuations) indicating the gradient between the SAR, Crestmore Lake, and downgradient locations; • A discussion in the DEIR about whether the brownfield designation was established by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control or another agency, along with the expected level of remediation and waste management from that agency • A discussion in the DEIR with regards to jurisdictional delineations and any actual impacted acreage • The Riverside County Department of Environmental Health be consulted regarding any dismantling activities of capped disposal sites. • Recommends the DEIR incorporate and respond to the Crestmore Quarry Mining and Reclamation Plan dated February 7, 1991, which was Riverside Cement Company's proposal for an industrial park and preserved wildlife refuge in Crestmore Lake and ephemeral wetlands within the Commercial Quarry. The DEIR should discuss requirements of the California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act and how the 1991 plan may need to be revised. Any revised reclamation plan should be included in the DEIR as an appendix. • If Crestmore Lake is identified as having a federal nexus (i.e., regulated by the US Army Corps of Engineers) the project would impact these waters and a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit would be required. • RWQCB may also determine that waste discharge requirements and associated mitigation are necessary for protection of isolated wetlands as waters of the State. An LSA from the CDFW may also be required. • The project obtain a Riverside County MS4 permit per Regional Board Order No. RB-2010-0033, NPDES Permit No. CAS 618033 • The project obtain a Construction General Permit per SWRCB Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. | |

All comments are organized based on date received.

¹ Appendix A includes responses to the full list of comments in the RWQCB letter. This table includes the comments that need to be addressed in the DEIR.

2. Introduction

In addition, a scoping meeting was held on July 27, 2017, at the Jurupa Valley City Hall, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509, to elicit comments on the scope of the DEIR. A list of attendees is provided in Appendix A; no verbal or written comments were received during the scoping meeting.

The NOP process helps determine the scope of the environmental issues to be addressed in the DEIR. Based on this process, certain environmental categories were identified as having the potential to result in significant impacts.

2.3 SCOPE OF THIS DEIR

The scope of the DEIR was determined based on the City's NOP, and comments received in response to the NOP. Pursuant to Sections 15126.2 and 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, the DEIR should identify any potentially significant adverse impacts and recommend mitigation that would reduce or eliminate these impacts to levels of insignificance.

The information in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, establishes the basis for the analysis of impacts as included in this DEIR. As described in Section 3.3.1.7, *Project Phasing and Construction*, the project is anticipated to be completed within approximately three years. As such, this DEIR has been prepared as a project-level EIR providing analysis at the level of project information available and addressing each of the discretionary approvals as listed in Section 3.3.19, *Land Use Entitlement Requests*. Regulatory requirements, applicable policies and design standards, and proposed mitigation measures have been detailed. Applicable performance standards and monitoring would assure implementation of the required regulations and mitigation measures.

2.3.1 Impacts Considered Less Than Significant

In response to the NOP and public and agency comments received during the NOP comment period the City of Jurupa Valley determined that one environmental impact category was not significantly affected by or did not affect the proposed project. Agriculture and Forestry Resources is not discussed in detail in this DEIR.

2.3.2 Potentially Significant Adverse Impacts

The City determined that 18 environmental factors have potentially significant impacts if the proposed project is implemented.

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning

2. Introduction

- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation and Traffic
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Energy

2.3.3 Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts

This DEIR identifies seven significant and unavoidable adverse impacts, as defined by CEQA, that would result from implementation of the proposed project. Unavoidable adverse impacts may be considered significant on a project-specific basis, cumulatively significant, and/or potentially significant. The City must prepare a “statement of overriding considerations” before it can approve the project, attesting that the decision-making body has balanced the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable significant environmental effects and has determined that the benefits outweigh the adverse effects, and therefore the adverse effects are considered acceptable. The impacts that were found in the DEIR to be significant and unavoidable are:

- **Air Quality**
 - Construction-Related Emissions
 - Project Operational Emissions
 - Consistency with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)
- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**
 - Operational GHG emissions
 - Conflict with applicable plan, policy, and regulations adopted to reduce GHG emissions
- **Transportation and Traffic**
 - Conflict with applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing performance measures for the circulation system. Some intersections exceed acceptable levels of service (2020 and 2035 scenarios). Some roadway segments exceed acceptable levels of service (2020 and 2035 scenarios)
 - Congestion Management Plan. Project implementation would result in designated highways exceeding congestion management agency service standards.

2.4 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

Some documents are incorporated by reference into this DEIR, consistent with Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines, and they are available for review at the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509.

2. Introduction

- **Jurupa Valley General Plan:** The 2017 City of Jurupa Valley General Plan serves as the major blueprint for directing growth in Jurupa Valley and regulates the existing land uses on the proposed project site. The General Plan analyzes existing conditions in the City, including physical, social, cultural, and environmental resources and opportunities. The General Plan also looks at trends, issues, and concerns that affect the region, includes City goals and objectives, and provides policies to guide development and change.
- **Jurupa Valley Municipal Code:** The Jurupa Valley Municipal Code is a set of laws governing the City and covers all aspects of City regulations, including zoning, permitted uses and standards, and various development requirements. Zoning district standards are also included in the code. Where applicable, code sections are referenced throughout the DEIR.

2.5 FINAL EIR CERTIFICATION

This DEIR is being circulated for public review for 45 days. Interested agencies and members of the public are invited to provide written comments on the DEIR to the City address shown on the title page of this document. Upon completion of the 45-day review period, the City will review all written comments received and prepare written responses for each. A Final EIR (FEIR) will incorporate the received comments, responses to the comments, and any changes to the DEIR that result from comments. The FEIR will be presented to the Jurupa Valley City Council for potential certification as the environmental document for the project. All persons who comment on the DEIR will be notified of the availability of the FEIR and the date of the public hearing before the City Council hearing.

The DEIR is available to the general public for review at various locations:

- City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department, 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
- Louis Rubidoux Library, 5840 Mission Boulevard, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
- Glen Avon Library, 9244 Galena Street, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
- City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department Website:
<http://www.jurupavalley.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning>

2.6 MITIGATION MONITORING

Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6, requires that agencies adopt a monitoring or reporting program for any project for which it has made findings pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081 or adopted a Negative Declaration pursuant to 21080(c). Such a program is intended to ensure the implementation of all mitigation measures adopted through the preparation of an EIR or Negative Declaration.

The Mitigation Monitoring Program for the project will be completed in conjunction with the Final EIR, prior to consideration of the project by the Jurupa Valley City Council.